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 interesting. "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 Mellary. 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 stauncher 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. BOGGS. 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, Tenn.	Clark	Dorn
Ashley	Clay	Dowdy
Badillo	Conable	Edwards, La.
Baker	Crane	Fraser
Biaggi	Davis, Ga.	Gallagher
Blatnik	Dent	Goldwater
	Devine	Gray
Green, Oreg.	Landgrebe	Rostenkowski
Green, Pa.	McCulloch	Rousselot
Halpern	Macdonald, Mass.	Scheuer
Hansen, Idaho	Madden	Skubitz
Hawkins	Mink	Steiger, Wis.
Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes	Stuckey
Hogan	Roberts	Wilson, Bob
Jones, N.C.	Rosenthal	Wright
Kyl		

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. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. 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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

House votes on whether to approve funds for the continued development of the supersonic transport while each day Americans struggle to get to work and back home again in slow and inadequate transportation facilities.

A number of Members have addressed themselves to the environmental hazards of the SST, and I share these concerns, but I would like to focus my remarks on the need to turn down the request for SST funds and reallocate these moneys to mass transit.

Last year the Congress passed a 5-year urban mass transportation assistance program to expand the Federal role in mass transit development. For fiscal year 1971 the Congress has appropriated $214 million and authorized $600 million in commitments under the new contract authority financing mechanism whereby the Department of Transportation can enter into long-term obligations that will be met with cash in later years. This long-term guaranteed funding is very important to our cities that require, before entering into any large project, a commitment that Federal funds will be forthcoming.

According to studies conducted for the Department of Transportation some $35 billion will be needed to meet mass transit capital requirements during this decade. This suggests how minimal the $3.1 billion 5-year program enacted by the Congress is.

Despite the modest commitment made by the Congress, however, the President, in the program's very first year, has cut back the level of commitments by one-third—from $600 to $400 million. This was one of the President's spending reduction cuts. I would respectfully submit, however, that in the long run this will prove to be very poor economy. It just delays for another year the commencement of $200 million worth of public transportation improvements so desperately needed while billions of man-hours continue to be lost in traffic delays and construction costs mount at a rate of approximately 10 percent a year.

It is interesting to note that in actual dollars provided, more money has been recommended for the construction of two SST prototypes than for the entire country's mass transit needs.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with our priorities when our budget allocates more money for the development of a plane to shorten the trip to Europe for vacationers and a few businessmen than for the improvement of public transportation. The $214 million was appropriated in the 1970 appropriations bill in forward funding for the urban mass transportation program in fiscal year 1971; then, the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970 was passed authorizing the appropriation of an additional $80 million for this fiscal year. And yet, the President's budget calls for a supplemental appropriation of only $15 million bringing the total mass transit budget to $229 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the $134 million appropriation for the SST be struck from today's bill, and that the President take the opportunity to redirect these funds into mass transit development. The investment of these funds in mass transit will benefit many more people—including those who fly, but have to utilize some form of ground transportation to complete their journey.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was unable to be present at the session of the House on March 16, and missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 20 and "yea" on rollcall No. 21.

SOCIAL SECURITY VOTE

(Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was very shocked to learn that the vote on the 10-percent increase in social security took place on Tuesday, March 16, in my absence. Only that morning I had been assured there would be no votes on the floor of the House and, therefore, I felt I could serve my constituents best by remaining in my Philadelphia office to meet with them personally.

I do want to state emphatically that I am very interested in a sizable increase in social security payments, and on March 10 I introduced H.R. 5811, to increase the benefits by 15 percent. On the same day I made a statement in the RECORD explaining this legislation. This statement appears on page 5895 in the RECORD.

You may be assured I would have actively supported the 10-percent increase on March 16 had I been here as I believe our social security annuitants have worked hard and are certainly entitled to comfortable security in their older years. Therefore, I am planning to stimulate the interest of my colleagues in raising the increase from 10 to 15 percent as outlined in my bill, H.R. 5811.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY VOTE

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, when the House voted Tuesday to increase social security payments I was at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., meeting with Army officials and black inmates of the stockade there. I arranged the meetings in Kansas, because I felt that the problems of the black prisoners there warranted my personal attention, and after these meetings, I think that progress is being made in improving communications between the Military Establishment and the inmates.

Of course, when I made my plans, the leadership had announced there would be no business to come before the House on Tuesday. I must admit it was a shock to be in Kansas Tuesday afternoon and hear on the radio news of the House taking a major vote.

I am quite upset that I missed a vital vote. I hope that the leadership can organize itself better in the future so that this sort of thing does not happen any more.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 70, the social security conference report. Indeed, I believe that just a 10-percent increase is inadequate for the millions of Americans dependent upon social security payments as their primary source of income, and I would hope that the Congress can act to raise these benefits—and broaden overall social security programs—even more during the coming months.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. EILBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Tuesday, March 16, and was thus unable to vote on the conference report accompanying H.R. 4690.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of increasing social security benefits by 10 percent, retroactive to last January.

Additionally, I look forward to this House soon having the opportunity of raising benefits another 5 percent, providing a minimum monthly payment of $100, increasing the outside earnings limitation to $2,400 and providing coverage for prescription drugs through medicare. Let us hope that the great Committee on Ways and Means will soon complete its further deliberations on matters affecting senior Americans.

The commitment of this House must be absolute in assuring economic justice to hundreds of thousands of older Americans who have worked all their lives to contribute toward a better country. I pledge my unstinting support in this effort.

CERTAIN FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468), with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1, commencing on page 1, line 1, to line 6, page 2 of the joint resolution.

Under the rule, no amendments except committee amendments were in order to section 1, and the Chair had asked the

chairman of the committee whether there were any committee amendments, and the Chair was informed that there were no amendments.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. During the period from March 30, 1971, activities under the appropriation "Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development" may be conducted at a rate for operations not exceeding $289,965,000, but otherwise to the extent and in the manner provided for in the bill (H.R. 17755, Ninety-first Congress) as modified by the House of Representatives on December 15, 1970.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss with the House and the Committee of the Whole the procedure that we may be able to follow in order to get to an expeditious conclusion of the matter before this body.

As I view the procedure at this moment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will be recognized next for the presentation of his motion to strike out section 2. This is probably the only amendment which will come before the Committee. It will present to the House the issue of whether or not we should go forward with the SST.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) would like to proceed for the usual 5 minutes, and then he will ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes, so that he will have 10 minutes in order to present his amendment.

Then I will rise to oppose the amendment, and I will ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 5 minutes, if necessary, in order to reply. At that point we will then ask unanimous consent for some kind of time limitation. We would propose that all Members who wish to speak on the amendment to please rise and we will count the number of people who want to talk and multiply that by 5, so that everyone will have 5 minutes to talk. We do not want to cut off debate on anyone, but we want to arrive at some expeditious way to conclude this matter.

Then, presumably, there will be a recorded teller vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inform the Committee of the Whole that the chairman of the subcommittee discussed this procedure with me before he spoke, and it is perfectly agreeable to our side with regard to the procedure. I imagine some Members may have some other feelings on it, but so far as we are concerned on this side, it is agreeable.

Mr. McFALL. Of course, at the time when unanimous consent is asked, everyone in the House will have to agree. If the situation is changed at that time, then we will just have to see what other alternative might be acceptable. But this is the suggested procedure that we have in mind after discussion on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 2, line 7, strike out section 2 and renumber the following section.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to vote on the SST. There are five reasons why I believe the appropriations for the SST should be defeated.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

If Members would permit the gentleman in the well to present his arguments with a certain amount of solicitude, perhaps we would get this matter concluded much more expeditiously than otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The Committee will be in order.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will proceed.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the first reason is the enormous expense of the SST program. The prototype stage in itself will cost "only"—and I put that in quotes—"only $1½ billion." But this is only the first step in this huge outlay of the taxpayers' money. After the prototypes are completed, there still will be required to be expended before the first commercial SST can be turned out another $3 to $4 billion.

There is no doubt in my mind that even if the proponents say that the commitment of the Government will end with the prototype stage, that Boeing will be back—and the contractors will be back, to request funds from the Government with which to complete the commercial plane. Where else can the contractors go to get it? You know very well the financial conditions of the aerospace and airline industries today. They are in worse condition that they have ever been in their history. Where can Boeing and General Electric get their funds? They must do it not 5 or 6 years hence—when some argue that there will be a recovery of those industries—but almost immediately. Time is hard upon them. They must finance the later stages during the prototype flight phase—and the prototype is scheduled to fly in March 1973.

There are those who say about this program ,"Well, we have gone so far, why do we not put another couple of million dollars into it in order to get the prototype?" Surely, those who make that argument will be back to the Congress after the prototype stage to make the same argument: "We have about $1.5 billion in the prototypes. How can we stop now? We must help Boeing raise the additional amount of money so that we can have the commercial version of the plane."

Aircraft production is a quagmire. We learned that from the C-5A; we learned it from other aircraft programs. What makes us think that the SST will have a different fate than the C-5A or, a different fate than the Concorde—the Concorde, which originally started out with a limitation of $400 million for its production and development, and now finds its cost escalating to above $2 billion? Are our aircraft manufacturers so much better versed in costs and techniques than the French and the British that they can avoid escalations in costs in this new and untried field?

The second reason we oppose this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, is that it is an appropriation of public money for a private purpose. Yes; we do call upon the taxpayers and ask for their funds to build military planes. But we own those military planes. We need those planes for national defense. The SST is not in that category. The SST will not belong to the United States. The SST will belong to Boeing. The prototypes will belong to Boeing. There is a substantial difference between appropriating funds for the purpose of developing and producing military craft and producing and developing a commercial plane for a private company. And that is exactly what this program is about.

The American people do not want this plane. They do not want their money to be used for this purpose. Every poll in the country shows that Americans, in overwhelming numbers, are opposed to Government financing of the SST, and I say outside of Seattle and Cincinnati——

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I would prefer to yield to the gentleman in a few moments.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. What is the gentleman's estimate of the percentage of the American population that would have the ability to afford a ride in this proposed plane? Would it be more than 1 or 2 percent?

Mr. YATES. I am coming to that point. If the American people had an opportunity to vote on this appropriation as they do on school bond issues, what do you think the fate of this program would be? Obviously, it would be turned down overwhelmingly. On the point that is raised so cogently by my friend from Maryland, the ironical part of the program is that only 3 percent of the taxpayers who are financing this plane will use it. I say 3 percent. How do I arrive at that percentage? Today only 10 percent of American air travelers fly internationally. About one-third of those who fly internationally fly first class. The SST will have a fare that is higher than the first-class fare of supersonic jets. If American taxpayers are not willing to pay a first-class fare to fly overseas, what makes you think that they would be willing to pay a superfare to fly overseas? The only ones who use the plane will be business executives who can charge their travel off as a business expense.

Why should this House vote American tax dollars against their owners' will for a frivolous purpose for the benefit of a few well-heeled travelers?

The third reason that we oppose the plane is because of the possibility of polluting the environment. Proponents of the SST keep feeding us soothing syrup. They tell us not to worry that the environment issue has been dissipated. The gentleman from Washington, my good friend, last night said, "The environmental bubble has been burst." Nothing is farther from the truth.

They take the position that an environmental committee of scientists has been organized by Mr. Magruder and will report in 2 or 2½ years about the results of their investigation. Only then

will we know, although I must say I am concerned that the research team is headed by a scientist who told our committee he was 95 percent sure of what the results will be. We ought to have totally open minds for this project.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, this is not true. The scientists are still concerned about the possible effect of fleets of SST's flying at stratospheric levels. There is a possibility of polluting that atmosphere and the result of that pollution being felt upon this earth.

They say, second, that noise pollution has been dissipated—and that, too, is not true. There is on the drafting board a design for a new engine which will not be in the prototype, but will be in the production version of the plane, in the event that can be financed. This is a new engine that is supposed to reduce the sideline noise to a level the FAA has established for subsonic jets in the future. But that, too, is in the future and is only a hope at the present time. That is why I say the environment issue is still very much with us and has to be taken into consideration.

Also, much has been said that the age of the SST is upon us, that if the SST does not fly under the American flag, it will fly under a foreign flag. They speak about the Concorde and about the Russian Tupolev. I do not know what the information is about the Tupolev. Our committee has little information about the Tupolev at all, and we had thousands of pages of testimony. We do not know anything about it except what the Russians have said about it, and what the Russians have said about the speed of it is that it flew at mach 2. The fact is, however, no country in the world has yet bought a Russian plane. No country is willing to take the chance of buying a Russian plane and then trying to get spare parts.

Insofar as the Corcorde is concerned, that is no threat. Most Members have read a few weeks ago about the comment of a BOAC official, a sad comment, in which he said that the operating costs of the Concorde are twice those of the 747. What airline executive in his right mind would buy a Concorde that has twice the operating costs of an American 747?

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, on March 29 of this month, less than 2 weeks from now, executives of the British and French companies building the Concorde will meet—will meet—in order to decide whether or not to continue production of the Concorde.

Finally, we are opposed to the appropriation for the SST because we consider that the money being allocated from the very restricted number of Federal dollars in the budget could be used for much more vital purposes. Almost every appropriation in the budget without exception has been cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YATES. But the SST program has not been cut. It receives its full amount. School funds have been cut. Health funds have been cut. Hospital funds have been cut. Antipollution funds have been cut. Mass transit funds have been frozen. Funds for air navigation and equipment for airports that could go to relieve traffic congestion which plagues air travelers today have been cut. Housing funds have been cut. But not the SST, which flies on at supersonic speeds fully funded.

Why the rush? Why should the SST be a sacred cow that cannot be touched? Why does the SST deserve a higher priority than all the other programs that touch the lives of the American people much more vitally than does this aircraft?

I submit to the House, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation should be defeated. I urge the House to vote for my amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman say something about nobody in his right mind would fly the 747 if he could fly the Concorde. I have flown in a 747, and I think I am in my right mind.

Mr. YATES. I did not say that. I said no executive in his right mind would buy the Concorde if he could buy the 747. I fly the 747.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to all that has been said yesterday and today with reference to the SST.

Back in 1963 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted extensive hearings for several days extending far into the night on all of the problems with reference to the SST.

There are many here today who seem to be under the impression that flying at supersonic speeds is something new. The Air Force has been flying not hundreds but thousands of flights in the last 18 years over the United States. Extensive tests have been had by our experimental laboratory in Oklahoma City under the supervision of the Federal Aviation Administration. At the time of our hearings, the problems of the SST had been studied no end.

In 1963, where were all of these people who are today objecting to the SST? If there were substantial objections, those should have been voiced years ago and the project should have been stopped if those objections were justified. There may have been those who were against the SST before 2 years ago. If they were, they had not been registered with our committee. The first time I heard any objection to this matter was 2 years ago which was roughly 6 years after our hearings and the start of the SST. It seems to me that those who are now making objections are not only 7 years late, but are also $1.1 billion late. The cost of producing the prototype is estimated at $1.3 billion. We have spent approximately that figure up to now. Even if we stop the SST today, there would be an additional $115 million necessary to close up present operations. This simply means that we would have plowed over a billion dollars down a rathole when the program could be completed for approximately $1.3 billion.

I am never one who has criticized the loss of the horse because someone did not close the barn door. But it seems to me that when this matter has been open since 1963 and suddenly the complaints only arose some 24 months ago, that those who are opposing the project have certainly been lacking in diligence. Personally, I am not trying to change anyone's opinion with reference as to how he believes he should conscientiously vote. I just wanted to be sure that those who are in doubt will have some background of how this whole matter originated and was studied extensively in the beginning. If you will go back and read the appropriations hearings and also the vote on this matter, insofar as I can find in the record, nothing was raised substantially as an objection until 2 years ago.

When our committee had hearings on this matter, the problem with which we were greatly concerned was the recoverable costs. We had about every cost accountant and everyone connected with the program before us in an attempt to determine whether or not we were going to be able to get back the cost plus a reasonable rate of interest. At that time, I stated I would not support the program unless evidence to that effect was presented to the committee. From the hearings that were conducted, it was my feeling that there would be a recovery of the costs plus a reasonable rate of interest. I do not believe that the committee itself would have considered the project further unless the members in their own minds were convinced of that particular fact.

The question has been raised on the floor as to why private capital could not do the job. Mr. Bow, the ranking minority member on the House Committee on Appropriations, and I, together presented to President Johnson a plan for private funding through Government guaranteed bonds. The bonds, although guaranteed by the Government, would be sold to the public. There would not have been any public appropriations or financial problems insofar as the Federal Government was concerned except in guaranteeing the bonds. The company which offered to finance it was convinced that it was a project which would pay off. And it was their feeling that it could be done in that manner. I will admit that President Johnson did give it thoughtful consideration but came to the conclusion that it was inadvisable to change the policy since the project had been underway for some 3 years. I want it to be known that I am not in any way critical of President Johnson's choice which was based upon the advice he had from his own advisers. They thought it would not be wise to change the financial structure of the program 3 years after starting. I merely point this out to the House that there was a plan presented to do this through some kind of private enterprise effort in connection with the Government.

It seems to me that a great deal of what has happened since 1963 has es-

caped the notice of the House and the purpose of my presentation of these facts is to give the background from the beginning.

It is true that after the hearings were over and before the committee could come to any conclusion as to the authorization, the Department of Transportation was created. Under the language of the Department of Transportation regulations and policies, their legal counsel came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to have the authorization of either the House or Senate Commerce Committees. On the advice of the legal counsel, the Secretary could go before the Appropriations Committee and seek the necessary funds. However, I am advised that there were rather extensive hearings on the SST each year before the Committee on Appropriations. There certainly were complete hearings this year. I hold in my hand the hearings which run into several hundred pages over weeks of time. I would suggest that if there is doubt in anyone's mind, that they read those hearings and determine the witnesses they choose to believe as being most thoughtful and reliable in determining how they should vote on this issue.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McFALL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, one of the most remarkable things about the debate yesterday which many were unable to hear because of the St. Patrick's Day celebrations was the emphasis upon the economics of the SST. Many would have thought earlier that the emphasis would have been upon the environment. During the 4 days of open hearings in the subcommittee much information was provided that addressed the issue of the environment.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) says there are some problems yet to be solved. Yes, but there are some that the scientists believe can be easily solved. The main one has already been taken care of. They have designed a modified engine that will meet the noise requirements of FAR–36 which will make a quieter airplane than the present large subsonic jets which fly today.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is not an emotional matter of destroying the environment with technological progress. I think this has been our problem in the past. People in the United States want to see progress but they do not want to see this technological progress destroy the environment in which we live. I think we have put these fears to rest. So, what we are talking about here is a matter of economics. Now we can deal with the same kind of problem we have on this floor nearly every day.

There are economists who say we should not build this airplane. There are other economists who say we should. There has been over $1 million in studies on the future market for the SST, a market which will be for the 1980's. Remember we are building an airplane for the 1980's.

Mr. Chairman, the important thing is that we decided over 7 years ago to go ahead with this program. When the late John Kennedy was the President, he recommended that we go ahead and build the supersonic transport because he thought it would be essential for transportation in the 1980's.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFALL. I will yield to the gentleman when I have finished my general statement.

President Kennedy also recommended that we go to the moon—and we have. I did not think we could at the time, but I said if the recommendation is that we should go to the moon, I am willing to try—and we have succeeded. And I believe we can build a supersonic transport and succeed. We are building a supersonic transport that will be a productive airplane for the 1980's.

The point is made that this is only the first step, and they will be back here for production funds. Well, production financing is a matter to be determined later. We have letters from banks indicating that they would be interested in private financing of the production plane. This will be considered by this body in further debate. But I would point out to you that the private sector and the taxpayers will have $1.11 billion put into this by March 30. It will cost us another $119 million to stop now. On the other hand, we will have less than $350 million to go after this fiscal year.

When we get through with development, we will own about 90 percent of these airplanes, and Boeing will own about 10 percent—contrary to the statements made here on the floor that Boeing will own it all. We will own 90 percent and we will have the option on what to do with them.

The statement has been made that only a few people will fly in the airplane. Well, over 6 million Americans, secretaries and others, fly overseas. A large percent of the overseas flying is to Australia, to the Far East, and to Europe. By the 1980's there will be 25 million people flying overeas. While the aircraft industry is depressed now, overseas flight has continued in 1970 to increase by 15 percent as it has for the last 10 years. But we are building an airplane for the future.

It is said that we should not put public money into it—why, we put public money into any number of transportation modes that will produce for our economy. We started in transportation with the Panama Canal. Look at the money we put into our merchant marine. Look at the money we put into our airlines—and talking about airplanes, every airplane that we are flying today has been subsidized by the taxpayers. The 707 came through the B–52 technology, and the K–135 technology. It cost $2 billion to develop that technology. But this is the first time where the taxpayers have had a contract where they are going to get back some of the money that is expended for the development of an airplane.

We are putting money into mass transit. The point was made that every other program has been cut back. There have been cutbacks. I have a list of them. I am not in favor of those cutbacks. I think the administration ought to go ahead and spend the money for those things.

We are spending $400 million this year for mass transit, which is less than the amount we have allowed in the appropriation bill. We provided for a program level of $600 million and I think we ought to spend it all. But should we cut back on this program because other programs have been cut back? It seems to me that is like cutting off your nose to spite your face, or rubbing salt in the wounds of American labor which now needs jobs.

We could spend more money on this program and produce more jobs. There are jobs involved. Yes, there are 13,000 jobs involved right now. The aerospace industry is in very bad shape and if we are going to cut these jobs back, it will have a multiplier effect throughout our economy.

In the future there are 50,000 direct jobs involved in this as well as leadership in the aerospace industry. So I say to you, if you are talking of the tradeoffs in economics—and that is what we are talking about—we should go ahead as planned. We should build the prototypes and demonstrate that America can produce an airplane that will be the most productive airplane in our fleet for worldwide use during the 1980's.

Other countries are going ahead with their subsidized SST airplanes. Our airlines will have to buy these if they are going to compete, unless we have an American airplane. By going ahead with the SST we will keep our world leadership in the aerospace industry.

I would like to see if we can get some agreement on the discussion time.

I would propose that all those who wish to speak stand up.

I have counted 21 Members standing and assume 5 minutes each that makes 105 minutes or 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, end at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's objective is to assure 5 minutes for each Member?

Mr. McFALL. That is right.

Debate will be concluded at 5 minutes after 2 p.m.

Mr. MOSS. It is not possible to do that within that time by merely multiplying by five the number of Members on the floor who desire to speak. If the gentleman's unanimous consent request is that those on their feet be entitled to at least 5 minutes, I would withdraw my objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that rather than setting the time at 1:45 p.m. or 2 o'clock, inasmuch as you might have a quorum

call and the time would be thus taken up by the quorum call, it is far better and far more equitable to set a definite total amount of time regardless of any quorum calls or any other interruption. I only make that as a suggestion to the gentleman.

Mr. McFALL. Would everyone agree to 2 hours?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, again reserving the right to object, I think Members on their feet should be assured that they will have 5 minutes each. This request has come very early in the debate today for a limitation of time and it has come after the gentleman now in the well has used 10 minutes of time and his precessor in the well used 11 minutes. Some of us have very strong views on this and we would like very much to have the assurance of having 5 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. If you allow 5 minutes for everybody, then you do not have much of a limitation on the time.

Mr. MOSS. I am speaking of 5 minutes for those on their feet and that would be the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) that he amend his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 2 hours with 5 minutes to be allotted to each Member standing at this time.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it implicit in that request that should a quorum call occur that it would not come out of the time?

Mr. McFALL. That is the reason for asking for the limitation by the time used rather than by the clock. The time would be 2 hours with everybody on their feet now to get 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why Members will support or will not support the SST, and I suppose we can find an excuse for any position that we take. I think you probably have heard all the arguments, and anything that is said now is just going to be something you heard before. So I am not going to use all of my 5 minutes.

I merely wish to leave with you one thought that I think is paramount. We can argue all day about how we got here, whether you voted for this or against it before. The fact is that we are here today having spent $860 million on the SST, and the fact is that we stand today at a crossroads. Are we going to add to that $860 million another $100 million or so, for a total of about $1 billion and have nothing, absolutely nothing, to show for it, or are we going to commit ourselves to go the $1.3 billion and have the two prototypes and have the 100 hours of testing and finally determine once and for all, all the questions that have been raised here today? I think it is that simple.

What is our responsibility to the taxpayers? Not to stand here and argue about the votes that were cast in the last 6, 7, or 8 years, but to face up to the fact that we have spent $860 million, that it will cost the Federal Government a total of about $1 billion to get out of the project for which we would have nothing, or spend about $1.3 billion and finally carry to a conclusion that which we embarked upon 8 years ago.

When you listen to all the arguments about 300 planes, 500 planes, or what the payoff is going to be, or how much we are going to make, all the comments about the environment, that, literally, in my opinion, clouds the whole issue because we are not at that point.

We are trying to decide today the best course to follow as far as the taxpayers of the United States are concerned. I have sat in the hearings on the subcommittee, and I have heard the witnesses both pro and con, and I believe that the administration put forth the best case I have ever heard in any hearing I have ever been in.

I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not, having reached this point, follow through on this commitment and see it to a conclusion.

I will be very frank with the Members. If we follow through and the SST does not prove itself economically, if we cannot resolve the environmental questions, I am not going to be standing up here asking the Members to go forward. First of all, I think if it proves itself economically, we are going to have the leading lending institutions in there to finance the thing, and it will be built with private capital.

But that is beside the point. We must face today the simple question: Do we stop, having gone so far, or do we finally go over the last hurdle and complete the two prototypes and 100 hours of testing? I think it would be foolhardy to stop when we can see the light at the end of the tunnel.

I urge you to vote down the Yates amendment and vote to continue this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, in the summer of 1962 Najeeb Halaby, then FAA Administrator, appeared before the Government Activities Subcommittee, which I serve as chairman, and discussed in the most enthusiastic terms the development of an American supersonic transport. Even then the immense potential in terms of scientific advancement was readily apparent from such a project. As a general matter of policy, I accepted the supersonic transport concept as an advancement that would maintain American domination in the production and operation of commercial aircraft.

When FAA Administrator Halaby described how the leading edge of the wings of a supersonic transport would glow "cherry red" at top speed and that the aircraft would have to be constructed of titanium with even the most minor joint or moving part completely sealed from the searing heat and the bitter cold that would be the continually changing environment in commercial operation, I also realized there were formidable problems in translating such an aircraft from the prototype into an economically feasible commercial venture.

During the past several years, as the SST has been under discussion a number of other problems have arisen. Although considerable effort has been expended in research, the sonic boom has not been mastered. Questions have been raised as to national priority, pointing to the desperate need for more funds in the continuing struggle against poverty, ignorance, and disease.

All factors considered, the SST has been a close question requiring the most delicate judgment. Fundamentally, I believe that the need for continuously pushing forward through the spectrum of science and technology adequately supports the development of an SST and the investment of large sums of tax funds in the project.

Reluctantly, however, I must oppose apropriations for the SST in the absence of reasonable protection of the taxpayers' huge investment. Under the contract with Boeing, the taxpayers would not receive the normal royalty payment unless the production aircraft was designed for a speed of at least mach 2.2. If the airlines that would ultimately purchase and operate the SST's decide that the most economical speed of the aircraft would fall below mach 2.2, the taxpayers' huge investment would be limited to the recoupment of only 13 percent of the total investment, and this sum would be recovered only if 300 production models were produced.

Despite extensive efforts over a period of more than 2 years, detailed in Wednesday's RECORD on pages 6807 and 6916, I have not been able to obtain economic studies from the Department of Transportation reflecting a comparison of the incremental costs of increasing the aircraft's speed above mach 2.2 as contrasted to the economic benefit flowing from such increase in speed. Furthermore, even if studies were produced which indicated some potential economic benefit of the higher speed, there is absolutely no excuse for failing to protect the taxpayers' investment. There is no reason for arbitrarily limiting the definition of the SST to an aircraft capable of flight from mach 2.2 to mach 3.1.

The normal risk of investment in a project such as the SST is high in any event. However, to add to this risk serious loopholes in the contract with Boeing which deny the Government royalties on production aircraft falling squarely within the supersonic range is simply more than I can tolerate as a Representative of the taxpayers. I must

vote against this appropriation until obvious contract deficiencies are remedied.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the continued funding of the SST program.

As I have stated before, the question before us today is Will the United States develop the SST, and not will we have an SST. The fact is that the Concorde is an SST and it has been successfully flown by the British and the French. The fact is that the TU–144 is an SST and has been flown successfully by the Russians and the TU–144 will shortly be making commercial flights.

If we want to continue to be the leader in the aerospace industry, and not force our airlines to go abroad and buy many billions of dollars worth of aircraft, we have to maintain our position of leadership in the aerospace industry. This means tens of thousands of jobs for Americans, billions of dollars in a favorable balance of payments, and billions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury in taxes.

The return to the Federal Government of the Federal money in the SST will start with the sale of the first SST. Over $4 million will be added to the price of each SST and this over $4 million will come directly to the Federal Government. With the production of the 300th SST the Federal Government will have recovered all of its money invested and the sale of the SST's over the 300 mark will provide a most substantial return to the Federal Government, as we will continue to receive the over $4 million on each SST sold after the 300th sale.

All of the talk about the pollution in the upper atmosphere and the harmful effect that the SST will have on our ecology is unfounded. Russia already has a variable sweep wing bomber with a speed exceeding the speed of sound. The American B–1 bomber being designed and built by North American Rockwell is also a supersonic aircraft.

Our B–52 bombers can cruise at altitudes up to 50,000 feet. We also have the SR–71 and the U–2, both of which fly at altitudes equal to or in excess of the altitudes at which the SST will fly and, I believe, the SR–71 is a supersonic aircraft.

There have been no reports of any harmful effects on our ecology being caused by these aircraft. We heard yesterday from Mr. KUYKENDALL that if the entire SST fleet reaches a total of 500 planes, which will have 2,000 separate engines, the total emission of pollutants from these 2,000 engines would be equivalent to the pollutants discharged from only 1,800 new 1971 model automobiles equipped with Government-approved emission control devices.

In view of these facts, I urge that this amendment be defeated and the funding of the SST be continued.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, last week at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations some opponents of the SST pulled out all of the stops in their hysterical opposition to this program. Prof. James McDonald of the University of Arizona testified that the SST would probably increase the number of skin cancer cases. Later witnesses put down this theory. Dr. William Kellogg, Associate Director of the National Institute for Atmospheric Research, stated that the amount of ozone increase by virtue of increased water vapor would be virtually imperceptible. Thus the ultraviolet radiation would not increase in the manner in which Dr. McDonald suggested. He showed how misleading the statistics mentioned by Dr. McDonald were when he showed that if one actually believed Dr. McDonald's theory, a girl in a bikini would have to wear a bathrobe once in 2,000 years in order to protect herself from the incremental effect of the SST. But apart from the answers to Dr. McDonald's theory——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I have concerns about the environmental consequences of the SST, but to be perfectly frank, I do not think a specific enough case has been made about those consequences that I personally would utilize that argument alone as a means of opposing the SST project.

Yet I am in opposition to it. I am in opposition to it, because I think the method of financing it was in error when it was first adopted. It does not seem to me, under our system of free enterprise, that the taxpayer ought to be asked to contribute investment risk capital to a project as risky as this one is. If this project is not risky, as is now the allegation from the proponents, then it does seem to me that private risk capital should be anxious and, indeed, enthusiastic to take over the remaining financing of this project, particularly now that we have sweetened up the risk by contributing the taxpayers' funds in the enormous amounts that we have done thus far and which we will be required to do in the future. Does it not make sense, then, at this point to say, "Look. We have done all that we could do with taxpayer funds to advance what is essentially a commercial project with very limited utilization for the people of this country. We are willing to forgo that tax money. We hope to recoup it, to get it back, because if the project is successful, we will receive the taxes that the production and utilization of these planes will generate, but for the time being we are willing to let that money go and allow private capital to take over this project. You who believe that this venture is such a glorious venture, which has such great hopes and promises, you put your money on the line and do not ask the taxpayers to put up their capital, which is far more limited than the risk and venture capital which is supposedly abounding in this country." If we are going to spend $390 million this year to create jobs, if we are seeking WPA-type projects, then let us spend it on a project that will utilize the money in a better way and provide more benefits to the American public as well as creating jobs. I can think of a number of such projects, but just in the transportation field alone, if we contributed that amount of capital to rapid transit in this country, we would create far more jobs than will be created under this project. In addition to that, we would be contributing to solving the environmental problems of the country by ridding ourselves of some utilization of the motor vehicle and substituting in lieu thereof a rapid transit system. We would be creating a far better quality of life for a far greater number of people in America in that way than we would be by the creation of an SST.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from California talks about the method of funding the development of the two prototypes. It is my understanding that the contract with Boeing gives the Government the right to start to recover its investment with the sale of the first aircraft and the option has been exercised to have the Federal Government start to recover its investment with the sale of the first aircraft.

Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WALDIE. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say this to the gentleman. When we are talking about jobs, we are not talking about just the jobs to produce two prototypes of the SST. This bill specifically mandates the fact that once these two SST's are produced, the contractor will have to secure all of the financing with which to go into production, and that sum of money is going to run into billions of dollars.

I would also like to say to the gentleman that France and Britain and Russia have subsidized the production of the prototypes and they are investing money in the actual production of the aircraft.

Mr. WALDIE. I have heard that argument made throughout the last 2 days, that Russia is paying for the construction of it, but that is a Communist system. We should anticipate that to be the case. The British system with reference to transportation is a nationalized system.

If we are in fact a free enterprise system, please tell me why our risk capital people in this country were not willing to advance the capital with which to start this project. Why is that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The fact of the matter is that the outlay was too great for the development of the prototypes. We are talking about the free enterprise system. We are talking about a project

which will produce tens of thousands of jobs for a number of years.

Mr. WALDIE. The outlay we are talking about is not too large for private capital in this country unless the risk is too great. In other words, for the large amount of money involved, the risk is too excessive for private capital so the promoters of the SST seek public tax funds knowing full well that the guardians of public tax funds are not nearly as careful or cautious in their trust as are the guardians of private investment capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time until a later time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reviewed rather carefully this morning the debate of yesterday on the SST, trying to find out if there was anything there that would encourage me to change my opinion in opposition to the further funding of this rather costly undertaking and nothing appeared.

I saw a great deal of comment about markets, and the need of this country to be preeminent, to continue to be preeminent, in the air transport equipment industry.

Now, I want this country to be preeminent, but nowhere was there any information as to proven markets or as to a potential market for this aircraft.

At this time in this Nation and throughout the world the air transport industry is sick. It has lost a great deal of money and it is going to lose a great deal more. So, I do not think that our airlines are in a position to buy the planes if they were available or when they ultimately become available, at the magnitude of 500 aircraft which they would have to do if this Government investment is to be returned. This appears to be not within the realm of probability.

The most successful aircraft produced, the 707, as of the end of 1970 sold 673 planes worldwide since 1958. A great many of those are not of the intercontinental variety.

Mr. Chairman, the following facts are supplied for the information of Members. They represent worldwide total sales for all jet aircraft of U.S. manufacture.

	In service	On order	Total by types
707	655	18	673
727	797	40	837
737	249	24	273
747	40	150	190
DC-8	529	18	547
DC-9	571	36	607
CV-880	52	1	53
CV-990	31	0	31

Source: Turbine Engine Fleets of World Air Lines ESSO Air World, May-June 1970.

Mr. Chairman, this SST aircraft is highly speculative, we are told it will be flying in 1973, and will have two prototypes, and we will test it for 100 hours, and it will all be wrapped up with a total cost of $1,591 million.

I do not think it is going to wrap up at a cost of $1,591 million. This is an industry that has a remarkable record for understating costs, and you can see it repeated time and time again. I think it is going to cost much closer to $2 billion to complete the prototypes—and then more money has to be found if these jobs which are conjured up as the second attraction are to be realized.

If the objective is jobs, we can utilize the funds far more effectively and produce far more jobs, and have them dispersed far more broadly around this Nation, than we can by investing further funds in a project which actually was never authorized by this Congress.

I have served for 14 years, I am now in my 15th year on the committee which would have had to authorize it. I was called down to the White House at the time of the presentation of the package back in 1963, and the package offered then was an entirely different package than the one that is before us today—75 percent industry financing, and 25 percent Government financing, with an absolute ceiling of $750 million from the Federal Government, a ceiling long since exceeded, and one certain to be exceeded by at least 100 percent, or possibly 300 percent before we are finished. No, this is not a wise investment for tax dollars, which now are some of the most competitive dollars in the world. We have far too many demands at home and we need to reconsider some priorities, and I would suggest a few—and let me say again I am not at all impressed by the Concorde or the Tupelov, that they are going to be bought. The air industry of this country is sick, and a great many people traveling in the airlines of this country are disgusted and frustrated because they are called upon to go into facilities that are under par, and to travel airlines that are unsafe—airways that are unsafe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RONCALIO yielded 2 minutes of his time to Mr. Moss.)

Mr. MOSS. But instead of spending the money to improve these facilities, the very agency that comes in here and urges us to provide this money for the supersonic transport sits at this moment handcuffed in moving ahead on programs for the improving of airways of this Nation, and the airports of this Nation.

There is not a Member of this House, I do not believe, who does not fly, and who has not experienced the frustrations that are so common in air transportation today, which must be overcome by this industry if it is to attract a broader base of users and permit it to operate profitably.

Now, I know something whereof I speak. Because of my personal concern over the airlines, and with the sad financial condition of the arilines and the failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board to discharge its responsibilities, I instituted a suit in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and I won that suit—*Moss* v. *CAB* (430 F. 2d 281 (C.A.D.C. 1970))—to force the CAB to pay attention to some of the underlying problems of the air industry, and to recognize that the industry could not go on endlessly solving these problems by merely upping the fares, and that there were problems of management that need to be handled, such as the problem of over capacity.

The best evidence of this overcapacity was the fact that just last week the CAB issued an order suspending the antitrust provisions in order to permit the air transport industry to get together and to discuss the overcapacity in the air industry and to discuss the canceling out of some of the schedules and rearranging others so that they would be able to operate fewer planes and fewer seats, and do it on the sort of plan, well, almost a cartel arrangement between the air carriers. Certainly, the suspension of the antitrust provisions indicates that there is going to be a lot of soul searching.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. YATES yielded 1 minute of his time to Mr. Moss.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the airlines cannot even sell all the capacity of the latest ariplanes they are putting in service today—even with wider seats, a greater selection of movies, more exotic meals, and fancier stewardess uniforms. I have here in my hands an order issued by the CAB, dockets 23137 and 21866.

[United States of America, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., Order 71-3-80]

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT

(Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 12th day of March 1971, B-747 coach seating configuration proposed by American Airlines, Inc., Dockets 23137 and 21866.)

By tariff revision [1] marked to become effective March 14, 1971, American Airlines, Inc. (American) proposes to establish a coach/economy lounge in its dual and triple configured B-747 aircraft. The lounge is to contain 17 seats, all of which are to be withheld from sale.

Trans World Airlines, Inc. (TWA) has filed a complaint requesting investigation and suspension. It is alleged that the proposal will necessitate removal of up to 40 seats; that this coupled with the fact that the seats would be withheld from sale will result in underutilization of B-747 capacity; and that American is attempting to gain a competitive advantage which could have a potentially adverse impact on all B-747 operators by increasing unit costs. Delta Air Lines, Inc. (Delta) has filed an answer in support of TWA's complaint, alleging essentially that seating configurations have a way of becoming "writ in stone"; and that if other carriers are forced to follow suit the B-747 could be frozen for years into wasteful underutilization of capacity, thereby preventing this aircraft's economic potential from ever being realized.

In answer to the complaint, American alleges that the B-747 has not lived up to expectations in terms of passenger appeal, and that until it becomes more attractive carriers will be reluctant to retire older aircraft and thereby alleviate airport congestion. It is further alleged that the proposed reconfiguration will result in a loss of only 13 seats available for sale; that the issue of

[1] Revisions to Airline Tariff Publishers, Inc., Agent, Tariff C.A.B. No. 65.

withholding the lounge seats from sale is academic at today's load factors; that its lounge seats cannot be sold because they do not satisfy FAA standards for take-off and landing; and that the lounge can be withdrawn within 48 hours and replaced by normal coach seats when demand so justifies.

Upon consideration of the tariff filing, the complaint and answer thereto, and other relevant matters, the Board finds that the complaint does not set forth sufficient facts to warrant suspension. Seating configurations are already under investigation in the *Domestic Passenger-Fare Investigation*, Docket 21866. If it does not prove possible to resolve the issues relating to American's present proposal in the course of the *Passenger-Fare* case, however, the Board intends at a subsequent time to issue an order setting down a separate investigation. In our view, it will be essential to explore the long-run implications of a possible trend toward removing substantial numbers of salable seats from this aircraft for a future period when renewed traffic growth will again begin to put pressure on capacity.

The primary issue raised by American's proposal is whether or not it should be permitted to withhold the lounge seats from sale. In the past, where lounges have been provided in coach/economy service the seats have been available for sale as necessary to accommodate traffic demand. However, in light of the current disparity between traffic and capacity, we do not believe that as a practical matter withholding the lounge seats from sale will undermine the economics of B-747 coach service at this time. We are also influenced by the fact that the lounge unit to be used by American can be replaced by normal coach seats within a relatively short period of time, should traffic demand during certain periods or on certain routes so justify.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204(a) and 1002 thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. The complaint of Trans World Airlines, Inc., in Docket 23137 is hereby dismissed; and

2. A copy of this order be served upon American Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., and Trans World Airlines, Inc.

This Order shall be published in the Federal Register.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

HARRY J. ZINK,
Secretary.

MURPHY, MEMBER, CONCURRING

I wish to set forth more precisely the basis for my determination to permit American's proposed coach lounge configuration to take effect. In its answer to the complaints, American states that the 747 aircraft are currently facing a "crisis in passenger appeal" and that load factors on the aircraft have failed to reach the level to support economic operations. American states that at present even if the lounge seats were offered for sale, they would generally remain unsold. Accordingly, they contend the salability of the lounge seats is academic.

My decision is based on a *prima facie* acceptance of this representation by American. It will probably be some time before the traffic taxes the capacity of the B-747's and while load factors continue at the present low level, I see no practical advantage in trying to maximize seating density in the coach/economy section of these aircraft or any other aircraft. In these circumstances I am not willing to reject the decision of the American Airlines management and would allow them to provide the benefit of a 17-seat lounge to the traveling public.

ROBERT T. MURPHY.

American Airlines had applied for the right to remove 17 seats out of the B-747 in the coach section in order to give more room to the passengers and to make it a little more attractive. That was opposed by Trans World Airlines.

The Board found unanimously for American Airlines and they pointed out in answer to the complaint that "American Airlines B-747 has not lived up to expectations in terms of passenger appeal." The air transportation industry will not recover until we start attacking some of the fundamental ills of that industry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Will American Airlines exercise its option that it does have to purchase the Concorde?

Mr. MOSS. I do not think it will. I do not think the CAB should permit the airlines recover the costs of purchasing and operating either the Concorde or the Tupelov if they are not economical and efficient. That would be against the law. The public can only be charged fares that are based upon economical and efficient service.

One final point, I think it should be noted for the record that another major trunk airline, United, has so far first, canceled eight DC-10 aircraft, second, spread out the delivery of four Boeing 747 aircraft and eight DC-10 aircraft, and third, allowed its option on seven other Boeing 747 aircraft and 15 DC-10 aircraft to expire.

A tabulation follows:

Termination costs

[In millions]

New funds which must be appropriated to pay Boeing and General Electric	$97
Returned from escrow account at FAA (no appropriation of public funds)	22
In addition, some parties claim a moral obligation to return the risk money invested by the airlines by appropriation from public funds	59
Total claim of certain parties as amount to be appropriated by Congress as new funds	178

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL).

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to elaborate on my opposition to continued Federal funding of the supersonic transport plane. While the environmental arguments against the SST have been well documented in several authoritative studies, I would like to emphasize the conclusions of a Massachusetts Institute of Technology study on the SST's impact on the upper atmosphere. As the Study Group on Critical Environmental Problems affirmed:

> The projected SST's can have a clearly measurable effect in a large region of the world and quite possibly on a global scale.

After emphasizing that no one can be certain about the magnitude of the plane's various consequences, they urge that—

> Uncertainties about SST contamination and its effects be resolved before large scale operation of SST's begin.

The production of SST prototypes, however, will not aid in resolving these uncertainties. For, as Dr. Richard Garvin of the President's Science Advisory Committee pointed out in recent testimony, the prototypes will not "serve to alleviate any environmental concerns, since the production of sulfur-bearing particulate matter, the influence of water vapor in the stratosphere, etc., can never be determined by a brief flight test of one or two aircraft, but must be investigated by real research not involving high-speed aircraft." I concur with the scientist's contention that to proceed with the Government's support of SST at this stage of scientific knowledge about its effects would not only constitute a callous disregard for the welfare of citizens worldwide but may well doom subsequent generations to the potentially tragic effects of any commitment we may make now to the supersonic transport.

In an attempt to cloud over the major environmental concerns just expressed, pro-SST advocates have emphasized the ostensive economic benefits for American workers to be derived from its production. Yet this argument is also subject to great question in that it assumes that any moneys earmarked for the production of these planes would not necessarily be used to employ workers for other more useful projects. In fact, as Walter Heller, a former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers points out:

> On strictly economic grounds the SST is an enormously costly way to create jobs.

Rather than proposing the SST as a means to ameliorate the current crisis in the job market, the administration ought to direct the vast sums of money earmarked for the SST into public service job programs whose job-creating potential is immeasurably higher and more equitably distributed than the airplane's production could ever hope to be.

Another argument in defense of further Federal support of the SST which must be dispelled in its supposed beneficial effect on our trade balance with respect to other nations. While it is true that both the Soviets and Western Europe are already subsidizing planes similar to SST, these countries have no more evidence than we have that the plane will be either economically feasible to mass produce or environmentally safe. The English French Concorde supersonic jet, for example, has yet to find a buyer and significant segments of both English and French population I am informed are totally opposed to their government's further subsidizing of the plane's production.

What with the grave economic doubts surrounding the SST's ultimate marketability and attractiveness to transcontinental passengers, it is apparent to me that our balance-of-trade interest is better served by devoting our resources to their most efficient uses rather than undertaking a program requiring a $1.3 billion subsidy to just get off the ground.

In conclusion, the SST will only contribute to an already unstable economy by contributing to the inflationary cycle caused by superfluous government spending. It is my belief that continued Federal support of such an economically unsound and ecologically unwise project as the supersonic transport would be a grave error and an injustice to our constituents

who look to us for reasoned judgments on public policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I share with many in the House the deep concern over the environmental problems that have been advanced in discussions of the SST. I also find myself in the position of not being an expert in environmental affairs, and I find that I can find experts on either side of the coin who will testify and state their positions, one, that there are no problems that cannot be resolved, and the other ones who state that we are going to bring about utter disaster by going ahead with the SST program. Because of this situation, and as a result of listening to the testimony of experts and reading reports, I personally have reached the conclusion that this project should move forward, but that it should move forward on the basis of a control.

I am going to introduce in the form of a bill, assuming that the appropriation for the SST is passed by the House today, proposed legislation which will call for the development and institution of an independent commission that will evaluate the full environmental effects of the SST when the two prototypes are completed, and that this commission will report back to the Congress. We will have to have, I believe, an affirmative kind of position. Certainly from my own point of view, the commission involved will have to give a clean bill of health, the environmental to the SST, in order that I would go ahead any further in allowing the SST's to fly.

I would hope that other Members of the House would be willing to join with me in this type of a proposal, and I intend to make it possible for every Member to join me in bringing this type of legislation about.

There is a point that I think has been brought up several times, and I would like to briefly speak to it, and that is the question of percentages.

It has been stated by some of my colleagues that only 3 percent of this country would utilize the SST, and, therefore, it is not a valid investment for all taxpayers. I think if we start evaluating programs of this Government on the basis of percentages of the people who are directly affected, we may be missing many very fine programs. One specifically I have introduced this year and which the President has spoken of is the development of the National Cancer Foundation, which I happen to support very strongly, and I very much support the allocation of $100 million a year to fight the battle against cancer. But if we follow the percentage argument, the figures would show only one and one-half percent of our population dies each year from cancer. I think this is a horrible figure.

However, I think if we start discussing programs on the basis of their percentages and evaluate these figures in many programs—and I use cancer, because this is one that is going to be before the House—I think we will be making a terrible mistake. So I urge Members to discount this area of the discussion dealing with percentages.

Finally, my feeling is that I agree completely with one of my colleagues who just preceded me, who said probably there are going to be very few people whose minds will be changed here, but there may be a few, and I think if the few involved will measure the points I am bringing out, namely an independent commission to evaluate the SST when completed and not being related to percentages of use, then perhaps they will find a way of supporting this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER assumed the chair.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 17, 1971, the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4690. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1971 for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

CERTAIN FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, the supersonic transport plane has generated more response from Wyoming than any other national issue, and it is nearly unanimous in opposing another cent for the SST at this time.

There is no way to characterize the mail from Wyoming. It has come from medical doctors, ranchers, laborers, housewives, students, retired persons, from a genuine cross section of the population.

These letters, for the most part, have itemized arguments thoroughly familiar to this body. There are those who ask why the strain on the national debt be aggravated, and those who say the money is critically needed in more obvious programs of merit. There are those who question its value as a contribution to the American air superiority, and those who lament its possible effect on the environment, and on human life itself.

There is, however, another theme underlying these objections. Variously stated, but with the same agonizing presence, is the question I address now, "Who shall determine how the public revenue shall be spent?"

Mr. Chairman, each and every one of us is familiar with the crisis of confidence which now grips the Nation, which causes the people to wonder if the men who are elected to guide this Nation are, in fact, responsive to the public will.

They do not merely wonder how the funding for the supersonic transport plane is sewed up in the face of the great outcry against it, they wonder how Congress itself is mobilized to act for something when public opinion is so strongly against it.

Do we, the Members of Congress, reply to this situation with sincere action, with effort worthy to be called "thinking" and "working" or do we respond with another speech, or score "for the record" technique?

I am seriously concerned with this erosion of congressional reputation. We have allowed ritual and custom to engage us, and the resulting failure to work or think contributes to the troubled spirit of these times.

But, I am not here today to discuss this issue in historical terms, but rather to apply it to the issue before this House, the approval of continuing appropriations for the SST and for the Department of Transportation.

I have developed a special interest in the Department of Transportation in the short 2 months of this session. I had barely arrived from Wyoming, when I was confronted with the report of the Secretary of Transportation on a National Railroad Passenger Corporation and the basic system it would direct.

In that report, which purportedly concerns a national rail passenger system, my own State of Wyoming was threatened with exclusion. And, as Senator FRANK CHURCH pointed out in his speech in the Senate on February 26, this same, so-called national plan also threatens to exclude five other States: South Dakota, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, and Idaho.

In response to a groundswell of protest from Wyoming, I put full effort on this, and the results, I am sorry to say, have been very disappointing. I have received polite acknowledgements, and, in the case of my most recent letter to Federal Railroad Administrator, Mr. Carl V. Lyon, no reply at all.

During this entire time, my office was well supplied by the Department of Transportation with bulletins, briefings, and a buffet for funding the supersonic transport plane.

Also, on March 8, I wrote to Secretary Volpe inquiring about a news item in the February 21 issue of the Washington Star. The article reported the awarding of two $100,000 contracts for development of a tracked air-cushioned vehicle to run from Dulles Airport to Dolley Madison Boulevard in McLean, Va.

Without even beginning inquiry into why the one most satisfactory stretch of road in this area—the one with the least traffic problem—should receive a rapid transit project, I asked only for the background on these contracts. I have not yet received a reply to this legitimate inquiry into the expenditure of Department of Transportation funds.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Chairman, I am tired of this blase attitude by Federal agency heads, whose responsibility to the

public is as great as mine, even if it is not as directly established.

I am not going to vote for this SST or any other present Department of Transportation project and I urge my colleagues to stand up to this kind of summary treatment by doing likewise.

If the individual Members of this body are treated as adverse parties, and if the House as a whole finds itself reacting to situations, instead of directing them, then the quality of lawmaking here descends to a charade, to theatrics, and brief moments of surly submission to the well-oiled machinery of persuasion and of "vote by rote."

I am voting against funding the SST and against any continuing appropriation to the Department of Transportation to protest this gradual subjection of the legislative branch of this Government.

In the matter of appropriations, the buck stops here, in the Congress. If we cannot respond to the public outrage against wasteful diversions of the National Treasury, then we fail our constituents, we fail ourselves, and we fail the Constitution.

There can be little hope for the peaceful, reasonable, and orderly realtering of national priorities if the House today bows down to the demand for funding the SST and the Department which is forcing its failure on us for continued support.

In conclusion, I remind my colleagues that in addition to the evidence against the SST on the basis of sound economics and ecology, there is the larger issue of out-of-time—of priorities. If we wish to right the wrongful present direction, we must begin by voting down this request for continuing appropriations. Let us look at this stage of SST development 3 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, when I went on this subcommittee 2 years ago I soon discovered that one of the major problems with which I was going to have to be concerned was this issue of the SST. Since that time up to now I have heard many witnesses and much discussion of this issue.

I approached it with an open mind. I had no strong feelings one way or the other. It is not a political issue in my district. It is not an employment issue in my district. So I was in a position to approach it on its own merits.

As I learned more and more about it I became more and more convinced that the issue before the House today is one on which I had to be in support.

I have been interested in all the great discussions, the many words that have been spoken, but I have also been equally surprised at how little of it has to do with what is before the House to be decided today.

We are not going to decide the environmental issues today, and we are not going to decide the economic viability of the planes today.

I believe I can describe this situation as it really faces us in this way: We are in a stud poker game. Russia, England, France and the United States have hands in that game. We have already dealt four cards. We have called all bets up to this point. We have put into the pot, counting what we have already spent and what it will cost us to stop today, $1.1 billion.

This information is in the hearings, and I specifically saw that the actual cost of quitting was in there.

So if we throw in the hand today we will have stuck the American taxpayers $1.1 billion and they will have nothing on earth to show for it.

But if we draw that fifth card we can look at the exposed cards on the poker table. We know there is almost a certainty that we will win that pot. We are going to have to ante up another $200 million or $300 million, more than we are already stuck for.

I want America to stay in this poker game and to draw that fifth card and to win that pot.

What are we winning? Two prototype planes with 100 hours of testing.

If I were opposed to this because of environmental problems I would be here insisting that we go this far, because that would be where we would get the answers to prove my case.

If I were opposed to this on the problem of economic viability, I would want to go this one more step, because the testing of the prototypes would prove that point.

It is a strange thing to me why some want to stop right now. I ask the question: If we stop now who will benefit? Certainly not the American people, for they are going to be stuck for $1.1 billion. Since England, France and Russia have gone as far as they have, if there is any winning to be done by our stopping it has to be them and not us.

I begin to wonder why so much of this smoke screening and straining at gnats.

We can make one of two decisions today; either to stop or to go ahead. All we are stopping or going ahead on is two prototype planes.

The only way this country will ever get to the bottom of this issue, as to whether it will be safe for the environment and whether it will have economic viability, after having spent $1.1 billion, is to go ahead. What on earth is the reason why we will not give our Nation the rest of this answer for such a comparatively small additional cost?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to aline myself with the gentleman's principles as enunciated here today. He is talking sense. He is talking along the line of every accomplishment this Nation has ever made in every field of research and development.

We can go back to the diesel engine, developed by the Navy, and the Wright airplane engine, and the Boeing jets, and all these things. These were all done by Government subsidy, and then turned over to the civil uses of the people of the United States.

I want the gentleman to know I appreciate his remarks. He is talking sense.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

I want America to stay in this poker game until we get the answers that will be so important in the years ahead. I believe, having gone this far, there is no sensible or logical way in which you can justify throwing in the hand now and telling the American people that we have paid $1.1 billion and have nothing to show for it. I am going to vote to go ahead, and when I do that I want you to know I have absolutely no commitment that I will go any further with any of this until prototypes have been built and tested and we get the answers that we are all arguing about here all over the lot today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the continuing appropriation, House Joint Resolution 468. I oppose the pending amendment. I do it primarily as a scientist. Inasmuch as we have the state of the art, I am convinced that we should use it. I think the technical breakthroughs have been adequately proven in the light of my long service on the Strategic Airlift Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and continuous service on the Research and Development Subcommittee of the same committee.

It was there, Mr. Chairman, that we saw the SR–70, the XB versions, to say nothing of the F–4's, the U–2's, and the SR–71's and others which overfly and perform surveillance missions here and around the world regularly. Without such support of Congress in the McNamara era in the Pentagon—a disaster in itself—our Nation would have few such aerial superiorities in its defense measures.

I have had the privilege of visiting the plants in which the mockups and the prototypes are developed. Indeed, much of this technical know-how has come out of the great McDonald-Douglas Aircraft and aerospace area in Missouri.

I would simply remind those who hesitate, Mr. Chairman, that given a technical breakthrough; those persons, whether they be individuals or nations that stand idly by, are surpassed by others who pick up the baton and pursue it in their sovereign national interest.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the further Federal funding of construction of civilian supersonic transports, and in support of the Yates amendment striking the SST subsidy provisions from the pending Department of Transportation continuing appropriation bill.

I have opposed this subsidy on previous occasions. While I appreciate the excellent arguments and presentations made on both sides of this issue, I remain unpersuaded that this controversial plane, despite costly "safeguards."

would not cause further deterioration of our environment and complicate the struggle against man-created pollution.

It appears to me that the proponents of this costly project have failed to present scientific proof that overflights by supersonic transports would not make life on this planet more hazardous through air and noise pollution. I can see no great and overriding benefit to mankind compensating for the potential dangers of this project.

Nor is continued subsidy of the SST sufficiently justified on any economic grounds, least of all as a glorified public work project. If ever actual need arises for Federal programs to provide work for the jobless, certainly projects could be devised that would enhance and protect the environment rather than contribute to its pollution and deterioration.

If the civilian supersonic transport succeeds, it will shave intercontinental travel by a few hours for the relatively few citizens desiring and able to afford the luxury of such travel. But how about the average citizen who cannot get decent railway passenger service or adequate highways for essential travel?

There must be reordering of priorities, with greater relevance to the most urgent needs of our cities and rural areas and with more realistic visualization of our true national values and interests.

If moneys proposed for the SST project were instead expended upon transportation for the masses instead of the few, for example in improving our railroad passenger service through networks more adequately serving the public throughout all these United States rather than the bare skeleton proposed by planners, far more good would be done the greatest number.

Funds diverted from continuation of the SST project can also be put to work in improving our educational system, in conserving our resources, in enriching the lives of all citizens through expanding opportunities for cultural growth and recreational experience.

Perhaps some thought could even be given to possibly letting the taxpayer keep more of his earnings.

In this time of crucial need to exercise fiscal responsibility and special stringency with regard to any Federal expenditures, and in view of the many other far more meritorious projects needing priority consideration, I see no justification for gambling further Federal investment in the SST.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for the Yates amendment which strikes all funds for the SST from the pending bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in going on further about the distinguished Dr. James McDonald who appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I think something in his history would be interesting for the House to know. It turns out that he is the same scientist who appeared before a House Committee on Science and Astronautics in 1968 and testified about UFO's, that is, unidentified flying objects, which he said might have caused the blackout along the East Coast in the mid-sixties.

Now, Mr. McDonald also distributed a prepared statement, and I want to quote verbatim the whole paragraph:

> An extremely unusual category of cases, those involving reports of humanoid occupants of landed UFO's . . . I have tended to skirt such cases on tactical grounds; the reports are bizarre . . . For the record, I should have to state that my interviewing results dispose me toward acceptance of the existence of humanoid occupants in some UFO's. My efforts over the past two years being aimed at arousing a new degree of scientific interests among my colleagues in the physical sciences, have led me to play down even the little I do know about occupant sightings. One or two early attempts to touch upon that point within the time limits of a one-hour colloquium taught me that one loses more than he gains in speaking briefly about UFO occupants, but occupants there seem to be, and contact (with them) of a limited sort may well have occurred.

Mr. Chairman, is this the best the SST opposition can bring up here, a man who spends a great deal of his time talking about little men flying around the sky? Mr. Chairman, this is a serious subject, the jobs of hundreds of thousands are in the balance, at least $22 billion of trade balance is at stake, and the future sales market of our aerospace industry hangs in the balance.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider the responsible testimony of men like Dr. Will Kellogg, Associate Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, and of Dr. Leo Beranek, chief scientist of Bolt, Beranek & Newman, who ranks among the Nation's top acoustics scientists. I am not saying that Professor McDonald is not qualified in the atmospheric sciences, but he is no more qualified to talk about skin cancer than I am; and, I would hope the opposition to the SST would have the courtesy to their colleagues to bring someone forward who has not confided to us that little men in flying saucers are causing our blackouts.

Or, are we about to now hear that flying saucers may be an impediment to safe SST flights in the stratosphere? Mr. Speaker, I submit that the reasoned and perceptive testimony of Dr. Kellogg, Dr. Fred Singer, and Dr. Leo Beranek is persuasive evidence that the environmental hysteria ought to be laid to rest.

Mr. HALL. My colleague from Kentucky speaks about facts with which both he and I are acquainted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, this is the type of appropriation that would be very simple and very easy to vote down. It is going to cost billions of dollars. There are other questionable concerns over the SST.

One question concerns the environment and another concerns the finances and whether the Federal Government should finance it rather than private industry.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we cannot take the easy way out in this appropriation. I think we have to think about what is going to be in the best long-term economic interest of our Nation.

I believe the environmental argument against the SST has been blown out of all proportion. This is not unusual. This happens whenever we have any new developments in any instance when we try to advance technological know-how, going back to the development of the iron horse in the United States in the last century.

I think there will be and there must be proper safeguards concerning the effects on the environment. I think that it will take time but that it will come about.

The question of financing implies that this is something novel, that this is the first time the Government has financed the development of a new type airplane. The fact of the matter is that the United States has financed with Federal funds the development of every major airplane that has ever been designed in this Nation, going back to the DC-3, the DC-6 and the Boeing 707.

In all of these cases the research and development was performed by the military and the developmental fallout and know-how was then handed over to the civil aviation industry of the Nation.

The result of all this has been that we are supreme in this highly technological field throughout the world. Eighty percent of all civilian aircraft in the world are American made, both planes and engines.

Now, many of us are concerned about trade. We want to see free trade prosper and thrive in the world. We are going to be able to compete with the Japanese and with others in the world only if we remain proficient in the highly technological items such as aviation, electronics and the like. We cannot compete in some other areas but we certainly cannot afford to give up our tremendous competitive advantage in highly technological areas such as aviation.

We are talking here about the airplane of the 1980's. The supersonic transport is the airplane of the next decade. The preparation for it must come now.

I say that we have got to get on with this plane and we must favor and support this appropriation so that we will maintain the tremendous economic and trade lead in aviation which we have worldwide.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is, I think, one of the most thoughtful and intelligent Members of the entire Congress, and I almost always find the gentleman voting the way I do, but in this case we are on opposite sides of the question. I am wondering whether, if it were not for the fact that Connecticut is one of the six States, and there are only

six States out of the 50 States in the Union that would really benefit from this program, whether that has anything to do with the gentleman being on the opposite side of this question?

Mr. GIAIMO. Let me say this to the gentleman: that there are many people in this House who have a vested interest in the supersonic transport, but I happen to come from the only State in the Union which lost whatever great financial interest it might have had because in the competition for the engine for the supersonic transport, and this was between the General Electric Co. and the Pratt & Whitney Co. of United Aircraft in Connecticut, the Pratt & Whitney Co. and Connecticut lost. So we do not benefit from the SST contract except in a relatively minor capacity, perhaps.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is the gentleman saying that the figures I have given are wrong, and that the State of Connecticut does not get any benefit from the SST?

And that Connecticut does not get an important piece of this action?

Mr. GIAIMO. I think that the important piece of the action that Connecticut gets, to the best of my knowledge, is in the neighborhood of $15 to $35 million, which is a very small portion of the overall amount. If the Pratt & Whitney Co. rather than the General Electric Co. had won the engine contract then, of course, we would have had a tremendous economic interest affecting the workers of our State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am interested first of all, and above all else, in the economic feasibility of this plane, and what we are doing to the overburdened taxpayers of this country in continuing to spend millions for it. I heard almost every statement that was made on the floor yesterday, and again this afternoon, on the subject of this plane, and I have yet to hear a single individual supporter even come close to staking his reputation on the fact that this is economically feasible; that it will be able to carry a payload sufficient to pay for its operation and the costs to produce it.

Is there anyone here who wants to stake his reputation on the fact that it is going to be economically feasible?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield very briefly. The gentleman can say: "Yes, I stake my reputation on it," and that will take care of it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. No; I am not going to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Then I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. There are some things that are worth more than dollars to this country.

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield further, because the gentleman will not say that this aircraft will pay its way.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would stake my reputation on it, and I base it on the testimony of the conversations I have had with Withington, who is probably the world's foremost aeronautical engineer.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Washington, the home of Boeing, has a deep and unusual interest in this program, does he not?

Mr. ADAMS. I certainly do.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any more Members who are ready, willing, and able to hit the sawdust trail.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. No; I decline to yield further at this time.

I am not unmindful of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that a few years ago we were confronted with the TFX, which later became the F-111.

It was to be a supersonic, dual purpose military aircraft capable of being operated from aircraft carriers as well as land bases. Thus it was to be used by both the Navy and Air Force. The Navy washed it out long ago as being unfitted for carrier use and the Air Force found it full of defects.

Because of the unending trouble the Air Force has with this plane, Members of the House were told, when the fiscal year 1970 funding was under consideration, that it would be the last funding for production of the F-111. Do you remember that?

Then came the 1971 fiscal year and lo and behold the funding for further production of this questionable airplane was before us again as big as life and I believe it was twice as much. And so it goes on and on.

And do you remember how we were told by General Dynamics that it would provide 1,726 of these F-111's for $5.8 billion? Now we are told that we may get 514 of these supersonic planes for $7.88 billion—nearly one-third fewer planes at a cost of $3 billion more than estimated.

Yes; you bet your life we have subsidized aircraft in this country and the taxpayers have paid through the nose for them. I cannot recall the name of the St. Louis company that produced planes for the Government that would not fly and had to be towed by tractors through the streets of St. Louis to get them to the scrap heap.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman recall the FB 40 program where the Government spent $1½ billion to produce two bomber prototypes and one of them crashed and one of them is now in the air museum?

Mr. GROSS. The time has come for the public to get what they are promised for their tax dollars. The time has come to put a stop to this program until somebody in authority tells us that this plane is economically feasible. Let the promoters of this SST organize some type of Comsat Corp. and those of you who feel that this is such a good deal, then would have the opportunity to step up and put some of your capital to work by buying stock in this corporation. Let private risk capital take over from here and produce this plane if it is so good.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman makes a very valid point because the Department of Transportation which is pushing the funding of the SST so hard has the task as well of having to certify as to the safety and viability of the SST at such time as the prototype is completed.

I agree with the gentleman that there ought to be an outside agency, like a commission, that has the supervision as to whether or not this is a good plane.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it is time to quit hornswaggling the taxpayers with deals of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may reply before he starts his remarks.

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state in response to the gentleman that this program was transferred to the Department of Transportation and the certifying agency, is the FAA, and is separate from the Department of Transportation. So the gentleman was not correct, that the department that certifies is not the department in charge of monitoring the construction.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding to me briefly. I am sorry I did not have any time of my own.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this. In answer to the question of spending tax money for this, you might well look to all other facets of American industry and life to find where the subsidies are coming from.

We subsidize the merchant marine to the extent of $750 million—and I voted for it every time because I think it is in the national interest.

We subsidized the Penn Central Railroad.

We subsidize the Lockheed Aircraft Co.

We subsidized the development of the Boeing jet plane when it was first developed and the Wright diesel engine was developed by the Navy.

All of these things have been subsidized by tax moneys and they have returned to the American people in service and in dollars one hundredfold for every dollar that was spent.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some statements made here today which I think needs to be gone into in a little more depth. One of the most preposterous of those statements has been the

statement that only 3 percent of the people of the United States are going to use the SST. I do not know—maybe not even 3 percent will use it. But if it becomes an economically, commercial viable airplane—in time a lot of people are going to use it.

I rather imagine that the SST is at this time where some of the old planes built by the Wright brothers were shortly after they were built. Very few people were using those planes at that time. In a relative sense, I think ultimately as many people will be flying the SST as are flying in the available aircraft today. We have to start somewhere in this industry. We will not pounce into it full blown with 60 percent of the population using the first model. We must look ahead. We have to understand that we are making a start in this program. We have to start some place, and it is not going to be a full-blown venture at first.

Second—and I think Mr. HOLIFIELD mentioned the point here—I voted on the floor of the House a number of times each year for what I consider to be subsidies. I think they are good subsidies. I think they are necessary. The gentleman from Iowa made some remarks about the SST, but he supports the farm program, the farm subsidy. He feels it is essential. I feel the farm subsidy is essential, too, because it is an important part of our economy. But I also feel that the aircraft industry is an important part of our economy. I think there is an opportunity here for us, Mr. Chairman, to go into the next generation of aircraft, which is the supersonic aircraft, and to be a leader in that field, to continue and retain our world leadership in the aircraft transportation industry; I think we have a great deal at stake here.

I think the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) put it very well when he used the analogy of a poker hand. We have one more draw. It will cost us almost as much not to see the next card as it will to fold. We have an awful lot at stake, Mr. Chairman; so much at stake that I do not think we can afford to fold.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to strike funds for the SST and to deal specifically with one point which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) raised; namely, the pollution of the environment. This is not to say that my objection to the SST is based solely on environmental considerations. Although they are of great, and perhaps primary, importance, I also oppose the SST on the grounds of misplaced priorities: Specifically, that it would benefit only a small portion of our population, those engaged in overseas luxury travel, while it would adversely affect millions living near airports, suffering already from excessive air noise.

Specifically, regarding the environment, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the evidence and, indeed, the wisdom of Dr. Vincent Schaefer, the director of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center at the State University of New York at Albany. Dr. Schaefer is one of the very few cloud physicists in the United States and, so far as I know, he has done more research than anyone in the world on the question of microscopic particulate matter and the effect on the troposphere and the stratosphere of these particles. Specifically he has made the point that one of the greatest dangers of the SST is the possibility that the effluent from the SST engines will produce an increasing concentration of microscopic particles in the upper atmosphere which could modify the weather pattern of the globe.

This particulate matter ranging in size from 0.05 to 0.2 microns in diameter, move at random, unaffected by gravity. In other words, Dr. Schaefer says:

> The bombardment of gaseous molecules play nearly as great a role in their motion as the force of gravity.

They therefore remain suspended in the stratosphere where the SST is scheduled to fly, for long periods of time. Unfortunately, there are no obvious cleansing mechanisms in the stratosphere, since only the area up to about 40,000 feet, the lowest part of the stratosphere, is affected by precipitation. Further, since the SST's particulates have little mass, the residue may remain for years.

Dr. Schaefer concludes that a high concentration of such particles could cause such a reduction in the incoming solar radiation as to have weather modification effects all over the globe and lead in time to a new ice age.

I would like to repeat that last point and to quote very precisely from Dr. Schaefer's research. He says:

> A high concentration of very small particles in the stratosphere might cause such a reduction in the incoming solar radiation as to begin to have weather modification effects on a global scale. If this were to happen, a very large capital investment could be completely wasted, since further insult to the environment from this source would be intolerable since it would lead toward a new ice age.

I repeat—

> It would lead toward a new ice age.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, all the scientists who appeared before the committee, Dr. Kellogg, Dr. Singer, and Dr. McDonald, the environmental scientists, agree that the stratosphere is effectively about 100 times more sensitive to technological contamination that the troposphere, the lower area, because its turnover is 100 times lower approximately than the lower level.

I think the House would do well to believe that the hazards of this operation are still very much a part of this debate.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman from Illinois first, I thank the gentleman for his comments. However, Dr. Schaefer goes on to say:

> Our lower atmosphere is rapidly approaching a situation in which pollution is filling it up to the tropopause even though there are very active weather processes tending to remove the pollution particulates quite frequently.

This will not be the case, Dr. Schaefer points out, with the stable and cloudfree stratosphere—in other words, the upper environment does not have adequate processes of purging itself of these particles.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly correct.

That is the testimony that was presented to our committee as well, that is, the atmosphere in which we live is constantly washed by winds and rains, but the upper atmosphere is relatively calm and stable and when pollutants are deposited—and I include water vapor—they would remain there for 2 years before the possibility of their disappearing.

In sum, I would like to make clear that the environmental arguments are not tangential, but rather central and serious. Dr. Schaefer's testimony is corroborated by findings of other scientists, and is known to this administration. One may question how rapidly a number of SST's would affect solar radiation, but there is little doubt that it could happen.

Indeed, when similar buildups of particulate matter have already begun to saturate our lower atmosphere up to the tropopause, we should have received warning enough.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, on page 613 of the hearings, there is a statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and these are his exact words:

> Mr. CONTE. * * *
>
> One fast observation: I just want to commend Dr. Singer for his testimony. I think he has done an excellent job. I think that after 3 days of hearings, I only have to resolve one question. I think the environment question has been put to rest. I think that you and the other scientists that came here have definitely put to rest the environment question. * * *

Also, in yesterday's RECORD, on page 6819, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, said:

> As far as the environmental issue is concerned, it became perfectly clear in the hearings that building and testing the two prototypes will pose no threat to the environment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, much has been made of the fact that we have already spent $1.3 billion on this, and we cannot afford to back out. It is important to recognize, as I mentioned yesterday, that if that argument has any force whatsoever, it will be virtually unstoppable once the prototypes roll out of those hangars, because there is a $3 to $5 billion no man's land between prototype and production.

I think it is impossible to believe that once those shiny new airplanes roll out of those hangars, we are not going to be asked to come back and finance millions and even billions of dollars more for the next step.

Last December, after a meeting in New York, a number of top airline pres-

idents met in New York and expressed their belief that the United States should proceed with the program. Of those present, the president of Pan-Am posed the question: "Are we able to pay for our part of the program?" He then answered his own question. "We believe," he said, "that the Government and the aerospace industry and the airlines will be able to arrange for each to play its part in the time period 1976 to 1980." That sounds to me like a flat-out expectation that the taxpayer will be footing at least some portion of that bill years after the prototype and construction phase is passed.

A second point I would like to discuss, is the argument that has been made that if we build these two prototypes, we can settle questions concerning the environmental and economic feasibility of the development of this fleet of airplanes. Does anyone in this House really believe that flying those two planes for a total of 100 hours will answer any of the questions involved as to either the ecological consequences of the flight of a fleet of 500 planes or the economic possibility of selling that many planes? I really do not think anyone does, if he really and truly understands the worries raised by the economists and by the environmentalists.

I believe the biggest question we have to face here, Mr. Chairman, is purely a question of need. Do we really need to be able to fly to Europe in one-third the time we can do it today? Perhaps we do. I suppose it is possible we do. But I do not believe there is any doubt whatsoever that we do need 50,000 new doctors in this country and we do need 150,000 nurses in this country. I have 37 communities in my district which need now sewer and water programs and they cannot get them.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would not the gentleman also agree if we are talking about an airplane traveler his greatest need is to get back and forth from the airport a lot faster than we do rather than to travel faster once he gets onto the plane?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely.

I believe we must recognize that despite the fact that we are the richest country in the world we cannot afford to do everything we would like to do. We simply cannot do it. When we face up to that fact we must recognize we have to do the things which are important. I submit that this program is not that important, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has made a very good statement. I believe it is important to point out that the proponents of this proposal have not been able to answer one fundamental question. Even after the prototypes are built and are found successful, the United States will have to sell a minimum of 300 SST's at $60 million apiece before we get back penny one of the taxpayers' money on this project, and there is no one who can state here with any degree of certainty that there is a market or will be a market in the next 10 or 15 years for 300 SST's at a minimum of $60 million apiece. No airline can pay that kind of money now, nor in the foreseeable future, for one airplane.

Mr. OBEY. That is correct.

And I would emphasize again that flying two airplanes for 100 hours will not tell us one thing at all about the possible environmental damage that can be done by a fleet of 500 of these things flying at 60,000 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset that I have no Boeing or GE plants or significant SST subcontractors I know of in my district. So far as I know in my district I do not have more than a handful of employees of any company who will benefit from work in this project.

I do not represent the State of Ohio; I represent 500,000 people who live in Ohio in my congressional district.

I believe there is little point in continuing this debate in what is a relatively empty Chamber. Those of us who are here probably have all made up our minds. There are likely to be no new facts presented, and perhaps no new arguments developed nor any new methods of argument demonstrated.

But I have come to the conclusion that facts are not always persuasive in our peripatetic media-ridden society, for facts tend to lose their significance to emotional rhetoric these days.

Arguments against the SST have been full of misstatements and suspicions and what one television program my youngsters frequently watch calls nonfacts.

The suggestion has been made here today that the CAB should deny Pan American the right to buy any foreign-made SST. I believe CAB will have to do just that to keep Pan Am from buying foreign-made SST's, if we kill this project today. All of us know Airflot is now coming into New York with a New York-Moscow run. The Soviet TU-144 will soon be flying the SST into New York.

Pan American is going to have to "hawk" an awful lot of free "booze" for its old-fashioned 7½-hour trip to Europe to make up for the attractiveness of getting to Europe in 3 hours on Airflot.

The problem America faces in our modern society of speed is that U.S. airlines just simply will not be competitive if they take 2½ times as long to get to Europe. Otherwise Pan American might be successful by operating the *Queen Mary*.

Being slower or behind technologically is not a logical argument, gentlemen. I am sorry.

In the favorite words of the SST opponents I think, I suspect, I assume that TU-144's and Concordes will be sold in America next year because of the facts. The facts are here. Here is a book on the Concorde which I was given by a Member of the English Parliament. Or, if you want the facts on the Russian TU-144, they are here in this advertising poster. The TU-144 is advertised for sale. The specifications are here if we are interested in facts. But I am not sure that we are.

The Joint Economic Committee, on which I sit, developed a study with regard to the SST in which they avoided facts pretty liberally. The committees developed no data from Concorde engineers or from British-French economists. The committee report quoted scientists and economists in this country out of context and in the reverse attitude of their positions. The committee report implied opposition when the actual posture was one of support. The most unfortunate twisting of facts occurred yesterday when one of my colleagues on that distinguished joint body charged a Government scientist opposed to the SST had been muzzled. The press, of course, gave full attention to that in spite of the fact that the scientist himself said he had not been muzzled.

Now, what kind of an argument is this? The SST will not belong to Boeing. If developed, it will bring gains back to the U.S. Government in the form of royalties: the $1 billion initially invested by the Government and $1 billion beyond that from added royalities if 300 to 500 planes are sold. There will also be $6.5 billion available in the form of taxes not to mention the balance-of-trade situation.

How important is the balance-of-trade situation? One of the things I have learned from facts developed by the Joint Economic Committee is that last year we had a $9.8 billion favorable trade balance in the high-technology intensive industries in this country. This is the only area in which we have a favorable trade balance of any significance. The reason why is that we are able to keep technologically ahead of other countries. Our aerospace industry has given us $2.5 billion economic advantage in foreign trade balances. That pays a lot of taxes, and there are thousands of taxpaying workers working for the aerospace industry. That is where we get the money for housing, education, welfare payments for the unemployed. Where will such social support come from if we do not go ahead and develop this kind of industry?

Mr. Chairman, I am an environmentalist. If the SST is not desirable from an environmental standpoint, we want to go to the rest of the world and say "Here is the reason why the SST is environmentally harmful." We have invested $1 billion and found out that it will be degrading to the world's atmosphere. If that is true, although I doubt it is true, it will be worth the investment. The present investment will give us the facts. I do not think the Russians, the Japanese, the English, or the French will be interested in nonfacts. They will want to know.

They will want to know facts if we want them to stop their SST's because of the danger of pollution. And they will not stop their SST's on suspicions be-

cause they know that the way to progress economically is to build a better mousetrap and they are making a national commitment to try to win that race—not just in aerospace, but in many industries which have seen them overtake America technologically and economically. And victory in that kind of race will eventually mean they will overtake us in social benefits.

The SST is a symbol for those who are not satisfied to use the golden eggs that our golden goose has been laying. They would like to kill that goose, too. We kill American technological advantage to our future peril. America cannot be the most advanced nation in the world in social progress and the development of the free human spirit without the economic strength which comes from our capacity to do things better, quicker, and cheaper. The SST is such an economic advantage for our Nation in the world—unless we stifle its development today and yield the race to the competition. I urge you not to do that for the sake of our Nation's future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, last year I voted against further funding of the SST not because I considered the SST to be a serious threat to the environment but because I did believe that the SST was not a sound proposition economically. I am still inclined to believe that the plane will never be placed in production.

I have a great deal of admiration for and wish to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL), for the way in which he has led this debate. The gentleman from California has stated that he does have a strong belief that the plane will be successful as an economic proposition and that it will be put into production. I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question: One of my reasons for believing that it would not ever be put into production was the short range of the SST.

It is my understanding that the SST will not be able to fly from Great Britain to Miami, for example; that it will not have the range although it can fly from New York to Great Britain but not from Miami to Great Britain.

Mr. MCFALL. I am advised that the range is in excess of 4,000 miles for the production SST.

There was an exhaustive study made as to the economic viability of this airplane and the testimony given the subcommittee is that it is an economically viable airplane with a range in excess of 4,000 miles for the production model.

Someone asked if we would stake our reputation on it. All we can say as politicians is that the testimony given to us, after much study by responsible people is that it is an economically viable airplane.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his answer. However, there is no way that I can be certain as to the validity of my own beliefs until the two prototypes are completed.

I am inclined to believe that the hour of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has already passed. I have already spent $864 million and only $478 million is required to bring the prototypes to completion. If we stop now we will not only be liable for penalties but we also have the obligation to continue with the advanced payments. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that if the plane is to be eliminated, that action should have been taken before we reached the point of near completion today.

For these reasons, I have decided to support the further funding of the SST.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I recognize the soul searching the gentleman has been going through these last few years.

However, as the gentleman well knows I tried to stop the funding of the SST several years ago; I tried to stop it last year and I am trying again this year.

The point I am trying to make is that the gentleman proposes to vote for the prototypes because so much has been invested in them.

Mr. ICHORD. Does not the gentleman believe there is the possibility that if this plane is successful we will recoup the money that we have been spending, while if we stop at this time we will have lost $900 million-some-odd.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the object is to let private enterprise enter the field and take over the burden. My amendment will give them that opportunity, assuming that the environmental hazards are not present.

The gentleman is looking at the amount of money which has already been invested and that same argument might move him to vote for production money at such time as the prototype is completed and Boeing comes back and asks for $3 or $4 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while it would undoubtedly be an exaggeration to say that we have witnessed a total collapse of the ecologist argument, I think it is fair to say we have witnessed a considerable deflation of this argument. So, my very astute opponents have taken to the economic argument. We have heard them suggest that there is not even a remote possibility within the foreseeable future that American airlines will be able to purchase the required number of SST's that would enable the Federal Government to recoup its investment. Well, that is a rather astounding prediction, indeed. It is one that indicates a little less faith than I feel this afternoon in the resiliency of the American economy. I think that that argument upon a little closer analysis makes about as much sense as my friend who said, do not build this plane because of the decline that has occurred in the earnings of the American airline industry means they will not be able to afford it.

We might just as well say do not invest money in the great cities of America, do not invest money in urban renewal, or do not invest money in mass transit, because after all, our cities throughout the country are declining today, they are no longer economically viable as central cities.

Well, I do not accept that argument. I have more faith in the future of our American economy than some. Of course, there is a certain element of risk involved in this. Certainly we are talking about some gamble, just as we did back in 1961, when a bold, confidant, young American President suggested that we launch a space program, and that some day we reach the moon. He was taking perhaps one of the most gigantic gambles in all history, and yet we succeeded in that particular venture.

One thought occurred to me as I have listened to the arguments of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, and that is that he is analyzing the situation totally within the context of 1971, and I would suggest that this is the exact fallacy of the argument that he is making.

As we have seen during the course of the research and development phase of this aircraft, I think that answers are going to be obtained to some of the very serious environmental questions that have disturbed me, and that disturbed the gentleman.

I would suggest—and I repeat—I would suggest that we do not live in a static world. This is a very dynamic world, and a very dynamic society indeed. We are talking about an airplane that is going to be flying during the decade of the 1980's and even into the 1990's. We are talking about an entirely different world than we have in 1971. A world where we will have burgeoning population, a world where changes in science and technology are going to take place at an ever-accelerating pace in every single phase of human endeavor.

Let me address myself, if I have time, to the argument that the gentleman makes that only 3 percent of the American people today could fly in this airplane, and that therefore we are guilty of constructing merely a rich man's plaything. Well, I suppose that back in the early part of the 20th century when that first heavier-than-air machine rose in very faltering fashion from the sands at Kitty Hawk that there were skeptics then who said that, well, there are not 3 percent of the people in the world who will ever fly in that kind of a contraption, why in the world are they building it?

So I would suggest the mere fact that in 1971 only 3 percent of the people have indicated that they are willing to fly does not mean that in 1980 or 1990 we are not going to be living in the kind of world where this is going to be the workhorse of the international air fleet of the world.

I myself am interested in the priorities of this Nation, and what these should be, so let me, if I have time, attempt to deal with the argument on priorities. There are those who suggest, and in fact,

they concede, that the aerospace industry, a great basic industry of our country, is in real trouble today, and we ought to do something to help it. Then they say let them turn to making air pollution equipment, or let them turn to making something else.

Well, let me say to you that that must be very, very scant comfort, my friend, to the man who lost a job yesterday or the day before yesterday. It does not represent very much comfort to the man who feels the hot breath of unemployment blowing on the back of his neck to be told, "You can go ahead and retrain yourself, you can easily do something else."

I will say that I am interested in the unemployment problem, and I will freely confess that we have lost 7,000 jobs in my immediate area in 1970, and I am worried, and I do not want to contribute to a further exacerbation of that unemployment problem, and that is why I intend to support this project today, and vote down the motion to strike this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has disturbed me in this debate today has been some of the quick and easy comments that have been thrown out that are strictly against the facts as they were developed in the committee when the hearings were being held.

Somebody asked me if this is going to be an economically viable plane and would I stake my reputation on it. I answered "Yes." Not because of any information that I happen to have from the companies, but if you will look at the hearings on page 286 and 287, of the hearings, it was worked out in detail exactly where these planes will be sold and the number that will have to be sold and the price and where they are going to be sold.

Somebody stated that private industry has not been involved—and why not? Yet, in the hearings it was precisely stated that out of $1,342,000,000 cost by the Federal Government, $535 million is being put in by private industry. They have gone as far as they can. The airlines are in it and the manufacturers are in it. All of them have placed their money in the project.

Then there is this talk about productivity. When you talk about the productivity or pollution—productivity is the product of two things—the number of seats that you can put in an airplane and how fast it can fly. If we do not have this kind of an airplane in the 1980's, it would take 250,000 DC-3's to carry the same number of people.

The gentleman from Illinois just mentioned unemployment. Yes, I am concerned about unemployment. The gentleman said he lost 7,000 jobs in his district in the last year. There have been 70,000 jobs lost in the last 2 years in our general area as a result of unemployment in the aerospace industry alone.

There is this talk about shifting to other things and that we are going to spend the Federal money someplace else, and if they did that you could put many people to work.

As I said yesterday when I stood in the well of this House, I have supported mass transportation. I have supported the subsidy program for the merchant marine. When it comes to the railroads, I was here with Penn Central and the Penn Central does not come within 3,000 miles of my district.

If we are going to have a viable transportation system in this country, we had better see to it that we are technologically alert. We let the railroads go. This House of Representatives is going to have to face the fact that within the next year we will probably have to spend an immense amount of money to maintain any type of ground transportation at all in the United States.

Another point has been made that we are not spending the urban mass transportation funds. You do not turn on those funds tomorrow. We had an absolute statement from Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe that these programs are now delayed to a degree because we have passed the ecological requirements that must be met and comprehensive plans are required before any program can be funded. They cannot allocate even the $600 million we have already given them this year.

I can speak from experience on the local projects too. We had a plan in Seattle which requires matching funds and the matching funds were voted down by the local taxpayers and the Federal Government cannot allocate money to build an urban mass transit system there no matter how much they might want to do it.

We are all interested in the way things are going and how they may proceed but let us please stick with the facts.

There was developed, for example, in the hearings, the matter of the upper atmosphere effects of particulate matter. There is more particulate matter put into the atmosphere by one volcanic eruption than can be put in a fleet of 500 SST's if they fly for 2,500 years. If you want to hear the facts about it, they are there in the hearings.

EFFECT OF AN SST ON A CUBIC MILE OF AIR AT CRUISING ALTITUDE

Characteristic	Natural air content-pound	SST exhaust contribution pound
Nitrogen	755,000,000.0	0.1
Oxygen	231,000,000.0	192.
Argon	12,700,000.0	0.
Carbon dioxide	500,000.0	176.
Carbon monoxide	150.0	0.06
Water vapor	4,000.0	72.
Water vapor at saturation	156,000.0	
Oxides of nitrogen	600.0	0.3
Hydrocarbons	2,000.0	0.03
Particulate matter	2.7	[1] 0.015 [2] 0.015
Gaseous sulphur oxides	4,000.0	0.01
Total, Rounded	1,000,000,000.0	56.

[1] Sulfate.
[2] Carbon.

Note: SST passage will occur once each 45 days average for northern hemisphere (60–70,000 feet altitude).

A cubic mile of air weighs about a billion pounds. Do you know how much an SST would distribute in that billion-pound mile of air by going through it? It is less than one-quarter of a pound out of 1 billion pounds.

How much goes in there already in natural form—2.7 pounds.

You could fly an SST through that cubic mile of air for many days to even vary the natural amount and a fleet of 500 planes would go through the same mile of air, even over the North Atlantic, only once in 3 or 4 weeks. This would allow plenty of time for the air to cleanse itself from any tiny amount that was deposited.

As to the ozone content we have checked that. It is in the hearings.

In Caribou, Maine, the ozone content of the atmosphere day by day varies over 50 percent. The facts are here.

The total effect of a 500-plane SST fleet—let alone the prototypes—would be less than 1 percent, and you can see the natural content varies over 50 percent per day.

You can take any position or prove anything with figures. When a man says that this is going to increase skin cancer, I can tell you this. If you want to stay outside 4 or 5 more days a year any day of the year in a climate that you are not used to, you will get between 4 and 15 times the effect of any SST fleet flying.

Please, let us stay with the facts in debate. The ecological and economic arguments in favor of the prototype program are clear. I urge the Members to support the SST prototype program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and support the continuing resolution for the Department of Transportation. It was my honor to have chaired this subcommittee since its inception 4 years ago. This year I changed my assignment to chairmanship of the HUD, Space and Science Committee and was succeeded by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL). I join with my colleagues on that subcommittee and Members of this House in complimenting the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL) on the manner in which he conducted the hearings and the testimony that was adduced and the reports that have been issued.

I am sure that there is very little I can say here to change anyone's mind on this subject. We have had votes in this House before on this matter. Some will say that they have been on procedural points. I am sure the Members of this House, when they vote on procedural points, know precisely what they are voting for. In a sense, they are voting up or down the real issue the House has to face.

It is not an easy task to carry this issue to this House; it has not been over the past 3 or 4 years and is not today. It does not help me in my district. I am not aware of many jobs in my area that are connected with the SST. So politically it would be a nice thing to walk away

from it. I have received many letters opposed to the SST.

But I sense the responsibility I have to this Nation, I sense the responsibility I have to provide the means in resolving the talk about priorities many complex problems this Nation faces. "Priorities" has been a word that has been much abused and over-used in this Congress and in the press. The fact of the matter is what we cannot pay for solution of the great problems we have in the areas of the enviroment, health, education, welfare, mass transit and crime—we cannot pay for those programs unless we have economic stability and the economic health to do so.

How do you do it? You do it by supporting research and development—by constantly improving and developing technology. Eighty percent of the commercial aircraft sold in the free world is built here in the United States. You can go to any airport in the free world and you will see standing there the magnificent 707's and the 747's that have been built by the brilliance and the technical know-how of the workers of America. We have been able to undertake and pay for many of the programs that assist the cities and assist the ghettos in our Nation because we have a healthy economy in this area.

As the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, there have been more untruths more misstatements, and more half-truths in relation to this program than on almost any other issue that I can think of.

If anyone wants to build a house of horror with the statements that have been made by some of those who oppose the SST, just get the news clippings of the Washington papers or the New York papers or other papers around the country, the statements of some of the people who serve over in the other body. Witness the statement that appeared last night in the Washington Evening Star:

WHITE HOUSE SST GAG CHARGED

Well, it was easy for the person who made the charge to have called the doctor in NIH. He could easily have found out that Dr. Gori was not gagged, and that he was told by his superior that if he desired to appear at a press conference yesterday, it was up to him.

And yet the charge was made that he was gagged—that he was told not to go there. That was not so. That is an indication of the kind of opposition and the scare tactics that have been used by some who oppose this program.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I have received considerable mail opposed to the SST. Practically all of the opposition is based on the plane's impact on the environment. It is good that there is a deep concern by so many of our people on the effect that men and machines have upon the environment. And because this was and is a genuine concern of the committee that considered funding the SST, considerable time and much testimony was spent on the ecological faction. While no one testified that the present program of two prototypes will harm the environment, some questions have been raised about the impact a fleet of SST's might have on the environment. Although not all these questions can now be answered with absolute certainty, the evidence clearly indicates that any possible adverse effects of the SST on the environment can be resolved before any commercial U.S. SST's are flown.

Some of the most distinguished scientists in fields concerned with the environment testified before the committee. I present some of the issues raised and the conclusions of testimony by Dr. Beranek and Dr. Singer as well as Dr. Kellogg. Some of their testimony is summarized in the following excerpt from the committee report:

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY DR. BERANEK AND DR. SINGER—EXCEPT ITEM NO. 2

1. Engine noise: FAR-36 is a reasonable standard and the SST will be able to meet this requirement. Subsonic jets flying now are not able to meet this standard.

2. Sonic boom (flight over land): Testimony presented by DOT indicates that the SST will not be operated supersonically over the United States at speeds that will allow a sonic boom to reach the ground.

3. Sonic boom (flight over water): The effects below the surface of the water will not be significant.

4. Carbon dioxide: This is not judged to be a problem, because the contribution is minor compared to the carbon dioxide which is contributed by many other sources in the earth's atmosphere.

5. Nitrogen oxide: This is not judged to be a problem.

6. Water vapor and sulfates, hydrocarbons, and soot (immediate effects): Water vapor will radiate away some heat from the stratosphere and tend to cool it, while exhaust particles will absorb energy from the sun and heat the stratosphere, tending to offset the effect of the water vapor.

7. Effect of water vapor on ozone (skin cancer) (long-term effects): Water vapor may remove some of the ozone but the argument that this will increase the number of cases of skin cancer appears to be unsupportable at the present time. This concern can be disposed of with some relatively simple additional measurements which will be conducted.

8. Long-range climatic effects: The weather modification questions are not considered to be serious but additional testing is planned.

Just as the work on the environmental problems must go forward, the committee feels that the prototype construction must also continue. As Dr. William Kellogg, Associate Director, National Center for Atmospheric Research and Chairman of the Climatic Effects Working Group for the Study of Critical Environmental Problems (SCEP) stated:

"I am very much disturbed over recent gross exaggerations and scientific mis-statements regarding the SST's potentially harmful effects upon the atmosphere and man's environment. Last August a group of scientists at the MIT Summer Study stated that there are indeed environmental uncertainties, caused in no little part by gaps in available information, which require additional research in order that they may be resolved. I pointed out at that time and want to strongly reaffirm that there is no environmental reason to delay construction of the two prototype SST's.

"It is my profound hope that the U.S. Congress will not be mislead by these exaggerations or by scientific mis-statements. Dr. Ed David's[1] statement, which Dr. Walter Roberts[2] and I strongly endorse, says it well: "Let's not suppress technological advances but through research, development and experimentation make sure that those advances are obtained without undesirable side effects." I support a vigorous environmental research program in parallel with prototype SST construction. Don't downgrade the ability of American scientists and engineers to apply their genius to the successful resolution of uncertainty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues of the House, this issue, as is the case with all others, is indeed controversial. There are two sides to the issue and some merits on each side. To demonstrate the magnitude of this controversy, first of all, I think it needs to be said that the two usually together in almost any scheme have found themselves on opposite sides of this issue, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL). But this in itself still does not indicate the magnitude of this controversy. We also find an alinement in which the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) are on the same side. But it is still a little bit worse than that. The gentleman from the Northwest, from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) are on the same side. So we do have a controversy.

People have talked about sticking with the facts and sticking with the truth in this particular issue. Everybody has made an allegation somewhere along the line, but everybody has tried to protect himself by saying it could do this or that, or it might do this or that.

Some of these things could happen if—and on and on and on we go.

The Members and I have listened to 2 days of arguments based upon the economics of the situation, and based upon environmental factors, and nobody has changed his mind in either instance, I am led to believe.

But I do want to say this and then I am through. What is wrong, now that we have $864 million of the taxpayers' money already invested in the development of the SST, with spending a little bit more money and completing the development of the two prototypes to get some answers to some of these questions which have been raised? At least we would have something and if we quit we will have nothing. That is the time to make a final decision, not now.

I leave the Members with this warning, having asked that question: The day will come when we are going to conclude, as I have already concluded, that we are going to build it at some point in time or we are going to buy it. I prefer to build it. This Nation cannot afford to abandon its curiosity. We cannot forego the need for advancing our technology. This Nation is what it is because of our farsighted approach to our problem at home and abroad. We can never afford to be shortsighted because the road is too perilous.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

[1] Dr. Edward E. David, Jr., the President's Science Adviser, in a statement issued Dec. 5, 1970.

[2] Director, National Center for Atmospheric Research.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I explained at length my reasons for voting against further Government funding of the SST program. Today, I will summarize my feelings about the main issues surrounding this controversy.

While I realize this is not a black-and-white proposition, my innermost convictions compel me to vote no. I have consistently opposed Government subsidy programs in the past, and I see no reason now for retreating from my position on this matter. If the supersonic transport is the economic marvel that its advocates claim it to be, let it stand the test of the marketplace.

Some have said that we who oppose it do not have a sense of responsibility. I take issue with that. I am not voting against the SST because some environmentalists from my district have written to me and have sent me telegrams.

I represent employees in the western part of Massachusetts who get a piece of this action from Boeing Aircraft. So I believe it takes a lot of "guts" to stand up here and vote against this particular issue.

Now, if private industry stands ready to reap the benefits of this project, then it should be willing to sow the financial seeds needed to bring it to a successful harvest.

Aside from my fundamental objections to Government subsidy of private industry, I have serious reservations about some of the economic arguments that are advanced by the plane's supporters.

I, for one, do not feel the hot breath of the Concorde or the Soviet TU-144 breathing down our economic necks. The economic soundness of these planes is by no means established, as is evidenced by the fact that not a single U.S. airline has made a definite commitment to purchase a foreign SST.

Nor have I resolved all the economic uncertainties concerning our own SST. For one thing, passenger statistics cited by proponents of the plane are misleading. If one person travels overseas 10 times in 1 year, he is counted as 10 passengers for statistical purposes. The fact of the matter is that only about one-half of 1 percent of the country's population travels internationally on a regular basis. Granted this may climb to 2 or 3 percent in the next 10 or 15 years, but this is hardly enough to make regular overseas travelers a significant portion of the population. I do not see how we can justify a governmental outlay of more than $1.3 billion for a program that will benefit such a small segment of the traveling public.

The shaky financial condition of our domestic airlines makes me extremely skeptical about assurances that, should the Government continue financing the prototype phase of the program, its help would not be needed to finance full-scale production of the plane.

Under the terms of the original contract between Boeing and the Government, a financing plan for production was to be submitted by June 30, 1968. First the date was put off until December 31, 1969. Now we are assured that the plan will be submitted in June of 1972. This hardly inspires confidence in me that Government financing for the production phase of the program would not ultimately be sought.

Apparently my lack of confidence is shared by at least two officials of the airline industry. Robert Six, president of Continental Airlines, has told the Senate Aviation Subcommittee that he does not think there is a rush for the SST. Even more amazing is the statement of former FAA head Elwood Quesada who declared before the House-Senate Subcommittee on Economy in Government that—

> There are a lot of people that say that the airlines wish the airplane would go away. And I am one of them.

That same individual has predicted that the Government's share of the SST program could go as high as $3 to $5 billion.

Despite all these factors, supporters of the SST program insist that the Government will ultimately regain its investment with a $1 billion profit. Let us assume for the moment that this will be the case. The $1 billion profit, which in turn assumes the sale of 500 planes, represents a return of only 4.3 percent on the Government's money. Since the Government pays 6 percent to use its money, the $1 billion return is actually a loss as far as the Government is concerned.

Let me answer another question. The gentleman from Louisiana quoted from the hearings in regard to the environmental issue. I tried to be fair. Those Members who heard me yesterday know I tried to give both sides of the argument. I said that anyone in this House could vote on either side of the issue, and I feel that way today, because I believe some of the proponents have made an excellent case and some of the opponents have also made an excellent case on this particular issue.

I narrow it down to one issue, and that is the economic issue. I fought with some of the Members of this House for the past 12 years on farm subsidies, and I feel this is a parallel case.

I said yesterday that my industry, the General Electric Co., makes heavy transformers and is in trouble because of heavy transformer imports into this country from France, England, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, and now Japan. I said that this company is having a difficult time going to its stockholders and asking money for research and development; that unless something is done for this industry it is going to have to stop its research and development program.

Furthermore, the whole thing is compounded by the Federal Government's buying 95 percent of its transformers in the past 5 years from abroad.

Therefore, carrying this argument a bit further, why can we not come to the Federal Government and say, "Give us a billion dollars for research and development of the heavy transformer industry"? We have been the leaders in this industry. We have been in the forefront for decades and decades.

This is where we open up Pandora's box. This is where problems begin.

But let me go back to the environmental issue. We had 4 days of hearings. We heard everyone who wanted to testify. We heard some of the foremost scientists in the country before the committee. And they came to the conclusion that the environment was not in danger with respect to the two prototype SST's.

I believe my good friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and I, who team up on this, both agree on this particular point.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. But they did express concern that there may be an environmental hazard with fleets of SST's flying at that altitude, did they not?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, they did, and they said this was a part of their studies.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. McFALL. I believe the record also shows that the testimony went to 500 SST's, and the scientists believe there will be a minor chance of there being any environmental problem. That is the record.

Mr. CONTE. I believe Dr. Singer felt he was 95 percent certain there would not be any dangers to the environment even with a fleet of SST's.

I mentioned here yesterday that Dr. Kellogg, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, has testified that there is no environmental basis for delaying the SST program to develop these two prototypes. He said that preliminary studies regarding the climatic impact of large-scale SST operations indicate a negligible influence on the heat balance of the global atmosphere and a negligible increase in carbon dioxide. Particles added to the stratosphere could have a small, but possibly measurable, effect on stratospheric temperatures during periods of low volcanic activity but little or no influence on surface temperatures. Ozone in the atmosphere could decrease by 1 or 2 percent, but this would have a trivial effect on ultraviolet radiation reaching the ground, in his opinion.

In addition, Dr. Leo Beranek of the SST Community Noise Advisory Committee has testified that there does not appear to be any technical reasons why a commercial SST cannot be built which will meet Federal Aviation Administration noise standards for new, subsonic planes—108 decibels. Sonic booms should be no problem since the Department of Transportation indicates that the SST will not be allowed to fly supersonically over land areas of the United States. As for supersonic flights over water, studies indicate this will have a negligible effect below the surface.

Thus building the two prototypes poses no threat to the environment. Preliminary study indicates that large-scale SST operations would be environmentally safe but more research is needed and is being done. Results

should be in by the time a decision on full scale production has to be made.

To summarize, the comparatively small segment of the public which will use the SST, my skepticism regarding the alleged economic threat of the foreign SST's, and my reservations about our domestic airlines' being able to finance production of the plane and our Government's being able to recover its investment in this project—all this, when added to my fundamental objection to Government subsidy programs, compels me to vote against further funding for the SST.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment to strike out all funds for the supersonic transport.

Many of my colleagues oppose the SST because of the possibly dangerous environmental consequences of penetrating our atmosphere with polluting machinery. I, too, feel that sound arguments have been made about the ecological dangers of the SST, and many serious questions remain unanswered. Yet, I also believe that, with the technological capability of our country, these environmental problems can be solved.

I vote in favor of the Yates amendment because, in good conscience, I do not feel we can afford to appropriate millions of dollars directly out of the Federal budget for a program that can be financed with private capital. Far more pressing budgetary demands must be met and we cannot let this airplane, of benefit to relatively few people, preempt tax dollars that are more desperately needed in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, as early as 1969, I addressed my colleagues in this Chamber and proposed an alternative method of SST financing. I called upon the various companies involved in building the SST to work out a capital funding arrangement whereby the necessary money could be raised through the sale of federally-guaranteed bonds in the private sector. These bonds would fall due in the decade between 1980 and 1990, when the sales of the American SST should put developers in a position to repay the bonds. The Federal Government would stand behind these SST bonds with a guarantee equal to the total amount requested as the Federal share of SST development.

In this way, the Government would encourage immediate production of the necessary capital by attracting private investors who, in turn, would rely on a Federal guarantee of repayment to lessen their risk. If the SST is the financial success its proponents say it will be, the Federal Government would substantially reduce its direct dollar investment in the plane's development. At worst, the Federal investment would be postponed a full decade, with far less disasterous effects on the Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to this proposal as I feel it is the most desirable solution to the SST dilemma.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert my letters to Transportation Secretary John Volpe and the editor of the Washington Post on financing of the SST:

MARCH 16, 1971.

Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
Secretary of Transportation,
Independence Avenue SW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Since 1969, I have been proposing an alternative method of SST financing which places greater emphasis on private development and less strain on the Federal budget. Even if funds for the prototypes are appropriated by the Congress, I understand that final funding arrangements for actual SST production have not been fully worked out. Therefore, I would like to put forth my suggestion again.

Briefly, I propose that the government and the various companies involved in producing the SST work out a capital funding arrangement so that the necessary money can be raised through the sale of federally-guaranteed bonds in the private sector. Enclosed are two of my statements which detail the proposal. Such an approach would have reduced the problems we are encountering today with the SST issue. Moreover, the private financing approach with Federal guarantees lends itself to accommodating cost overruns and inflation far better than the direct appropriation process.

The technological and environmental problems of the SST are the kinds of problems that can be solved by American ingenuity. In my mind, the crucial issue is whether funds should be taken directly from the Federal budget at a time when there are still severe cutbacks in other areas of high priority. From this point of view, appropriations for the SST are very difficult to justify. This difficulty is illustrated by the number of conflicting studies that have been issued on the economic, environmental and social consequences of an American SST.

I would be happy to meet with you and discuss my proposal in greater detail if you feel it warrants further interest.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

FRANK HORTON.

[From The Washington Post, June 21, 1970]

FINANCING OF THE SST

Herblock's cartoon in the June 12 Washington Post makes a very valid point about the financing of the supersonic jet transport and one I have held for some time now. I cannot, in good conscience, approve direct federal expenditure for the SST.

In a statement on the House floor on Nov. 18, 1969, I proposed that government and the various companies involved in building the SST work out a capital funding arrangement so that the necessary $1.5 billion can be raised through the sale of federally guaranteed bonds in the private sector.

Such bonds would fall due in the decade between 1980 and 1990 when the sales of the U.S. SST should put the developers in a position to repay the bonds.

It is obvious that the SST development cannot be undertaken without federal assistance. But I do not believe this airplane, already riddled with financial and environmental problems, should pre-empt tax dollars that are more desperately needed in other areas of our economy.

It would seem to me that the federal guarantee of SST bonds should be sufficient to encourage the production of the necessary capital. In this way, the direct and immediate expense to the federal government would be eliminated. If the airplane is successful, the bonds can be repaid by the corporate borrowers. At worst, the federal investment is postponed for a full decade with far less disastrous effects on a very sensitive federal budget.

FRANK HORTON,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is a mood of expectancy and excitement in the House of Representatives today which we seldom find.

We have been working on the SST program for quite a number of years. We do not have the SST today. We would not have it until the late 1970's. However, in our national legislative business we must look to the future with respect to the great interests of our country. That is what we are undertaking to do through the recommendations in the pending resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations has, I assume, been the closest to this matter in recent years. We have considered and debated this issue up and down from time to time. After another debate on Monday last, when we considered reporting this bill and recommending that the House pass it, the vote in committee came as to whether we should kill the SST program or whether we should proceed with the program. Three Members abstained from voting, but out of the 41 Members voting 26 voted for a continuation of this program and 15 against, showing quite a decisive vote in favor of continuation.

I realize that many Members have had some difficulties in trying to determine what should be done about this matter, but it is my judgment that, as of today, the issue is not very complex or very difficult. As has been pointed out time and time again, the issue here is, shall we capitalize on the $800 million which we have already spent? Shall we realize that if we kill the program today the total cost to the Government, with little if anything coming in return, will be about $1 billion? Or, shall we take the step of saying we will go forward and spend a total of about $1.3 billion and develop two prototypes and see where we want to go from there?

It seems evident to me that, today, we have only one logical course of action—regardless of whether we are strong for the SST, or lukewarm for the SST, or even against the SST. Why do not those who are so strongly against the SST want to see it completed so that they can be vindicated and be able to point the finger of criticism at those who continue to support the program?

The press, the columnists, the television, and the radio commentators, are all very much interested in what we do here. The news at to what we do here today will be flashed around the globe very quickly. If we vote to stop this program, the leaders in the Soviet Union may well say, "Well, America has lost that spirit which made her great—the spirit of taking a gamble, the willingness to risk something for something to be gained." Of course, the Governments of France and Great Britain would take

heart to this extent: They will have a better chance to lead the world in commercial aircraft production in the future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that we not flash the news to the rest of the world that America is taking a back seat in anything potentially worthwhile or in anything potentially enduring. The stakes are very high.

The transportation industry is worthwhile and is enduring. We as a Nation are now foremost among the nations of the world in aviation development and progress.

So, I would repeat, let us not take a back seat to any nation in the world. Let us maintain the industrial preeminence which we now occupy. Let us vote down with a resounding vote the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a number of Members have come up to me expressing concern about whether the money for research on the environment and research on engine noise is contained in the money for the SST and would that be stricken by the success of my amendment. The answer to that is "No."

The money for the environment is in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and environment research will go on if my amendment is successful or not.

The money for the noise abatement is in the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Administration and that too will go on.

So, with respect to the research that seeks the answers on environment and noise, that research will continue whether my amendment is successful or not. Nor, Mr. Chairman, will the prototypes be necessary to conduct that research. Witnesses before our committee stated positively that the prototypes are not necessary in order to conduct the atmospheric research, they are not necessary to conduct the research on noise.

My good friend and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), declared that the Committee on Appropriations had voted, as he said, overwhelmingly against the amendment which I offered. I do not agree with his conclusion.

The members of the Committee on Appropriations did vote 26 to 15 against my amendment. But I suggest to the distinguished chairman of our committee that that is two more votes than my amendment got last year, which is progress.

Second, of the three members who voted "present" two of them are going to vote against the SST. One member who voted against this amendment in committee has turned around and he is going to vote for my amendment on the floor.

Further, the Committee on Appropriations usually supports the reports of its subcommittees overwhelmingly, almost unanimously. When an amendment like mine can get 15 votes before the Committee on Appropriations one knows the amendment has a great deal of merit.

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), waved a pamphlet and said, here are the facts regarding the Russian Tupolev. I have seen so many of these travel folders with pictures of planes and beautiful places, I suggest they do not always contain entirely factual information. The fact is that the testimony before our committee did not indicate——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In view of the fact that the gentleman used my name, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I shall yield to the gentleman in just a second, as soon as I finish my sentence.

The case before our committee did not indicate any testimony as to the Tupolev other than its speed, other than the fact that its wing configuration was the same as the Concorde.

If those characteristics are like the Concorde, and if it looks as though the operating expenses will be similar to the experience of the 747's, then I say any airline executive who buys one of those planes is out of his mind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I will now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my comment has to do with reference to the facts related in the gentleman's comments earlier in that he had not seen the material on the Russian plane, how fast it would go, what its seating capacity would be, and so forth and so on, and I will state to the gentleman that that material is available in the pamphlet which I have.

Mr. YATES. I am glad to have that information, but I will tell the gentleman that that information was not in the record.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I hope the gentleman will have the opportunity of looking at it afterward.

Mr. YATES. I will be glad to look at it later.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I think that this is an historic moment. We have reached the culmination of years of debate on the SST. In all those years the Members of the House have never had the opportunity to vote by rollcall on authorizations for the supersonic transport or on appropriations. This will be the first time. I say let us end the supersonic transport now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOW).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOW yielded his time to Mr. GERALD R. FORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this body are interested in the most recent facts, then they should read the 709 pages of testimony and exhibits contained in this book of hearings produced by the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations. And may I say that on the basis of the factual arguments and evidence presented here, pro and con, anyone, even those who in the past have voted against this proposal, if they are objective, could be and should be convinced that we should vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), and vote for the supersonic transport.

Mr. Chairman, the temptation is to appeal perhaps at this late hour to those on the Democratic side, and those on the Republican side on certain emotional grounds. The RECORD shows that a Democratic President in June of 1963 made the first recommendation for the supersonic transport before the Congress of the United States. And for 5 successive years President Lyndon B. Johnson recommended to the Congress that we approve the supersonic transport funding.

I say to my Republican friends, for the last 2 years a Republican President has joined with his predecessors, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, to support this project and this program. They had the vision and the courage and the dedication to know of its importance—not for today but in the future, for the United States to remain preeminent so far as the aircraft industry is concerned.

Yes, four Congresses—the 88th, the 89th, 90th, and the 91st Congresses have supported the requested appropriation for the SST and now this Congress in one of its very first tests has to make the decision whether it is a man or a mouse. This Congress is going to make up its mind whether it is going down the path and at the crossroad take the road to strength or the road of weakness for the future of America.

There are about five or six main issues involved in this vote.

As to the pending amendment, if you vote "yes" on this amendment, you in effect are giving layoff slips figuratively tomorrow to 13,000 employees who are currently engaged in various production jobs on the SST. You are in effect issuing layoff slips to a second tier of 50,000 employees who are now working on this project.

If you vote "yes" on this pending Yates amendment, in effect, you are denying 150,000 American jobs a year for the next 10 years. If you vote "no" on the Yates amendment then you are, in effect, insuring jobs today for 13,000 people and 150,000 American jobs each year for the next 10 years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman repeat his statement for the benefit of the Members to the effect of the vote on the pending amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

If you vote for the SST, you are insuring 13,000 jobs today plus a total of 50,000 current jobs in the second tier and 150,000 jobs each year over the next 10 years.

If you vote for the Yates amendment, you will be handing out layoff slips to those individuals who are currently employed in this project all over America.

As to the question of cost. If you vote against the SST, you are, in effect, insuring that the Federal Government will have to pay approximately $176 million in cancellation costs and, in effect, you will be throwing down the drain approximately $860 million of money that has already been spent.

Furthermore, if you vote for the SST, you are insuring when we get through with the investment that we have now, and the $290 million that we propose to put into it with this proposal, we will end up with some worthwhile hardware, the two prototypes, which will give us an opportunity to do something affirmatively and to answer some of the questions and some of the problems that have been raised.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) exhibited for the members of the committee this sales material put out by the Soviet Union in favor of their version of the SST. This sheet shows the speed of the aircraft and the other flight characteristics of the Russian SST. It shows the other benefits of this aircraft which is on the market today and will be flown on commercial flights in October of 1971.

I have in my hand here a public announcement that the Soviet Union has signed a sales agreement with an American to market this aircraft in America.

Now the question comes right down to this—if you vote against an American SST, you are insuring that the Soviet Union, the British, and the French will dominate the market in advanced aircraft over the next two decades.

On the other hand, if you vote for the American SST, then you are insuring that the U.S. plane will be flying and that we will outdistance the competition of the British and the French and of the Soviet Union.

On the next issue, the question of the environment, I say now that I would not vote for the two prototypes if I was convinced that there was any problem in the area of the environment, and I say, categorically, right now that I will not support the production of an American SST if I believed there would be any problem in relation to environment in the future. The testimony that was heard by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations answers the environmental questions. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who is an opponent of this program, admits that the overwhelming weight of the evidence is against any environmental problems caused by an American SST.

Let me talk about the balance of payments. This country cannot subsist now or in the future if we do not have a net plus in our balance of payments. The record is clear that one of the biggest producers of an American favorable balance of payments has been the aircraft industry. If you ground the American SST, you, in effect, will kill any possibilities of our American aircraft industry in the future producing a favorable balance of trade.

The argument has been made here, "Who is going to buy the American SST?" I have in my hand a copy of a statement made by Najeeb C. Halaby, president of Pan American Airways, a person known to many of us over many years. He, in this prepared statement, speaking for all of the U.S. commercial airlines, indicates that they, as a group, support the continued research, development, and production of the two prototypes of the SST. In a statement they say that it is essential for us as a nation to proceed with this project.

The question has been raised, will private industry finance the actual production of some 300 or 500 American versions of the American SST?

I have in my hand a copy of a letter from the executive vice president of the Bank of America, and a copy of a letter signed by Eugene R. Black and James B. Mitchell, all renowned bankers in this country, representing the largest financial institutions in America, and they say that private industry will finance an SST, an American version, if we have the courage to proceed with the prototypes that we are trying to proceed with at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude with this observation and comment: If we vote "yes" on the Yates amendment we are throwing down the drain $1.34 billion of U.S. taxpayers' dollars. If we vote "no," if we vote for the SST, we are voting to keep the United States preeminent in the aircraft industry, and we are voting for a program to build and to sell American SST's rather than a program to buy foreign versions of an SST.

I urge, strongly urge, a vote against the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCFALL yielded his time to Mr. BOGGS).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I find myself on the same side of the aisle with the minority leader but for entirely different reasons. I would say to the Members that the SST—and 10 SST's—could not rescue the economic policies of the Nixon administration. This program is not a WPA. It is not designed to make work. It is not designed to give jobs. It either stands on its own as a scientific advancement necessary for the continuing movement ahead of the United States of America as a technological leader on this earth, or it has no justification whatsoever.

At another time and on another occasion I will deal with the economic policies of this interim administration in the White House. Suffice it to say that after 12 years of moving ahead in this economy the Nixon administration succeeded in giving us zero growth last year. Suffice it to say that with all the things we need in this country, in the cities, and in the urban areas and in the rural areas around this country, we have 6 million able-bodied Americans, talented Americans, engineers, craftsmen, and nonunemployed. Twenty-five percent of the industial capacity of the United States is unused. So, Mr. Chairman, please do not buy the minority leader's WPA argument for this project.

Let us take a look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. Let us see if we can separate the wheat from the chaff. What is involved here? What is the issue before us? The gentleman from Illinois, my old and dear friend, Mr. YATES, says this is a historic occasion, because never have the gentlemen as Members of the great House of Representatives had the opportunity to say "yes" or "no" on an SST. The Members know that is not so. The Members know over the years that the distinguished Committee on Appropriations has brought here the appropriation for the Transportation Department and anyone could have offered a motion to recommit where we would specifically strike the SST.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I do not yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman should yield. He used my name.

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Of course, the gentleman should yield. There has never been a vote on this in the House of Representatives directly on this question of striking the SST, and the minority had the motion to recommit, and we did not.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is technically correct. I know that the gentleman is perfectly sincere in his position.

But let us see what is proposed. We propose to build two prototypes of an aircraft that is already being flown by the Soviets and the French and the British.

Today I read in the press, in the New York Times, that if today we pass this bill, and we vote down the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that we will increase the danger of skin cancer. I read down a little further in the story, and I discovered that one of the men making this assertion was the same man who allegedly made a statement a few years ago that the power failure in New York might be attributable to flying saucers.

I read also where Charles A. Lindbergh is opposed to this program.

Well, so be it. I sat in this House when Mr. Lindbergh said, "Let us make a deal with Hitler." I sat here when Mr. Lindbergh said it was impossible to defeat the Nazis. I do not find his testimony commanding.

Now, in truth and in fact one of few areas, since World War II, where the United States has prevailed has been in the field of aviation; and, thanks largely to the vision of the late President John F. Kennedy, in the field of space. By some strange coincidence I find so many people who are opposed to the SST program also opposed to the space program.

I know the arguments they make. They say, "We cannot afford both."

Well, I find that argument hard to buy. I find it hard to believe that in an economy of a trillion dollars—not a billion

dollars, not $100 billion, not a half trillion dollars, but $1 trillion—we cannot afford about $300 million to maintain the scientific ingenuity of the United States of America.

I am for urban mass transit.

I am for the poverty program.

I am for model cities.

I am for aid to education.

I am for building hospitals.

I am for cleaning up the slums.

I am for helping the small towns and farms of this country.

I am for cleaning up the environment.

But none of this will happen if we do not maintain the scientific ingenuity of this Nation.

Why, a few weeks ago we had here three brave men here who had gone to the moon, two had walked on the moon. They stood here and talked to us, and we were proud of them. I said to myself, repeating someone else, "Why did we go to the moon? Because of man's eternal quest for knowledge."

When the time comes that we in America turn back on that quest for knowledge when we say we do not have the know-how, we do not have the resources and we cannot do it, then we shall cease to move ahead. There is no such thing as a static society.

These two aircraft are admittedly experimental. No one who has studied the issue says with any degree of certainty that we should or should not build supersonic aircraft. But they do say: "Let us pursue the subject. Let the scientists and engineers and environmentalists and ecologists, after they are built, make that determination."

That is all we are saying.

Now, the economic consequences flow naturally therefrom. We do have a balance-of-payments surplus on the sale of aircraft. We have been able to sell our aircraft when at the same time we have seen the complete demise of the American merchant marine and the decline of the American Navy. We are spending today billions of dollars to revive the merchant fleet of the United States. At the end of World War II the United States had more modern ships than all the other nations put together. But today we carry about 8 percent—mind you, 8 percent—of the foreign commerce of the United States in American bottoms.

We are now required to spend billions of dollars in order to modernize the American merchant fleet, and face the same situation with respect to the American Navy. It is obsolete, outmoded, outgunned in the Mediterranean, as I speak to you, by the Soviet Navy.

So, my colleagues, the issue here is simple. It is not complex. This is not a WPA project. This is a question as to whether or not you have faith in the ingenuity of the people of this country and want to see this country move ahead.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, as a freshman in this great House, I have not before been recorded on the SST. I took the opportunity during the first weeks of this Congress to acquaint myself with the various components of the debate surrounding the SST. My review of the arguments, Mr. Chairman, has not been helped by the high emotional level of both proponents and opponents of the SST. The rhetoric, frankly, has been a great source of disappointment to me as I have attempted to study conscientiously and with an open mind the economic, environmental and technological aspects of this most important decision. In almost 20 years of public service I have rarely faced a decision of such complexity. But the time for decision has come for me as well as many of my colleagues who have conscientiously studied this question.

Mr. Chairman, I have decided to support funds foi the construction of two prototypes. I would like to share with you and the Members of this great body my reasons for this decision.

The debate, as is well known, centers on two separate but interlocking issues: the economic impact of the SST and the environmental aspect of the SST. I want to make this clear that my decision today is confined only to the development of two prototype aircraft. I am not convinced at this time that full production is economically feasible or environmentally sound. Let me repeat, we are not deciding today whether the SST will go into full production; we are deciding merely whether to provide continued support for research and development for two planes. This is an important distinction, and one which has unfortunately been overlooked by the proponents who promise billions of dollars in economic benefits and the opponents who conjure up visions of environmental cataclysms.

ECONOMICS OF THE SST

The prototype development will have a beneficial effect on the horrible unemployment in my district. Unemployment figures fluctuate, but it is reliably estimated that over 8 percent of the Connecticut work force is unemployed. I am informed by reliable authorities that to discontinue prototype development would mean that 1,200 to 1,500 more men and women would be out of work. That translates into the immediate loss of some $15 million in contracts in Greater Hartford. I am frankly hard pressed to justify a vote that would deny these people employment when, as I have noted above, we are today deciding only to support money for research and development of two prototype aircraft. I will state just as firmly that I am willing to vote against any production beyond these two aircraft—no matter what the consequence is to employment in my district—if the studies that result from production and testimony of the prototype indicate a serious threat to our environment. Again, let me repeat that I am basing my vote today on the immediate economic impact in my district, but I am willing to stand up and say "No" to my district if full production of the SST proves after testing to be harmful to our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been talking about and we are voting on funds for two and only two experimental planes. At this point, I would like to suggest to all-out supporters of the SST that I have serious doubts about the economic viability, as well as the environmental soundness, of mass production. Let me concentrate for a moment on the economics of the SST. For the U.S. Government to get its money back, there must be a sale of 300 SST's. This, I believe, is unrealistic, but I still support the need for R. & D. to keep the state of the art highly developed in the United States. Future mass production must pass rigid environmental tests, but even if prototypes secure answers to these vexing problems, the economic issues remain. These are:

First, there is a functioning high speed—not supersonic—aircraft with large passenger and load capacity. I refer, of course, to the 747. There are more "airbuses" on the way. I believe that airlines will not duplicate their inventories of air carriers, especially as the supersonic carrier has limitation of flight privileges—the SST cannot fly overland at top speed.

Second, in light of the need to sell 300 SST's, rumor of cutback in 747 acquisitions casts doubts on the ability to sell 300 SST's.

Third, I believe that the Soviet SST and French-English Concorde, which are nearly operational, will seriously reduce any market for the U.S. SST. In short, by 1978–79, the date for an operational U.S. SST, I feel there will not be a market for 300 such aircraft and the U.S. and aircraft companies will sustain great losses.

Fourth, economic viability is also based on desirability and cost factors. Let us look at each in turn. The SST is being supported on its increased speed. I have computed some statistics on estimates of SST capability and operational characteristics of the 747.

Plane	Passengers	Time to Europe (hours)	Speed (miles per hour)	Range (miles)	Cost
SST	298	[1] 3	1,800	4,000	$40,000,000
747	350+	6	550	5,000	20,000,000

[1] Estimate.

Note in this table, column 2, time to Europe. The figures in both cases involve airport to airport and do not include waiting time over airports. There is approximately 3 hours difference, but, as can be seen by the chart, there is a difference in seating capacity. In my concern for economic viability of the SST, I called several airlines to find out if their 747's were not filled. I reasoned that, if existing 747's were not filled, there might not be a great demand—300 planes worth—for the SST with smaller but still large capacity. To my dismay, I found that on the most popular route, New York to London, 747's leave with almost 100 seats vacant! If this is a problem now, how much greater will it be when 747's,

other airbuses, Soviet and French-English SST's and U.S. SST's compete for a 1978 market? My questimate: The U.S. SST will not fare very well.

Still, I believe given the long lead time and life of supersonic aircraft, the U.S. must continue its R. & D. effort.

I am intrigued with the argument over termination costs. It will cost $478 million to complete the R. & D. program. DOT says that termination will cost $178 million; opponents say $97 million. Whichever figures are accepted, I believe that the $487 should be appropriated for the two test planes in order to maintain the state of the art in the United States.

I would warn the aviation industry including labor that any effort to place a "life saver" role on the SST is questionable at best and foolhardy at worst. I do believe that the technological aspects of prototype development are vital, but as I have noted, I have serious reservations about the future beneficial economic effects of mass production.

ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS

I wish to state categorically that I am opposed to full production of any U.S. SST until all environmental questions are satisfactorily resolved.

The chief concern of both proponents and opponents of the SST have been centered on sideline noise and atmospheric changes resulting in climatic changes.

It has been asserted by opponents that a fleet of high flying SST's will cause climatic changes by affecting the ozone layer in the stratosphere and by increasing the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. I have read the allegations and charges on both sides and I have neither the personal competence in analyzing meterological and stratospheric assertions of the two groups to come to any informed decision on this problem, but I feel that two prototypes will answer these questions.

NOISE

It is with the concept of noise that I feel more comfortable, although scarcely more learned. The debate over noise has two components: ground noise and sonic booms. Let me discuss each in turn:

Ground noise—noise at or near the airport.

Community noise: Noise over communities after takeoff. Both proponents and opponents seem to argue that faster rate of climb will allow the SST to make less noise on takeoff than is presently required.

"Sideline" noise: Noise on the airfield before takeoff. Both sides initially agreed that the sideline noise was much too high to be acceptable. In recent weeks there have been announcements that sound suppressors have been discovered to eliminate this problem, although there is concern that the additional weight of these sound depressers will severely lower the seating capacity of the U.S. SST. Two prototypes will answer this question.

Sonic boom: The issue of the sonic boom has received the most publicity. The FAA has ruled that the SST is not allowed to fly at supersonic speeds over the continental United States. Both supporters and opponents agree with this ruling. If this ruling is kept in effect, I believe there will have to be a tremendous increase in overseas passengers to make the SST economically viable. Opponents have pointed out that the sonic boom over the seas might affect the ecology in the oceans and cause discomfort to persons on the high seas.

I find convincing the argument that further research and development might answer the problems of ground noise and potential climatic changes. I remain skeptical that there are any answers to the sonic boom. If these problems are not resolved, I will fight production of the SST.

Finally, I wish to join with those of my colleagues who are demanding that the Office of Management and Budget release funds appropriated for urban mass transit. The OMB, it has been reported, is freezing more than half the moneys allocated for this purpose for this fiscal year. This must stop immediately. I believe that this Nation can afford to keep its primacy in aviation and develop an effective mass transit system.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against increased appropriations for the supersonic transport because the arguments advanced by its supporters are specious and because the social risks and hazards to the environment far outweigh any possible short-range advantages.

Supporters argue that continued development of the SST prototypes will preserve jobs and will protect the United States against a potential threat to her balance of payments. Toward these ends they would have us underwrite an unprecedented investment of U.S. tax dollars as a substitute for the private venture capital which the program has failed to attract. They project a two to one return on this public investment.

Taking the arguments in order, I do not believe the United States should invest in private, nondefense industries merely to create jobs, unless those jobs in some way contribute to the general social welfare. We cannot justify massive investment in a make-work project at a time when our taxpayers are screaming for relief, our schools are on the verge of bankruptcy, our cities are rife with crime and delinquency, when more than 20 percent of our citizens are ill clothed, ill housed, and ill fed, and when our very environment is endangered by civilized evils which we are only beginning to comprehend.

Second, no one can predict what our balance of payments will be in 1985 or 1990, but to argue that a favorable balance of payments depends on development of the SST is to carry the logic of the cold war and the arms race into the arena of economic competition. If the SST cannot stand the test of economic competition it should be abandoned. If it cannot attract private venture capital on its own merits, in sufficient quantity, we should take that as a warning and avoid sending good money after bad. If other nations want to gamble on such a risky proposition, let them do so. The United States has never been at a loss to capitalize on a technological breakthrough and to remain on a sound competitive footing with other nations. We did not develop the subsonic jet transport but we are and will remain the world's leading producer. Finally, U.S. policy will largely determine whether there will be any world market for supersonic transports.

As I said in the beginning, the arguments for the SST are specious. The arguments against it are compelling. First, there is the moral question: How can we justify such an investment when there are so many unmet needs in our society? Second, there is the practical question: Can we afford to gamble further with our already threatened environment? When Mount Agung erupted in Bali in 1963, the resulting particles in the atmosphere raised the temperature of the equatorial stratosphere 6 to 7 degrees centigrade and the temperature remained 2 to 3 degrees above normal for several years after the eruption. According to the study of critical environmental problems sponsored by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology last July, a fleet of 500 SST's "could range from a small widespread continuous Agung effect to one as big as Agung." In short, we would be inviting a new ice age. Pro-SST propaganda to the contrary, the supersonic transport would not be quieter than subsonic transports. They would create a 50-mile wide sonic boom over the entire course of their flight, doing incalculable harm to man and his environment.

Finally, we must ask who would benefit from the SST. Only three States stand to make more in contracts and subcontracts than they would spend in tax dollars. Several thousand aviation industry workers would have their jobs a little longer, but their skills could be redirected into less risky enterprises or into new technologies such as high-speed ground transportation. If the SST ever did go into commercial use, a few select individuals would enjoy the privilege of making intercontinental junkets in one hour instead of several, at a cost that the common man could never hope to pay. But the common man would be asked to subsidize the new aircraft and the ground facilities to handle them and to suffer the noise and pollution for the benefit of the select few.

Obviously, those who conjured up the SST did not have the general welfare in mind. Their responsibility was less broad than ours. But we are responsible for the general welfare and can be held accountable for our action here today. We cannot go along with this boondoggle in good conscience.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion to strike from House Joint Resolution 468 those funds for development of the supersonic transport. On a number of previous occasions I have made statements in the House on this subject and as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations I have voted against Federal funds for construction of prototypes of the SST.

As the Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of New York, in which Kennedy Airport is located, I have followed this issue closely and have op-

posed the project for several reasons, among them my conviction that there is no economic justification for the project, there are grave environmental problems connected with the program, and few projects deserve lower priority.

In light of the recent public relations campaign in support of the SST, I also want to remind my colleagues of optimistic statements in the past about the ability or willingness of the aircraft industry to control air and noise pollution and weigh this against the substantial costs involved and the number of Americans to be benefited. We should consider who will use the SST and the need for its development. We should consider not only our Nation's domestic priorities but those who need our help and those who do not.

No one disputes the fact that very few Americans will ever travel by supersonic aircraft. It is a luxury item we cannot afford—a luxury for the wealthy and a tax burden for Americans in middle- and low-income brackets. This is further brought out by a recent study. Those who support the SST tell us that fears about increased air and noise pollution are unwarranted. I remember when FAA officials told us in 1957 that jet aircraft at Kennedy International and other airports would be as quiet as prop aircraft. I have no reason to believe present optimistic statements about the SST are any more accurate.

The SST poses a threat to the environment which we must resist and this threat includes operations at U.S. airports by foreign supersonic aircraft. Instead of worrying about whether France or the Soviet Union will capture the SST market, we should concern ourselves with procedures to protect our environment from the air and noise pollution which any supersonic aircraft will cause.

If the SST will produce the return on investment and profits which its proponents would have us believe, then private industry should be more than willing to make the required financial investment without the need for Government subsidies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the further funding of the SST.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, the reasons for ending Government financing of the SST program at this time are legion. Among them are the steadily escalating costs which have plagued the SST during its developmental stage; the grave doubts as to whether this craft can be operated profitably by the airlines, should it be built; and the whole range of environmental issues which have been raised against it. However, in the short time remaining before this House votes on the SST, I would like to call to your attention the almost intolerable situation which now confronts those who reside near our major airports, and those characteristics of the SST which would actually result in a further deterioration.

AIR POLLUTION NEAR AIRPORTS

First, there is the problem of air pollution over the areas surrounding our airports. Research indicates that although these levels vary, air pollution in some airport areas is now as high as that inflicted upon central urban areas. SST engines operate in such a way that widespread use of the craft would increase greatly pollution of the air. Russell Train, Chairman of the President's Council of Environmental Quality, has written:

> It is my understanding that [SST] opertion at subsonic speeds, including speeds necessary for takoff and landing, results in inefficient fuel combustion with a resulting heavy discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere. Both atmospheric pollution and ground contamination seem likely to result.

The fuel combustion problem for the SST is especially large because it consumes so much more oil than subsonic jets do. For example, in takeoff the SST burns 1 ton of fuel per minute. If this Congress is at all serious about preventing further contamination of the lower atmosphere, harsh action must be taken to reduce and eliminate this type of pollution which jet aircraft produce.

AIRPORT NOISE

Second, the tremendous amount of noise produced by the SST in takeoff and landing has attracted much attention lately. Department of Transportation officials have been boasting for the past month that they have solved the problem of community noise. Through some changes in the engine design, they say, the SST noise level has been reduced to approximately that of subsonic jets now in use. However, if these officials or anyone else believes that the present noise levels are acceptable in any way, let them ask the people who live near Cleveland's Hopkins Airport. For years these people have been subjected to the constant roar of jets as they fly immediately overhead after takeoff and before landing. Just last year hundreds of them signed petitions demanding that something be done about this noise.

And the views of these people have been backed up by scientific studies. Recently the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering called upon the Department of Transportation to establish maximum airport noise levels which are substantially below those now in effect. Let us be quite clear in what we are talking about when we speak of airport noise and the regulations governing it. Noise amounts are measured in units called decibels, a figure which also takes into account the length of time the noise is heard, and its pitch or tone. The FAA has ruled that the noise emitted by an aircraft into the community surrounding an airport cannot exceed 108 decibels. Subsonic jets presently in use are approximately at this level, and the SST is barely able to reach it. As a comparison, the amount of noise produced by the type of jackhammer used to break pavement is about 115 decibels near the operator's ears. At these levels, is it any wonder that there should be so much concern about noise?

Concern over noise pollution has been enhanced by recent findings of scientists who state that prolonged exposure to noise can result in serious damage to the human body. Thus not only is such noise annoying and distracting, it can also impair hearing and other bodily functions. Much research remains to be done in this area, and during this time when noise pollution is a worsening problem for all cities, commonsense dictates that we call a halt to any program which might further harm our environment in this way.

In my past consideration of legislation involving commercial aircraft and the airports, I have always kept the well-being of those who reside near the airports foremost in my mind. I certainly cannot now justify the expenditure of $1.3 billion of the taxpayers' money on such an unwise project that will actually worsen their situation. For this reason, I shall cast my vote against the SST.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, the question will shortly be before the Congress as to whether or not the Government will continue to finance the private development of a supersonic transport.

Arguments have raged back and forth with increasing intensity. Claim and counterclaim are made with a growing divergence between the various views. To me the choice is plain.

I do not believe that the taxpayers of the United States should be forced to take a $1.4 billion risk that private enterprise is unable or unwilling to sustain.

It is increasingly obvious that a powerful, inextricably intertwined lobby is seeking to siphon this vast sum from the public treasury for the benefit of an aerospace complex that is already in deep financial difficulty because of its own poor judgment and past errors.

The airlines have no desire to have this craft, even if it were brought into being, upon them. Staggering from debts and interest rates incurred by overbuying of large jets, they look with horror upon the costs of this new mastodon of the air.

Yet the aerospace companies affected have attempted to force this monstrosity down the throats of an already balky public.

Who would utilize such a monster? Only the very wealthy. Why do we need such an aircraft? So we can cross the oceans faster and have the extra 2 hours to spend in traffic jams? That is the only use that comes to my mind.

Arguments are put forward by the smoothly functioning, well financed lobby about the Anglo-French Concorde. News from the other side of the Atlantic piles up to the effect that the British and French are stuck with a flying white elephant; a grossly expensive technical disaster that tears roofs off houses near airports, drives people half insane with its roars and shows no sign of ever approaching a financial breakeven point. Mr. Servan-Schreiber's communications of recent weeks are more than a little thought provoking.

Yet to me the ultimate argument centers around the environment as well as about priorities. Expert technical people have again and again raised pertinent questions about what long-term environmental effects this craft or a fleet of them will have upon the world we inhabit.

By daring to have the courage to raise these questions, the environmental groups and their allies have been at-

tacked, maligned and threatened. Their patriotism, judgment, and even sanity has been called into question along with their tax exempt status. Yet all they are doing is asking questions Americans should have begun asking years ago. Before pesticides ran wild, before subdivisions ran amuck, before all the forests were hewn down, before mercury began to be dumped in large quantities, before all sorts of chemical compounds began to be added to our food; ad infinitum, ad nauseum.

American industry has, in the name of technology and progress for progress' sake, perpetrated one atrocity after another upon the Nation, reaping vast profit from public indifference. Now that indifference is at an end, particularly when the very people who will be victimized by their latest little technical gimmick are being asked to subsidize it.

I represent a district in New York City's borough of Brooklyn. My constituents know what they require in terms of transportation requirements.

Mass urban transit that is safe, fast, cheap and dependable. Fewer traffic jams. Less lead in gasoline. Better and safer cars. Subsidies to help the beleaguered city and suburban dweller who cannot move with dispatch any longer in the confines of his own living area.

It is presently impossible for any large number of Americans to move safely, quickly and cheaply on urban mass transit with any consistency anywhere in the Nation. And we are now being asked to subsidize this ridiculous flying boondoggle for the benefit of the SST lobby? Not on anyone's life.

And what about the other national priorities crying out for attention and assistance? What of housing? What of antipollution? What of drug programs? What of the hungry among us? How about our schools and the millions of jobless citizens whose hopes drop lower daily?

Instead of these people's needs, we are asked to approve subsidies for the ultimate in noise pollution. Have any of the SST's proponents walked through downtown Manhattan on an average day? Let them have a treat in terms of noise, and then come back here and ask us for money for a chain of sonic booms stretching across the oceans and land areas.

Howls of anguish are heard on this score. They say they will never, never, never fly across the land routes. This is so much nonsense. All the lucrative routes for any such craft lie across land. If they do not fly such a plane across them, complete with sonic booms that would do nationally what already has been shown in Oklahoma City, the plane would lay an even bigger financial egg than we are assured it will do anyway.

The blather about how many jobs it would create or take with it is just that. Hollow, empty mouthings by public relations men who are frightening apprehensive aerospace workers into lobbying on behalf of the vested interests.

The Russian SST is obviously going to become as great a cropper as the Concorde. Attempts to scare us into massive subsidies because of national pride are as empty as the other claims on behalf of the SST.

My home State of New York already contributes more than $23 billion annually into the Federal Treasury. In return we receive less than $3 billion in Federal programs. I for one am outraged at the thought of having to pay for such a venture. If private industry wants it, then let them pay for it as they have done in previous instances.

Finally, if this atrocity is foisted upon the public in spite of their expressed wishes, then it is my fervent hope that my home city will insure the passage of a measure now pending before the New York State Legislature. It would prevent the use by any SST of any airport facilities in the New York area. Without such privileges, there will be no SST.

Let the forces lobbying on behalf of this incredibly brazen project be aware that this is not isolated opposition they face. The harder they fight, the greater the forces they rouse in opposition to the entire range of attacks upon the environment. Americans have passed the point of no return in regard to awareness of the finite nature of clean air, water, and other irreplaceable resources.

Future SST's and any other projects similar to it will have to run the same gauntlet. Those struggling on behalf of the environment and a restructuring of priorities have tasted victory again and again in recent months. We shall not rest until we have turned this particular parade around. Let those who are immediately affected take note.

Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I shall cast my vote against any further subsidy for the SST.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in the last few weeks my office has been besieged by telephone calls, letters, newsletters, and advertisements both for and against the supersonic transport. I frankly believe that the issue has been so charged with emotion that it is necessary for me to explain why I am voting today to continue Federal financing of the two prototypes.

The Federal Government has a contract to finance the prototypes. Whether a fleet of SST's is finally produced or not, it is my understanding that we are obligated to fulfill the financial terms of that contract. Thus we would save nothing by failing to fund the prototypes.

Many claims have been made concerning the aircraft. Proponents allegedly have spent millions of dollars in newspaper and radio advertising directed at our constituents. While I doubt the propriety of such expensive pressures—which may well have come from Federal funds as have been charged—the plane's opponents have also expended a great deal of time, energy and money in making their case. I have taken the advice of a columnist writing in a recent issue of the New York Times and applied what he called the "mendacity discount rate."

The claims on both sides of the issue have been found wanting.

Mr. Chairman, even assuming the truth and ultimate validity of the arguments of either the proponents or the opponents, it seems to me one fact stands out: If we fail to finish the propotypes, about 14,000 employees, directly or indirectly involved with services and production, would be quickly laid off.

Considering that we are now experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the last 25 years, I cannot in good conscience at this time vote to cut off the funds. The Federal Government has not only a legal obligation to the company under the contract, it has an obligation to the workers and the public not to exacerbate an already intolerable employment and economic situation which is not their fault.

Even if the Federal Government reneges on the contract, it is my understanding that we will have to pay the company the same amount we are obligated to spend to complete construction. In voting the way I do today, I have chosen to complete the prototype, whatever its merits, and insure that those now employed in its construction will remain employed and not become additions to the welfare rolls. In fact, according to the administration, if we were to merely stop construction of the plane, we would be handing over to the companies involved upwards of $200 million in cash to bail them out of a program they started and which has caused them to deplete their own capital resources. I do not believe it is the function of the Federal Government to indemnify private industry for mismanaged risks. In this case, I would prefer to utilize the money to insure the employment of those working on the plane rather than to bail out the company.

My vote in favor of building the prototype should not be interpreted as being in favor of the Federal Government's continued involvement with the plane, nor should it be interpreted as even being in favor of the plane itself. The ultimate decision of whether the plane ought to be built must be based on whether there is a commercial market for the final version, rather than on whether somebody else may build it first. I should like to remind my colleagues that in another age the United States put all its resources into the construction and development of fast clipper sailing ships in order to build a sleeker, faster ship before anyone else. Meanwhile, other countries developed slower but steadier steamships which carried more cargo and go to their destination with greater dependability in spite of the wind and at any time of the year. As a result, we had a fancier ship before anyone else. The other countries, with their ugly steamers, however, carried the commerce.

In addition to the marketability question, we must also consider the effect of this plane on the public, many of whom will never be able to afford to fly in it. The noise, the supersonic boom, possible effects on the environment and weather, the pollution and smog all must be weighed against the need to carry 130 persons to Europe a few hours faster.

Therefore, it should be clearly understood that my vote today will not prevent me from taking a fresh look at any future requests for further appropriations as well as Federal restrictions on the plane's use of the public air space.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, for me the vote on the SST is a difficult one.

There are persuasive arguments on both sides, and I have listened to them all and have considered them to the best of my ability.

I set the environment-ecology argument largely to one side, not because it is not important—it is important—but because it is, to my mind, inconclusive and highly speculative in character.

I set the balance-of-payments arguments to one side, for somewhat similar reasons; and I am not willing to spend billions solely for the purpose of artificially stimulating employment, unless the project involved—here the SST—is itself an important and worthwhile objective for public expenditure. Any and all moneys spent for any purpose whatsoever will, of course, create some temporary employment. This can hardly be a determinative argument in respect to the merits of the SST.

The Federal budget is unbalanced; it is a deficit budget. It is deep in red ink. It is an inflationary budget. The SST is costly—and any additional expense makes for bigger deficits and more inflation, or for higher taxes. This consideration weighs against the SST. It may not be determinative if a strong national interest nevertheless demands the expense. A military aircraft, for example, might in some cases be a necessity, regardless of expense. The SST, however, is not a military plane.

In the final analysis it seems to me that there are two determinative arguments.

First. The strongest argument for the SST is the contention that to go ahead with the American SST today, and by means of this appropriation of funds, is essential to the future maintenance of our country's leading position in manufacturing and sales in the field of civil aviation. If I were fully persuaded of this I might well vote to fund the SST. It has not been demonstrated, however, that our foreign competition is itself viable from an economic point of view, or that we cannot in the end compete successfully by means of private enterprise alone.

Second. The strongest argument against the SST—and one which meets my fundamental beliefs—is that public funds ought not to be spent to finance private enterprise or private interest, and that this is a field where private enterprise and private financing should prevail. Coupled with this view is the visceral feeling—despite all the arguments that this is beyond the financial capacity of private enterprise—that private enterprise will, in the end, find a way to the necessary financing if it has to do so, and if in fact the SST can be commercially profitable, as its proponents all say that it can be.

This feeling is heightened when we consider that, on the basis of figures submitted, private industry would only have to find an additional $480 million between now and 1973 to bring the prototypes to completion, than it is contemplated that it would spend if it has continued Government assistance.

Surely private enterprise can find an additional $480 million if there is fair prospect of a profit. If there is no such prospect ought the taxpayer to foot the bill?

I cannot demonstrate in a Euclidian fashion the soundness of my conclusions. But, on balance, I am persuaded, on the foregoing basis, that if the SST is sound American private industry ultimately will build it. If so, I think that is how it should be done; and I am not persuaded that there is an overriding need to vote today to abandon this route in favor of a subsidy which I believe, if granted now, will, in all reasonable probability, be increased in the future and increased again, and yet again.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the Yates amendment and in favor of the committee recommendation to continue the SST for the balance of this fiscal year.

Frankly, I had hoped that the committee would come in with a smaller figure for the SST, so that we might slow the program down a bit. But, unfortunately, that recommendation was not made; the only question before us is whether we are going to continue the SST at the present rate or whether we are going to stop the program altogether—immediately—with the loss of some 13,000 jobs in industries, including the General Electric Company, already working on the SST program, and some 50,000 other jobs in industries related to the current SST development effort.

Mr. Chairman, I believe several points need to be made clear. First of all, it ought to be clearly understood that the SST is not a plane for tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. Certainly we do not need an SST today to travel around the world. The 707's, the DC-8's, the 747's, and the other aircraft are filling our current aviation needs at the present time.

But in air travel, as with automobiles, we always have to look ahead to the future. The Model T does not meet our needs today, and so we have constantly sought to develop new and better and more effective models to meet the increasing and more complex requirements of the future. The SST is not being built for the 1970's; it is being built for the 1980's and the 1990's. And if we do not get going now, in terms of technology, to keep America's technical lead two decades ahead, we could find ourselves in real trouble a generation from today.

Second, many people have suggested that this project, desirable as it may be, ought to be financed by private industry, not by the Government. But the fact is that in today's depressed aircraft industry market, the additional necessary funds are just not available. Either the Government furnishes the money, or else the project comes to a full stop.

Besides that, whether rightly or wrongly, we have now spent over $800 million of Federal money on this project already. If we end it today, the termination costs will bring the total to $1.1 billion, with nothing at all to show for our money. If we complete the Government's commitment, it will cost us $1.3 billion—just $200 million more—and we will then have two prototypes that just might succeed in keeping our American predominance in the international commercial aircraft field.

Many people have expressed concern about the environmental impact of the SST. But one thing has come out of this debate today: two prototype planes will not have any adverse impact on our environment, but two prototypes will enable us, as I see it, to find the answers to some of these environmental questions that cannot be fully answered in the laboratory.

And we ought not to forget, by the way, that the present research work on these environmental questions, including the noise factor, is being carried out at the General Electric Research Center in Schenectady, in my district. Just in the past few weeks, they have come up with impressive results in reducing the sideline noise level of the SST engines to a level even below the present 707 jet airplane.

So, Mr. Chairman, I shall support continued research on the SST, and shall oppose the Yates amendment, in an effort to preserve our technology, to keep the jobs we have, to prevent doing anything that, by some domino effect, might depress our great aerospace industry still further. And I intend to cast my vote as an expression of faith in progress and in the future.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is with great hestitancy and reluctance that I rise in opposition to the appropriation of additional funds for construction of a supersonic transport prototype. This represents a change in my prior position, is a matter of grave concern to me, and comes as a result of countless hours of study and research on the subject.

I have agreed in the past with the proponents of this project about the desirability of maintaining a leading role for the United States in air travel, the probable benefits to our economy, the fact that the Russians are constructing their own supersonic TU-144 and the French and British are constructing a British-French Concorde, which if successful in production and sales will result in supersonic transports being flown in the stratosphere whether we want them there or not. On the other hand, I do not believe the proponents of the project have effectively and convincingly answered the many questions concerning threats to the environment which could and should be answered by additional research. Futhermore, with development of the jumbo jet 747, I do not believe there will be public demand by a sufficient number of people for supersonic speed in the immediate future to justify the financial investment.

Eventually, of course, it may well become economically feasible. But if so, I am convinced that this vibrant, healthy, free-enterprise system of ours can and will provide the necessary additional private risk capital. Most certainly the more than $800 million of Federal funds we have already committed to this project should represent a sufficient public contribution.

I feel, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that no harm will be done in delaying further Federal participation in this project until

more answers can be obtained, particularly when such a large number of the American people are expressing grave concern about it. My vote today is not a vote against progress or against maintaining leadership in the field of air travel, but a vote to stop, look and listen, and then proceed with caution.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, proponents of the SST are currently petitioning Congress for $290 million in Federal funding for fiscal 1971. This is approximately $80 million more than what was requested last December to continue development on the SST prototypes for 1971. These additional expenditures will have to be totally subsidized by the Federal Government owing to the severe economic woes of the air industry.

Last year the airlines lost $123 million and their projected loss for 1971 is $192 million. In 1963, when the SST program was first initiated, an agreement was made whereby the Federal Government would be paid back in full after the first 500 SST planes were sold. To date only 122 planes have been ordered and this does not necessarily mean that they will be sold.

Since the SST project was first begun, the costs have doubled the original $750 million guidelines. The complete cost is expected to total $1.8 billion with Federal Government providing 85 percent, or $1.3 billion of it. Now cost experts are estimating that the total expenditures for the SST could go as high as $5 billion and the SST plane is expected to cost between $40 to $50 million each. An additional $30 million has just been spent for experimental testing to reduce the noise level of the SST engines at takeoffs and landings.

I think it is the time to evaluate the Federal Government's priorities in its subsidizing of the SST. We have paid millions of the taxpayers' dollars for the SST already and it is expected to cost millions more before the project is completed.

The SST has not been designed for military purposes, therefore, it is not a question of priority concerning national defense. Neither will the future of the country be dependent on the SST.

Essentially what is being developed is a high-speed plane designed to travel at 1,800 miles per hour—faster than the speed of sound. A trans-Atlantic flight would save the passenger 2 to 2½ hours in traveltime. Primarily the people who would benefit from this are the international travelers and businessmen. This is very impressive, but it would be much more advantageous to build adequate mass transit and improve other forms of transportation which could be used by more people than would be traveling on the SST. There are statistics which indicate that 95 percent of the population will never fly in the SST.

In terms of public needs which now face our Nation, the SST does not meet a high priority. The funds that are being spent for the SST could be channeled into programs such as the housing industry, social security, and welfare reform. I hope the Congress will make a very serious examination of the SST project before they vote millions of dollars more of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I support this appropriation so that work on the supersonic transport may continue without a damaging delay. As one of the members representing Greater Chicago, I do so with my region as well as the basic matter in mind.

Those of us who reside in Chicagoland are very much aware of the importance of transportation. While Washington, D.C., has been the political capital of the United States since the early days of the Republic, Chicago, which is much nearer the center of population, is the transportation capital. No matter how you wish to travel—by land, by water, or by air—we have the most up-to-date facilities for accommodating travels to and from Chicago.

More than a dozen major highways, tollways, and expressways and more than 20 trunkline railroads serve Chicago. Its location on Lake Michigan makes it the link between the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Mississippi River. More than 100 steamship lines serve the Port of Chicago. Twenty-eight scheduled commercial airlines are served by the world's largest and busiest commercial airport which is located in Chicago.

The importance of transportation is, of course, not limited to Chicago—it is important to all 50 States. Our Nation grew in size, population, and wealth as it took advantage, first of the steamboat and the locomotive, then of the automobile, and finally of the airplane.

While helping us to solve the problems of time and distance, the various transportation systems inevitably created new problems. Fortunately, for the well-being of the American people, we did not permit these problems to frustrate us; instead they were challenges to America's inventive genius. We made the rivers navigable, built railroads and highways from coast to coast, and constructed airports.

Improvements in the various modes of transportation made them faster and safer. The outstanding example of a vehicle combining speed and safety is the space capsule that has enabled man to reach the moon. The problem which immediately concerns us, however, is how to enable the ordinary American to travel quickly and safely, not to the moon, but to other parts of the United States and to nations all over the globe.

The critics of the supersonic transport are sincere in their arguments and I am convinced that constructive criticism has helped the aviation industry in building a cleaner and quieter plane as well as a safer and faster one. Some of the opposition, however, has come from ill-informed opponents.

Let us consider first of all the problem of noise. Inasmuch as the supersonic transport will remain at subsonic levels while flying over populated areas, the worry over the damage to people and buildings that might be caused by sonic booms can be calmed. The new planes will travel supersonically—at altitudes between 60,000 and 70,000 feet—only while flying over the oceans and such uninhabited regions as the polar zones.

Next let us consider the problem of pollution. Three automobiles traveling at a rate of 60 miles per hour will emit as much pollutant material as one supersonic transport carrying 298 passengers at 1,798 miles per hour. There are, of course, millions of automobiles in use in the United States every day, most of them in highly congested areas. All the commercial jet transport aircraft presently in existence could stop flying today and the instruments that measure pollution would detect no change in the atmosphere.

We now turn to the problem of weather modification. A fleet of 500 supersonic transports that made five daily flights would produce approximately 200,000 tons of water vapor—about as much as one large thunderstorm. Between 3,000 and 6,000 thunderstorms occur around the world every day. According to the National Academy of Science and the Office of Meteorological Research, a fleet of supersonic planes will have no appreciable effect on the normal atmospheric balance of the earth.

The next question should not be, "Can we afford to build it?", but "Can we afford not to build it?" especially when we realize that foreign countries are already producing similar planes.

France and the United Kingdom, working in partnership, are already building the Concorde, which, while carrying only 128 passengers and flying but 1,350 miles per hour, will be available in 1973. While we are debating the issue, the Soviet Union is building the Tupolev. It will carry 120 passengers, two-fifths as many as the SST, and will fly 1,550 miles per hour, slower than the SST, but with this important difference—it will be ready for use next year, 6 years earlier than the American product.

Soviet experts have predicted that by the year 2000 they will produce an SST which could circle the globe in an hour with a passenger load three times that of any version now being tested.

Obviously, if we decide not to build supersonic transports and foreign nations continue to build them, our balance of trade will be adversely affected.

We could, of course, bar the new planes, but the victims of the embargo could retaliate by barring our planes. Even if banning made sense, we could not persuade Canada to join us in such action.

Both foreign nations and domestic airlines are hoping that we will proceed with the manufacture of the supersonic transport.

Turning on the green light for production of the supersonic transport will benefit not only the aviation industry, which is presently suffering from financial and other difficulties, but also its workers, many of whom are now unemployed. About 150,000 jobs are involved in the SST controversy.

One of the most serious problems that confronts the airlines and one that is very annoying to those who use their facilities is airport congestion. The supersonic transport would help relieve such congestion, as a 298-passenger SST could make 27 New York-London round trips in the same flying time that the new Boeing 747 requires for 10 such round trips.

Air travel became cheaper while it was becoming faster and safer. Although the purchasing power of the dollar decreased 28 percent between 1959 and 1969, the average air passenger fare remained about the same. In terms of constant dollars, air travel in 1969 was 25 percent cheaper than in 1959. Do we want such progress to continue or do we want to force increases in air fares by stifling progress?

Contrary to interpretations that have been circulated, the supersonic transport program is not being subsidized, as were the railroads, highways, and waterways. The Federal Government is not subsidizing, but investing, in the case of the SST. It will receive a royalty of approximately $4,000,000 on each plane that is sold. The first 300 will result in royalties totaling $1,200,000,000, almost as much as the Federal Government's $1,300,000,000 investment. When 500 planes have been sold, the Government will receive an additional $1,000,000,000 as interest. Royalties will continue as more planes are sold.

Mr. Chairman, Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon all favored production of the supersonic transport, believing that the airplane is here to stay. Let those of us who have the power of the purse demonstrate our desire for a faster, safer, cleaner, quieter, and, in the long run, cheaper airplane by voting for the pending measure. Let us cast a vote of confidence for the twentieth century.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, for the third time since my election to Congress the House is voting on whether or not we should appropriate funds for the two prototypes of the supersonic transport. In the past I have had sufficient doubts in my mind regarding the economic feasibility of the plane, as well as questions regarding its effect upon the environment, to warrant withholding my support for its funding.

I have attempted to follow the progress of the plane's development and the issues surrounding it and found on each occasion the situation to be changed. In 1970, although I felt the environmental arguments against the SST were being washed out, I continued to be concerned over the effect of this large expenditure of Government funds when other worthwhile programs were being cut to the bone to curb Government spending and rising inflation.

Today, the economic situation is further changed. The economy has slowed to a standstill, the unemployment rate is high and President Nixon has proposed to Congress a deficit-spending budget which it is hoped will revitalize the economy and restore full employment.

In a further attempt to resolve all questions in my mind regarding the economic impact of the program, I have reviewed all available facts and figures, including several current studies, and I have satisfied myself that the following facts are true and pertinent to the decision we will be making—

Over $1 billion has been appropriated to date for the two SST prototypes, as a research and development project.

It would only cost approximately $300 million more to complete the prototypes than to close down the project.

Any stretchout or delay in the funding of the prototypes will result in greater costs to the project.

Government funds are being invested in the prototypes as a loan only, to be repaid with interest. The Government's investment will be recovered when the 300th plane is delivered and the Government will receive an additional billion when the 500th plane is delivered, as well as royalties on additional planes.

World air travel will triple by the 1980's, and, unless the United States develops the SST to compete with foreign models, most of this will be in foreign air carriers.

Commercial air carrier sales by U.S. producers contribute to the balance of payments; in 1970 the United States sold $3.4 billion worth of aerospace products overseas, including $1.5 billion in commercial transport planes alone.

Export of the production SST is expected to create a $22 billion to $50 billion favorable trade balance for the United States.

Cutbacks in defense and aerospace spending in 1970 alone resulted in the loss of 168,000 jobs, and the industry is presently in a serious state of depression.

The SST prototype project provides more than 13,000 jobs directly and when in production will provide 50,000 jobs which would aid in reviving the industry.

The plane is not going to be flown over land at supersonic speeds, thereby voiding the concern over sonic boom. Furthermore, close scrutiny by environmentalists such as Russell B. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Dr. William Kellogg, Associate Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, and other studies into the environmental effects have concluded that the SST poses no major threat to the environment. The air lines have given assurances that the production SST will meet noise standards and the administration has pledged that, should the plane not get a clean bill of health from scientific research, it will not be produced. As the administration and the aviation industry have acknowledged, we will not really know how economically feasible the SST will be until the prototypes are completed and tested.

The decision we make today appears to me to be whether we want to drop the project completely and write off approximately $1 billion already spent for the prototypes, leaving it up to the industry to come up with the means to complete the prototypes. The delay which would result could greatly reduce the economic benefits to be realized by the United States. Or the decision is whether we want to complete the investment when all the odds appear to be in our favor to derive substantial economic gain for the country on a long-range basis.

My decision is to vote against the crippling amendment and support continued limited Federal funding of the SST prototypes.

I would like to point out that the request for the SST in fiscal year 1971, amounts to about 3 percent of the transportation outlays of the Department of Transportation. The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 provides authority for the next 5 years to fund airport development at $295 million per year and airway facilities development at $250 million per year. In fiscal year 1971, the ground transportation category, a $4.8 billion outlay is planned for highways. Urban mass transportation has a $400 million program level in fiscal year 1971 and $600 million in fiscal year 1972 as part of the $3.1 billion authorized over the next 5 years. A revitalization of water transportation is planned with over $400 million authorized in fiscal year 1971 for maritime research and development and for subsidies of ship construction and operation with plans following to construct 30 merchant marine ships a year over the coming decade.

With regard to national priorities, the SST funding represents only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the total fiscal year 1971 U.S. Government outlays. Billions are planned for social and welfare programs. On the other hand, in fiscal year 1971 with trust funds included, support for human resource programs will surpass national defense and account for the largest percentage or about 42 percent of the total year's outlays. This funding supports programs such as education and manpower, health, income security, and veterans' benefits and services.

It is my belief that completion of the SST is an investment in the economic growth of our country that should be made, as other investments must be made to insure the jobs and taxes needed to fund the domestic and social programs of the future.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Yates amendment, which would delete the $134 million provided for the SST in House Joint Resolution 468.

As has been pointed out repeatedly in recent weeks, we still have not solved the monstrous difficulties and dangers of the SST. We should not continue with its construction while the problems of noise, environment, and economics remain.

The plane as now designed produces a sonic boom that will not be tolerated over land in any country where the inhabitants can vote. On takeoff, the SST noise problem is much greater than with ordinary jets—and though proponents of the program claim that the problem of sideline noise has been "solved" in recent weeks, the noise level will be reduced only from 124 decibels to 108 decibels. Even at this level, the SST would barely reach the interim standard set by the FAA in December 1969, and would be unable to meet the limit of 98 decibels which the National Academy of Sciences has recommended be set for John F. Kennedy Airport in New York by 1975.

The unresolved economic questions associated with the plane are enormous. The president of the American Economics Association, Prof. Wassily Leontief, of Harvard, estimates that the project would create less than 3,000 jobs in the next few years. Certainly no one can deny that there is a serious unemployment problem in this country—but if we

are going to create new jobs through "make work" projects, there are many products which are more important than the SST. Housing, improved waste treatment systems, and new health facilities are all urgently needed in this country. We should encourage our scientists and engineers to concentrate their efforts on these vital areas; and if the Government is to fund public service projects, those projects should be geared to meet our domestic needs.

Walter Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, points out that, if the SST is supposed to be such a profitable undertaking, the taxpayer should not have to pay 80 to 90 percent of the development costs—private industry, which will make the profits which are being predicted, should underwrite the project. Paul Samuelson, professor of economics at MIT, says:

> Any realistic cost-benefit analysis will reach the conclusion that . . . Government subsidy of the SST or similar supersonic aircraft is at this stage of technology and economic development both an economic and a human disaster.

With regard to broad environmental questions, the risks the SST would pose to the oceans and the atmosphere are still unknown. In routine operation on the New York to Paris run, planes flying at supersonic speed could cover more than half the North Atlantic with sonic booms of an intensity of 2 to 4 pounds per square foot as often as every half hour during peak travel seasons. The effect on migratory birds, fish, and other marine life, and the ocean itself is still unknown.

The SST will discharge vapor into the thin air of the stratosphere, leading to unknown effects on health and climate. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) pointed out in his separate views in the report on House Joint Resolution 468 that prototypes are not necessary to carry out atmospheric research to determine the SST's probable effect on the atmosphere. I, therefore, urge that we have the necessary research conducted, and look at the results, before we continue with this project. We have already discovered the havoc a man can wreak when he pursues technology for the sake of advancement, without assessing the harmful affects of his technological triumphs. To testify to our folly, we have DDT in our fruit and mercury in our tuna; and our lakes are choking from the effects of detergent phosphates. The radiological hazards associated with nuclear powerplants are still unknown.

There is no point in continuing construction of the prototype SST, when there are so many questions about the value of the ultimate product, and so many valid arguments against the project. We should take a good hard look at the possible effects before we pursue a questionable technological goal.

I urge adoption of the Yates amendment, to delete SST funds from this continuing resolution.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, disturbed by predictions of environmental and economic disaster, I have scrutinized my previous support of funding for the development of an American supersonic transport. Compelled by the urging of many constituents, I have searched for facts that would justify a reversal of my position.

Most of the arguments against continuing Government support of the SST have not withstood careful examination. They have often been obscured by emotion and supported by inaccurate or unsubstantiated information. Yet some cannot, for lack of conclusive data, be lightly dismissed.

The prospect of a fleet of supersonic aircraft cannot, at this time, be judged all good or all bad. There is much evidence that such aircraft could prove beneficial to our economy. Yet there are disturbing possibilities that such a fleet could have unacceptable consequences.

Environmental opponents of the SST contend that it will generate excessive noise. Furthermore, they fear that the current regulation banning overland flights at speeds that would cause sonic booms will be relaxed should the industry exert pressure to do so. There are also warnings that the amount of moisture introduced into the stratosphere by SST's will significantly reduce the ozone content, thereby dangerously increasing our exposure to ultraviolet radiation and, perhaps, drastically altering the weather.

Experiments on the American SST engine indicate that this aircraft will be quieter than subsonic jets when flying over the community. Excessive sideline noise, however, has not been completely eliminated and there is admittedly no guarantee that the regulation banning overland flights at supersonic speeds will never be relaxed.

Although an SST fleet would undeniably add moisture, and other elements, to the stratosphere, the consequences of these intrusions remain speculative. Proof of adverse effects simply does not exist.

The programs of other nations to develop supersonic aircraft must here be considered. Both the Soviet Union and Britain, in cooperation with France, have already test-flown their versions of the SST. If supersonic flights should damage the stratosphere, our environment will be harmed—whether or not we produce and fly an American product.

It would seem imperative, then, that our prototype phase be completed so that all possible safeguards can be devised. In the event of unsolvable problems, we can confront the nations of the world with valid evidence that an international banning of SST's is required.

Economic questions involve many areas of dispute: balance of payments; employment; Government involvement; and return on the Government's investment, as well as questions involving the profitability of the aircraft in commercial operation.

In regard to maintaining a favorable balance of payments, critics argue that this is not currently a problem and that the impact of the SST could never be sufficient to justify the expense involved in its development.

However, we must consider the fact that foreign countries are now flying, and plan to market their models of the SST. It would be unrealistic to assume that we could retain our 84-percent corner on the free world aircraft market if we fall behind the competition technologically. Moreover, it would be fallacious to assume that a loss of any portion of this vital market would not adversely affect our balance of payments.

Critics contend that the impact of the SST program on unemployment would be negligible. They also argue that the Government would do better to spend such funds on domestic programs.

It must be realized, however, that the Government plans to spend 42 percent of its total budget for human resource programs this year. Yet due to cutbacks in defense spending, our scientific and technological community is faced with an unemployment crisis. A full-scale SST program, contingent on sound estimates of market demand, would relieve this pressing situation. It would not be a "make-work" program. Employment of a wide range of people in the SST program would also have a positive effect on other jobs and help create the revenue required to further increase Government activity in domestic fields.

Some opponents believe that the Government should not be involved in a commercial, profitmaking venture. However, the Government has often provided financial assistance to major transportation programs: railroads; highways; previous commercial aircraft. In addition, the SST proposes to be the first of these programs to return the Government's investment to the taxpayers with interest.

Will the Government recoup its investment in the SST?

Adversaries of the program suggest that the SST will never prove to be a profitable, self-supporting venture, and that the Government will be forced to support production of the fleet. As evidence they cite the production company's inability to present, at this time, a plan showing that adequate private financial backing will be available.

Under the existing contract, royalties are due the Government on every SST sold until the Government has earned 6 percent on its investment. Production of a viable SST would also generate substantial Federal, State, and local tax revenues. As I cited earlier, these funds are urgently needed to help support domestic programs.

The magnitude of possible economic effects that the country could reap from the SST program is a compelling reason to continue examining and refining this aircraft. While there are always risks involved in such undertakings, we cannot ignore the fact that two-thirds of the estimated Government portion of the SST program has already been committed. If the program is abandoned now, an $884 million "downpayment" will have been totally wasted. We will have neither a viable aircraft nor proof that such an aircraft would be contrary to the public interest. In addition, the Government would have to pay substantial closing costs if the program were halted now.

I can only conclude that possible benefits and the importance of resolving disputed issues urge completion of the prototype program.

The authentic hazards of continuation of the SST program must, however, be eliminated. I have therefore introduced legislation that will mitigate problems of: Excessive noise, continued presentation of conjecture as fact—by both sides, and Government assumption of an increasingly greater share of financial responsibility.

The SST represents a technological advance. To insure, however, that it does not betray those it should serve, I have proposed the statutory prohibition of overland flights at speeds that would cause sonic booms to reach the surface. To further protect the public from exposure to excessive noise, my bill stipulates that the SST demonstrate its ability to meet required noise levels before production is inaugurated.

Future decisions regarding the SST must be based on reliable data. Completion of the prototype phase, rather than representing a threat, is a means by which questions can be answered and threatening unknowns resolved. To stimulate compilation of objective data, I have proposed the formation of an independent, interdisciplinary group of non-Government scientists and economists. It would be the duty of this group to monitor all aspects of development of a civil SST and assess each innovation objectively to determine its long-range consequences.

To further insure a concerned public that all evidence will be weighed before actual production begins, my bill would require that the Secretary of Transportation make available to the Congress and the public a report on all aspects of the prototype phase when it is completed.

Not until these two reports have been submitted to and evaluated by the Congress could a single SST be produced, according to a provision of my bill.

If any benefits are to be derived from the SST, the aircraft must prove itself in the competitive market. I have consequently proposed that the major production companies be required to submit a plan showing evidence of adequate private financial backing before the production of SST's is initiated.

To prevent continuous cost revisions and ever increasing appropriations, my bill would place a $1.5 billion ceiling on the amount which the Government could invest in developing the SST.

In conclusion, I express the hope that we can all rise above the emotionalism in which the SST debate has become mired. I am convinced that the overall national interest requires that we determine to do two things: First, proceed with completion of the SST prototypes; and second, reserve final judgment on commercial production until more conclusive data is available.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee to provide further funding for the SST program for the development of two prototypes, and I feel that this section should be deleted from the bill.

It seems to me that the recommendation to pour more money into this program represents a misplaced set of priorities. Many Federal programs have suffered cutbacks in funds because of the administration's desire to curb Federal spending as an anti-inflation measure. I have generally supported these efforts, and I feel that the level of spending requested for the SST is not in line with them.

One program in which I have had a particular interest is the Hill-Burton program for hospital construction grants. Under the proposed allocation of funds for the current fiscal year, my State of North Carolina's share will be reduced by nearly 20 percent. Surely a program of hospital construction is of more direct benefit to a greater number of people than the construction of the SST.

Proponents of the SST reason that by investing Federal money in this project, the Federal Government will realize profits from royalties on SST sales and taxes. I have studied the record of hearings conducted by the House Appropriations Committee, and I feel there is serious question that private industry will be able to finance the very high cost of commercial production of the SST, even if a successful prototype is developed.

I urge my colleagues to support the deletion of funds for the SST from this continuing appropriation.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the SST funding because I believe in technological advancement, but more so because I support continued U.S. air strength.

Like many other Members, I likewise share concern over the unemployment statistics and the constant partisan use of unemployment figures by some as if an insinuation that we in Congress are not doing everything we can to curb inflation and curb unemployment.

I think very shortly we will be receiving a program labeled the Public Service Employment Act which will be sold to us as a community employment scheme to train the hard-core unemployed by getting them used to working—even if they are doing nothing constructive.

Yet, today, opposing the SST funding program are many of those who are most vocal in spreading the hysteria of unemployment, joblessness, malnutrition, and lack of opportunity. Certainly it seems contradictory to express concern over unemployment and then oppose the SST program.

Had I been in Congress when the enabling act to nationalize aviation was considered, I would probably have opposed it. However, in the present technological race, I am convinced that the SST program is performing a needed vital purpose which because of related scientific experimentation and development will offer many benefits to humanity far exceeding the supersonic aircraft itself.

Additionally, I might add that I much prefer spending tax dollars for salaries for constructive workers rather than rewarding those who produce nothing.

I most certainly urge defeat of the amendment to delete all funds from the SST program and plan to cast my people's vote for continuation of the SST program.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

I do so even though I am not one of those who believes that the SST will be the prime instrument which will inevitably bring about irreversible environmental collapse. This issue is so precariously balanced even now that x number of Volkswagens added to the highways will probably suffice as the instrument of our destruction as well as y number of SST's, and I shall leave it to more competent experts than I to delineate the fatal equation with scientific precision. I simply concede that the SST or, for that matter, the highly touted "airbus" now in the offing, will both make a dubious contribution to the air we breathe.

The most compelling arguments for continued funding of the SST project can be summed up in one word: "JOBS." It would be callous indeed to ignore the unemployment picture, especially in the hard-hit aerospace industry—and pretend that continued funding would have other than a beneficial effect in this industry—and pretend that continued funding would have other than a beneficial effect in this industry. Proponents say it could mean as many as 150,000 jobs, and despite the criticism that this involves a generous use of "multiplier" factors, and that the employment effort is concentrated in a very specialized field, it is not a prospect to be lightly ignored.

If we resort to this means, however, of economically stimulating the depressed aerospace industry, there are certain long-range implications inherent in the course of action we will have embarked upon. One noted Harvard economist has spotlighted these by asking the following question:

> If we overcome some employment or balance-of-payments problems by subsidizing SST development, what happens when the SST demand is fulfilled? Will there be another demand for something to keep this industry occupied and happy?

Prof. Walter Heller predicts that "private producers are likely to return to the Federal well again and again."

A University of Chicago economist, Milton Friedman, puts it succinctly, if tartly:

> Our objective should not be jobs but *productive* jobs and that objective is best achieved by the test of the market, not by government subsidization of "leaf-raking" jobs—and if the SST is not commercially viable, then jobs in producing it are the economic equivalent of "leaf-raking."

Arthur Okun, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, forecasts the ultimate reduction and absurdam of the jobs argument—

> Used to prove that jobs would be created by a Federal appropriation for digging holes and filling them, or for dynamiting buildings and rebuilding them.

How useful, how viable will be the SST?

Arguments over this are likely to rage for a long time to come, regardless of the outcome of these debates. But I am struck by another observation of Professor Heller's that—

> The benefits (of the SST) will go mostly to . . . travelers for whom "time is money"—

for whom a 3-hour instead of a 6-hour ocean crossing is meaningful—while the risks and costs will be borne by taxpayers generally (most of whom will never fly an SST).

If we look at the choice before us steadily and unflinchingly, we are obliged to admit that considerations of creating more jobs and maintaining American technical excellence are ultimately focused in the service of that traveler "for whom a 3-hour instead of a 6-hour ocean crossing is meaningful."

Let us not forget that point. We are not voting for continued unemployment in the aerospace industry. We are not voting to concede a technological lead to the Russians, the French, or the British. We are not voting for skin cancer. We are not voting for further environmental degradation.

We are being asked now to vote on continuing appropriations not exceeding $289,965,000 in fiscal year 1971 for SST development based on its own merits and in relation to other outstanding appropriations requests in a rational order of priority.

It is, of course, absolutely essential that we consider SST appropriations in the broad context of national priorities. If this were not a factor, then we could proceed to act favorably at once on all proposals worthy of our immediate attention: Further and more realistic increases in social security; improved care for veterans; increased Federal aid to education; an improved system of national health care; salary increases to members of the Armed Forces to hasten implementation of the all-volunteer army concept and the end of selective service; increased national security; increased Federal aid in the war on crime and drug abuse; better manpower training programs; and so on.

The list is endless and each proposal carries with it its special urgency and demand for priority consideration. The SST has a natural order of priority among these, and it is our task to establish it.

Earlier this week we considered social security increases. The 10 percent this body approved and already signed into law by the President is a lot less generous than many of us had hoped it would be. No one is more buffeted by the cruel blows of inflation than the elderly poor, yet in real terms the raises we voted can amount to as little as $6.40 a month—hardly enough to cover rising medicare costs they have experienced while waiting for us to take action.

There is a genuine crisis in proper nursing care in the Veterans' Hospital in my hometown of Portland. The same problem undoubtedly exists in many of your districts, too. Chairman TEAGUE will tell you that it boils down to appropriations for veterans' hospitals, and I know no one who has fought more compassionately and ably than he to gain the necessary appropriations.

The crisis in education continues to mount. Colleges are failing and the middle-income families, the same ones who are to principally foot whatever bill is forthcoming for SST, are apparently at the bottom of the totem pole in consideration of tax dollars—primarily their own—to aid them in sending their sons and daughters to college.

The son who cannot go to college, of course, is especially vulnerable to the continuing inequity—and iniquity—of the draft—which his parents' hard-earned tax dollars might help eliminate; if we decide on this priority for their allocation.

Meanwhile, many of our citizens, especially the elderly poor exposed to soaring medical costs, are finding, literally, that it is cheaper to die. It would not be, of course, if we assign a proper priority to a system of national health care.

The housing picture has begun to brighten perceptibly in recent months, but all of us realize that we still have a far way to go in realizing the housing requirements of this Nation.

President Nixon himself has said that to keep up with the housing requirements of our exapnding population, we shall have to build the equivalent of a new city of 250,000 persons each month from now until the end of the century. I would hope that we would have the will, the wit, and the wisdom to utilize available and otherwise unemployed skills to the undertaking of so vast and worthwhile an enterprise. And who would deny that the skills are more easily converted from aerospace industry to housing than the opposite direction? If jobs are the most compelling argument for the SST, we had better examine all the arguments again.

I have.

I have examined each of the priority items already discussed and how they will benefit the vast majority of our taxpaying citizens. Relative to how they would be served in concentrating on programs for increased social security, veterans' care, aid to education, housing, youth opportunity, crime-fighting capability, and national security, I find that the requirements of the citizen to whom a 3-hour as opposed to a 6-hour oceanic crossing is meaningful are significantly wanting in priority of our attention.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support House Joint Resolution 468. I do so after careful consideration of most recent arguments by both the proponents and the opponents of the supersonic transport.

I have listened to such diverse considerations as the matter of national priorities, the question of balance of trade, the loss of jobs, sonic boom, the effects on the atmosphere, and a lot of others.

I intend to follow the same course I did when this issue was before us last fall, not simply to be undeviating or to avoid being self-contradictory, but because I believe the issues are about the same as they were then and after listening to all of the arguments all over again I have reached the same conclusion.

But regardless of what may have been contemplated in the past, today we are not talking about the manufacture at any time in the future at Government expense of any given number of SST's. We are talking about only two prototypes and the expense of 100 hours of testing. No more. The money provided in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468 in the amount of $289 million will provide for the SST to be taken out of the realm of speculation and placed into a laboratory status. The U.S. SST is designed to carry 298 passengers as against 128 for the Concorde and only 120 for the Russian TU-144. Ours will have a speed of 1,800 miles per hour as compared with 1,350 miles per hour for the Concorde and 1,550 for the TU-144.

The U.S. SST is a better plane than the TU-144 and the Concorde. We know the world will buy our version if only we get to build it. If the Congress grounds the SST now it will mean the Russians and British and French will literally take over the skies of our world in the years ahead.

Where do we stand timewise so far as our plane and that of the British, French, and Russian competitors? Well, the Russians have their first flight scheduled for October of 1971. The Russians are taking delivery orders now and the British and French are close behind. It is not a question anymore of someone's guess or speculation because the French accomplished a successful test flight in March of 1969. They estimate that in the not too distant future, they can offer their plane for sale. They say they can expect delivery for commercial sale not later than the first few months of 1974.

Foreign competition is only one issue that should be considered. We have heard a lot about the loss of jobs to American workingmen. I would hope that we would not at this time make the job issue the only issue. The SST should not be thought of as only a make-work project. It has a far better justification than that. The real reason for continuing research and development on SST is to assure that our country will continue to be the technological and scientific leader of the world. If we have faith in our scientific community then we should have faith enough to maintain American leadership by voting for continuing technological and scientific advances made possible by SST which will benefit not only our aircraft industry but our entire country, and yes, because of willingness to share knowledge, it will benefit all mankind.

Oh, there are so many arguments which must be considered and answered that it is impossible to consider them in any particular sequence or any relative order of importance. There is the environmental issue. There has been a lot of hysteria brought into the campaign against development or commercial use of supersonic flight. After I have listened to all the evidence I am convinced any additional pollution from supersonic travel will be offset by shorter travel time required by these planes for covering any given distance. I know that our country has an environmental consciousness at the present time but I also know we are continuing to go ahead on research and development in air pollution and much of the money in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468 will be helpful to the field of antipollution research. I introduced in the last Congress and again in this Congress a measure to prohibit supersonic flight over the continental United States. The facts are the SST will fly at subsonic speed over land and accelerate

to 1,800 miles per hour only when it is well over the ocean or over the poles.

Despite the boost to our economy, I would be opposed to the SST if I seriously believed it would be environmentally offensive. I mean by that if I thought that it would be responsible for some of the scare charges that have been made against the plane in recent days. At least two Government studies assure us that even a large fleet of SST's will not threaten the earth's atmosphere. In further consideration of the environmental issue I believe that if there is as much evidence as the critics of the SST suggest then instead of wanting to stop building our SST these same critics should be seeking international abolition of the SST. Unilaterally grounding our own U.S. planes is not enough. But all of us ought to know, and if we are fair with ourselves, do know, there are no environmental risks involved in the proposition to proceed with two SST prototypes.

Another question has been raised of priorities. Mr. Chairman, I think I have had a rather consistent record of voting for programs to try to attain what is regarded as our top national priorities. I have voted for improved health programs. I have voted for increased funding for hospital construction. I have voted in favor of larger appropriations for aid to education and to override the President's veto last year. I have voted for hundreds of millions of dollars to assist environmental cleanup in the field of water pollution. I have supported an increased Federal gasoline tax to build better highways. I have supported urban mass transit.

In proper perspective, Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of having these progressive programs or the SST. Rather it becomes a question of needing both. Soon we will have a $1 trillion gross national product. Surely, we can afford the $289 million provided by section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468. Rather than the either/or approach it is a matter of a balance between the two. We can have both. We have reordered our priorities. Recently we have been spending more on those things we hope lead to social programs. But we must also continue to spend enough money to be sure that the inventiveness, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of our scientific community is not neglected. In other words, we must also maintain American technological leadership.

Someone has asked the question, Just what is at stake in this vote today on House Joint Resolution 468? Is it just a question of $289 million? The answer is an emphatic "No." The reason is that to vote no today means not only the issuance of termination slips to 20,000 aerospace workers. It means a matter of the loss of 150,000 jobs over the next 10 years. It has been said that to stop now means millions and millions of dollars down the drain with nothing to show for it except some incomplete prototypes. At stake is a chance to make $31 billion made up of $10 billion in a favorable trade balance between 1978 and 1990; a $12 billion trade loss avoided between 1978 and 1990, if we continue on now. At stake is $6.7 billion to be lost in State and Federal tax revenues and over a billion in royalties to be made from the sale of our SST.

Without itemizing all of the constituent items in the total, if we stop now most of the total investment of Government contractors and the airlines may be lost. This totals over $1.1 billion, and over and above that is the opportunity or a chance for this country to have $31 billion in benefits in the period from 1978 to 1990. Moreover, if the SST is canceled now, it is not a question of adverse balance of trade alone and tax revenues lost, but it may well be the permanent loss of the world aircraft market.

I know that figures and statistics are confusing and sometimes even misleading. But one thing we can point to that does not require any reference to statistics. That is the fact there is little or no question but that a commercial SST will be built. The only question is who will build it? If we in America turn around and run away from this present opportunity it will be a permanent and irrevocable loss to our country.

Sure there are obstacles to be surmounted in SST construction. Some are real. Others have been manufactured by critics of the SST. Yet, over the years since the time of our Revolution, the American way has been to recognize the obstacles and they find a way to surmount them. We can, I am confident, solve the problems of sonic boom noise and potential pollution.

Reliable economists estimate that in the next 20 years the volume of commercial air travel will multiply six times because of population growth, renewed business activity, increased personal income and more leisure time. At this moment because our American air carriers are faced with the uncertainties of whether our country will meet this newest of air challenges by the Anglo-French Concorde and the Russian TU-144 they have had no other choice but to consider purchase of one of these other model SST's. But that is not the American way.

We know that these airliners will be flying around the world regardless of what is done here in the United States. The age of commercial SST flight is upon us. There is no way to turn back the clock. A vote for the American SST is clearly a vote in the American interest. We must not be left behind in this area of travel development. To vote to retain section 2 of House Joint Resolution 468 is not only a vote to keep America first in commercial SST but it is a vote of faith that we can and will in the years ahead maintain our technological and scientific leadership of the world.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to again voice my support for American efforts to develop a supersonic transport aircraft.

I am convinced that those efforts cannot be effective or productive unless there is substantial financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Two foreign competitors, the Soviet Union's TU-144 and the British/French Concorde, are being developed solely with government funds, with no financial participation by private companies at all.

In the United States, the Federal Government has for the past 8 years been working as a team member with several of the Nation's commercial airlines and engine industries, and those efforts have brought us almost to the prototype stage of development.

Before I came to Congress, more than $800 million had already been spent to finance those efforts. Regardless of how we vote on this additional appropriation today, another $178 million will have to be spent to cover contract cancellation costs.

For $112 million more, we could have two prototypes in the air, testing environmental effects such as noise and air pollution and conducting other experiments to answer other questions that are being posed today.

With the answers to those questions, based on hard facts rather than theories, we can make a much more knowledgeable decision on whether mass production of the SST is warranted or not.

But if we fail to appropriate these additional funds, we will have sent more than $1 billion down the drain, the questions will still not be answered, the United States will lose the lead in aviation, 150,000 jobs will be lost. This is clearly not the solution to the current controversy over the SST.

On the other hand, if we do continue the project, the result will be the safest, most comfortable and fastest commercial transportation ever devised, a $1 billion return on Government investments, additional billions in tax revenues generated by the SST, and a vital shot in the arm for our ailing aerospace industry.

Surely, we can see that this is the more responsible course. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the continued development of an American supersonic transport.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, once again the House is being asked to fund the supersonic transport program. The blitz which has accompanied the forthcoming vote has attempted with slick, high-flying propaganda to suggest that the major questions which have hounded this program since its inception have somehow gone away.

In addition to this tactic, I object to the current campaign seeking to brand opposition to Government subsidization of the SST as anti-America.

But all the full-page advertisements, all the tricky little radio spots, all the high-pressure tactics that public relations men can dream up cannot erase the serious problems which militate against the SST.

I am personally concerned with the argument that jobs by the thousands will vanish if the SST is junked. But after careful examination, I am convinced the proponents are misleading Congress on this point.

This is the job picture as outlined by the Department of Transportation with relation to the SST project:

Presently employed	14,000
Presently providing services	40,000
Mid-1971 employment	20,000
Full production employment (1978)	50,000
Full production service employment	100,000

These figures will add up to President

Nixon's full-production total of 150,000, but they are based on two broad presumptions.

One, that the SST will be technically feasible.

Second, that there will be sufficient world market to require 300 to 500 SST's, which is, by the way, in the range which must be sold for the Federal Government to anticipate some payback on the funds which are under consideration.

Taking into account the big competition argument with which the proponents of this plane are drowning Congress, I find it doubtful that 300, much less 500, of the American version of this craft will be ordered.

The employment figures alone would make the ditching of the project seem alarming. But the silent sums do not ask the important question: If the SST program is not continued, will the Government funds presently dedicated to the program not be spent? With the number of critical needs facing this country, I do not expect that these funds will lie fallow.

Federal funds that would be spent on the SST should create as many jobs when spent for manpower programs, or health, or mass transit.

A report of the Democratic Study Group on the SST comments:

> The employment situation depends on the willingness of consumers and businesses to spend their incomes and on the stimulus of Federal budget and monetary policy. If the SST is not produced, airline passengers and airlines will keep spending money in job-creating ways. Even if airlines invest less, adjustments to monetary policy can enable other industries to invest more and thereby create other jobs. The issue is where to spend public funds—not whether to spend them.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the question this House faces.

Will we strap the taxpayers of this Nation to a program that the industry itself will not fund—or will this Nation begin to move to correct the grave ills that those of us who spend most of our time on the ground face daily.

Every poll shows that if the taxpayers of this Nation could speak directly on this subject, they would say "No." That, Mr. Chairman, should clearly be the answer of this House.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, like every Member of the House of Representatives, I have given long and considered attention to the SST issue. In the past, I have supported the requests of both President Johnson and President Nixon for SST appropriations. I am philosophically in agreement with the contention that the supersonic aircraft is the plane of the future and that the United States should be in the forefront of its development.

The Federal Government has already made a substantial investment in the SST, and I would hope that the remaining investment can be generated from private capital.

There are considerations present in this round of debate on the SST which were not necessarily so weighty in past debates. Certainly one of the most compelling is the question of priorities. I believe that the SST is important, but I also believe that there are much greater needs within the transportation field itself; for example, the development of mass transit systems for urban and metropolitan areas. There are other areas of pressing public need which have a much higher priority on public funds than the SST. Environmental protection, urban and rural community development, narcotics control and rehabilitation, law enforcement, health and education, to mention a few.

If we are sincere in our declarations about establishing meaningful priorities, we must exercise responsibility and make hard choices.

It is impossible to ignore the weight of testimony from concerned environmentalists. The United States already has a supersonic aircraft resting in an air museum, I refer to the B-70. I would assume that this aircraft could be utilized extensively to test and to develop information about the impact of supersonic flight on the environment. The SR-71 is a mach 3 aircraft, and perhaps it would be feasible to employ these planes in the testing phase.

For these reasons, I voted in favor of the Yates amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. YATES, EDWARDS of Alabama, MCFALL, and CONTE.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 217, noes 204, not voting, 12, as follows:

[Recorded teller vote No. 2]

AYES—217

Abourezk
Abzug
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Begich
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Celler
Chisholm
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Coughlin
Culver
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Dellums
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
duPont
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fish
Ford, William D.
Forsythe
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galiflanakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gibbons
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Harrington
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks, Mass.
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
King
Koch
Kyros
Latta
Lent
Link
Long, Md.
Lujan
McCloskey
McCollister
McDonald, Mich.
McKevitt
McKinney
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Melcher
Metcalfe
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Nedzi
Obey
O'Hara
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pike
Podell
Poff
Preyer, N.C.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Railsback
Rangel
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Seiberling
Shoup
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waldie
Wampler
Widnall
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Zwach

NOES—204

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Baker
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burleson, Tex.
Byrne, Pa.
Byron
Cabell
Camp
Carney
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Corman
Cotter
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frey
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Gray
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McClure
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McMillan
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morgan
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Roe
Rooney, N.Y.
Sandman
Satterfield
Schmitz
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggonner
Ware
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion

NOT VOTING—12

Barrett	Edwards, La.	McCulloch
Crane	Green, Pa.	Rostenkowski
Dorn	Jones, N.C.	Rousselot
Dowdy	Kyl	Stuckey

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I voted "aye" by mistake in all the confusion. I want to be recorded as voting "no" and ask unanimous consent that my vote be corrected accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be recorded as voting for the amendment instead of against it. I voted against it, and I ask unanimous consent to correct my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. None of the funds provided by this joint resolution shall be available for the execution of a program for commercial production of a civil supersonic aircraft.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 300, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 2 and renumber the following section.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, an "aye" vote will be a vote in favor of the Yates amendment; it that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 203, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—216

Abourezk	Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.
Abzug	Bergland	Broyhill, Va.
Addabbo	Bevill	Burke, Fla.
Alexander	Biaggi	Burke, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Biester	Burlison, Mo.
	Bingham	Burton
Andrews, Ala.	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brademas	Caffery
	Brasco	Carey, N.Y.
Ashley	Brooks	Celler
Aspin	Broomfield	Chisholm
Badillo	Brotzman	Clay
Begich	Brown, Mich.	Cleveland
Collier	Hechler, W. Va.	Rangel
Collins, Ill.	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Conable	Helstoski	Reid, N.Y.
Conte	Hicks, Mass.	Reuss
Conyers	Horton	Rhodes
Corbett	Howard	Riegle
Coughlin	Hungate	Robison, N.Y.
Culver	Hunt	Rodino
Danielson	Hutchinson	Rogers
Davis, Ga.	Jacobs	Roncalio
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
de la Garza	Karth	Rosenthal
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Roush
Dellums	King	Roy
Denholm	Koch	Roybal
Dennis	Kyros	Runnels
Dent	Lent	Ruppe
Diggs	Link	Ruth
Dingell	Long, Md.	Ryan
Donohue	Lujan	St Germain
Dow	McCloskey	Sarbanes
Drinan	McCollister	Saylor
Dulski	McDonald, Mich.	Scherle
Duncan	McKevitt	Scheuer
duPont	McKinney	Schneebeli
Dwyer	Macdonald, Mass.	Schwengel
Eckhardt	Madden	Seiberling
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Shoup
Esch	Mayne	Sisk
Eshleman	Mazzoli	Smith, Calif.
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe	Smith, N.Y.
Findley	Michel	Stafford
Fish	Mikva	Stanton, J. William
Ford, William D.	Miller, Ohio	Stanton, James V.
Forsythe	Minish	Steele
Fraser	Mink	Steiger, Ariz.
Frelinghuysen	Minshall	Steiger, Wis.
Frenzel	Mitchell	Stokes
Fulton, Tenn.	Monagan	Sullivan
Fuqua	Moorhead	Symington
Galifianakis	Morse	Talcott
Gallagher	Mosher	Taylor
Gaydos	Moss	Thompson, N.J.
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Goodling	Myers	Thone
Grasso	Nedzi	Tiernan
Green, Oreg.	Obey	Udall
Griffiths	O'Hara	Vander Jagt
Gross	O'Neill	Vanik
Gude	Patman	Waldie
Haley	Patten	Wampler
Halpern	Pike	Widnall
Hamilton	Podell	Wolff
Hammer-schmidt	Poff	Wydler
	Preyer, N.C.	Wylie
Hanley	Pryor, Ark.	Yates
Harrington	Pucinski	Yatron
Harvey	Quie	Zwach
Hastings	Railsback	
Hathaway		

NAYS—203

Abbitt	Collins, Tex.	Henderson
Abernethy	Colmer	Hicks, Wash.
Adams	Corman	Hillis
Anderson, Calif.	Cotter	Hogan
	Daniel, Va.	Holifield
Anderson, Ill.	Daniels, N.J.	Hosmer
Annunzio	Delaney	Hull
Archer	Derwinski	Ichord
Arends	Devine	Jarman
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Johnson, Calif.
Aspinall	Downing	Johnson, Pa.
Baker	Edmondson	Jonas
Baring	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Barrett	Eilberg	Kazen
Belcher	Erlenborn	Keating
Bell	Fascell	Kee
Betts	Fisher	Keith
Blackburn	Flood	Kemp
Blanton	Flowers	Kluczynski
Blatnik	Flynt	Kuykendall
Boggs	Foley	Landgrebe
Boland	Ford, Gerald R.	Landrum
Bow	Fountain	Leggett
Bray	Frey	Lennon
Brinkley	Fulton, Pa.	Lloyd
Brown, Ohio	Garmatz	Long, La.
Buchanan	Gettys	McClory
Burleson, Tex.	Giaimo	McClure
Byrne, Pa.	Goldwater	McCormack
Byron	Gonzalez	McDade
Cabell	Gray	McEwen
Camp	Griffin	McFall
Carney	Grover	McKay
Carter	Gubser	McMillan
Casey, Tex.	Hagan	Mahon
Cederberg	Hall	Mailliard
Chamberlain	Hanna	Mann
Chappell	Hansen, Idaho	Martin
Clancy	Hansen, Wash.	Mathias, Calif.
Clark	Harsha	Mathis, Ga.
Clausen, Don H.	Hawkins	Meeds
	Hays	Miller, Calif.
Clawson, Del	Hébert	Mills
Mizell	Reid, Ill.	Ullman
Mollohan	Robinson, Va.	Van Deerlin
Montgomery	Roe	Veysey
Morgan	Rooney, N.Y.	Vigorito
Murphy, N.Y.	Sandman	Waggonner
Natcher	Satterfield	Ware
Nelsen	Schmitz	Watts
Nichols	Scott	Whalen
Nix	Sebelius	Whalley
O'Konski	Shipley	White
Passman	Shriver	Whitehurst
Pelly	Sikes	Whitten
Pepper	Skubitz	Wiggins
Perkins	Slack	Williams
Pettis	Snyder	Wilson, Bob
Peyser	Spence	Wilson, Charles H.
Pickle	Springer	
Pirnie	Staggers	Winn
Poage	Steed	Wright
Powell	Stephens	Wyatt
Price, Ill.	Stratton	Wyman
Price, Tex.	Stubblefield	Young, Fla.
Purcell	Teague, Calif.	Young, Tex.
Quillen	Teague, Tex.	Zablocki
Randall	Terry	Zion
Rarick	Thompson, Ga.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Latta

NOT VOTING—12

Crane	Green, Pa.	Roberts
Dorn	Jones, N.C.	Rostenkowski
Dowdy	Kyl	Rousselot
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Stuckey

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latta for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Crane.

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT). If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Yates amendment to the SST section of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained re-

turning from the State of North Carolina on official business. Had I been present, on rollcall 25 I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority whip inform the House what is the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. At the close of business today, there will be nothing scheduled for tomorrow.

The program for the week of March 22 is as follows:

Monday is District Day, no bills.

Tuesday, funding resolutions from House Administration Committee:

House Resolution 149, Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

House Resolution 175, Committee on the Judiciary;

House Resolution 202, Committee on Armed Services;

House Resolution 210, Committee on Rules;

House Resolution 218, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries;

House Resolution 225, Committee on Ways and Means;

House Resolution 226, Committee on Banking and Currency;

House Resolution 236, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

House Resolution 253, Committee on Agriculture;

House Resolution 272, Committee on Education and Labor;

House Resolution 279, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

House Resolution 285, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

House Resolution 290, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and

House Resolution 301, Committee on House Administration.

House Joint Resolution 223, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older. Open rule, 2 hours debate.

Wednesday and the balance of the week:

House Resolution 304, Committee on Government Operations investigating authority; and

House Resolution 7, Rural Telephone Bank, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts indicate whether there is any more business today and for the rest of the week?

Mr. O'NEILL. There is no further business scheduled for today or for the rest of the week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The program the gentleman from Massachusetts has just read off is the program for next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would just like to know whether or not, in view of no District business or other listed business for Monday, it is contemplated that there might or might not be any votes, inasmuch as conference reports are eligible at any time. Is the acting majority leader advised by the leadership as to whether or not there is liable to be a vote on Monday? Would the gentleman care to make a commitment and, if so, can it be backed up?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is my understanding that no votes are contemplated on Monday, and no conference reports are contemplated on Monday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I believe he has the best of intent. I hope it will be borne out better than when some Members demand of the Speaker that votes be taken regardless of prior commitment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Missouri must understand that there is no such thing as an iron-clad commitment. There is always the question of a matter of high priority or a matter of national emergency. I had great reservations about whether or not the vote on Tuesday was a matter of national emergency, but the Speaker was confronted by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking Republican member of that committee, and they assured him that there was an emergency. The gentleman from Missouri is a Member of this body and he is subject to the possibility of voting on questions of national emergency at any time, regardless of any type of assurance that we might try to make.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader's going to the microphone and rationalizing the position in which the leadership finds itself for its broken commitment of last week. One can claim national emergency, and that is subject to definition. I am just about as handy with semantics as anyone around here, if you want to bandy words on that basis. One can claim that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is running the House and is, in fact, the leadership thereof instead of the majority leader. One can claim that the Parliamentarian makes demands on the Speaker to which traditionally he has had to bow. But the final question will come up as to who is the leadership and whether its word is inviolate or not, and whether that word has been broken, be it in the name of expediency or be it in the name of any other rationalizing term that you want to use. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy which has just occurred developed the information that apparently there will be no legislative business on Monday next. However, I should like to take this opportunity to announce that in room 340 of the Cannon Building there will be a reception for the wives and families of prisoners of war. This is pursuant to the proclamation of the President that the week of March 21 through March 27 is National Families of Prisoners of War Week. I should certainly hope that every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle would accept the invitation in writing that has now been extended by the distinguished chairman of the Democratic caucus, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), and myself, and attend that reception at 11 o'clock next Monday in room 340 of the Cannon Building.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL REVENUE-SHARING PROGRAM FOR TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92–71)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When the early settlers first encountered the American wilderness, a man's mobility was dependent upon his strong legs and the sharp axe with which he cleared his path. But even in those pioneering times, Americans quickly came to realize that good roads and docks and bridges were community concerns.

Over the years, government has become increasingly involved in improving the Nation's transportation systems, from the building of post roads and canals

in the early periods of our history, to the construction of airports and superhighways in recent years. The question we face today, therefore, is not *whether* government should participate in transportation matters, but *how* government should participate—and *which levels* of government should undertake which responsibilities. These are the central questions I am addressing in this message as I outline a new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation.

GROWING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AND GROWING PROBLEMS

As the demand for mobility has mushroomed and as new means of transportation have been invented in recent years, the size of our transportation system has reached staggering proportions. It has been less than 70 years, for example, since the Wright brothers flew at Kitty Hawk. In that time, our aviation system has grown to the point that last year it served over 173 million commercial passengers and handled more than 4 billion ton miles of air freight. An open field with a wind sock was a sufficient airport for most communities only a few decades ago. Today many airports are cities in themselves and air traffic is controlled by highly sophisticated electronic systems.

At the turn of the century there were only 8,000 automobiles in America. By 1920 nearly 8 million cars traveled our highways and today we have more than 100 million registered vehicles which travel over one trillion miles annually. The people of our Nation are driving more than twice as many automobiles as they did just 20 years ago.

These two technological developments—the airplane and the automobile—give dramatic evidence of both the successes and the failures of American transportation. The automobile and the airplane are mechanized masterpieces. The highways and airports which they use are often glowing displays of America's engineering genius. But behind the mystique of jet travel and the convenience of the family car lie serious problems that have been growing more acute in recent years.

The airplane means fast travel over great distances, to be sure. But it also can mean harmful noise and air pollution, congested terminals, misplaced luggage and airports that are difficult to reach. Highways that speed motorists between cities can become long and narrow parking lots where cars are stalled for hours within urban areas. It often takes longer to move by "horseless carriage" across our major cities today as it did by horsedrawn carriage a century ago. Efforts to improve this situation by building new highways often have the effect of destroying neighborhoods and disrupting lives. It is estimated, moreover, that automobiles are responsible for almost half of our air pollution—a growing problem that is slowly choking our central cities.

And there is another serious problem, as well. For with our heavy investment in automobiles and air transportation has come a sharp decline in rail passenger service and in public mass transit systems.

The first electric street car lines and the first subway appeared at about the same time as the automobile and, like the automobile, they grew in popularity during the first quarter of this century. In 1905, local urban transit systems carried 5 billion passengers. By 1926, ridership had more than trebled, but that was the peak of mass transit's popularity—except for a brief period during World War II. After 1945, public transit ridership, revenue and service declined steadily. In 1950, there were still some 1,400 urban transit companies operating 87,000 vehicles and carrying 17.25 billion passengers. By 1970, however, there were 327 fewer companies and 25,500 fewer vehicles carrying only 7.3 billion passengers.

Public transportation has been caught up in a vicious cycle of increasing costs, rising fares, shrinking profits, decreasing quality, and declining ridership. Ironically, this decline in mass transit has come at the same time that the need for fast, convenient, economical public transportation has become greater than ever before. This Nation has the technology to provide such transportation. If we can move three men a quarter million miles to the moon, then surely we can also find ways to move millions of men and women over short distances in our cities. This is another of the great transportation challenges of our time.

HOW HAVE THESE PROBLEMS BEEN MET?

All of these problems—pollution, congestion, inefficiency, and the lack of sufficient mass transit services—have been recognized for years. And for years the Federal Government has been working to alleviate them. In the past two years, this administration has recommended a number of new programs to improve American transportation. As a result, we now have an accelerated program to develop urban mass transit systems, new authorizations for the expansion and improvement of airports and airways, and a quasi-public corporation to operate a national rail passenger system.

It is clear, however, that more money and more regulations alone will not solve our transportation problems. Nor will they make the Federal Government more responsive to local needs and local aspirations. It is equally clear that the established relationships among Federal, State and local governments are unsuitable for achieving the goals we pursue.

What are those goals? They can be usefully described under the general heading of "balanced transportation."

ACHIEVING BALANCED TRANSPORTATION

A balanced transportation system is essentially one that provides adequate transportation not just for *some* of the people in a community but for *all* the people in a community. A balanced system also recognizes that an individual can have different transportation needs at different times. Such a system treats speed as only one of the factors in the transportation equation and does not ignore the importance of other qualities such as comfort, safety, and reliability.

Despite our technological capacity, we do not enjoy a fully balanced transportation system in modern America, particularly in our larger cities. We have relied too much in our cities on cars and on highways; we have given too little attention to other modes of travel. Approximately 94 percent of all travel in urbanized areas is by automobile, yet only about 25 percent of our people—especially the old, the very young, the poor and the handicapped—do not drive a car. They have been poorly served by our transportation strategy.

DISTORTIONS CAUSED BY MATCHING REQUIREMENTS

One of the most disturbing elements in the present transportation picture is the fact that such inequities have often been reinforced and even precipitated by the Federal Government. One reason is that Federal dollars have been relatively easy to obtain for highway building but more difficult to obtain for other transportation purposes. The Federal Government now pays 90 percent of the costs for a new interstate expressway, for example, but only 67 percent of the costs for a new mass transit system and only 50 percent of the costs of building an airport. It is little wonder that State and local planners are encouraged to cover the landscape with ribbons of concrete. Such distortions of local priorities are among the major problems that this administration is seeking to correct.

EXCESSIVE FEDERAL CONTROL

But local priorities are not only distorted by Federal requirements concerning matching funds. Local determinations of what is needed most must constantly yield to Federal judgments about what a local community should do with the money it receives from Washington.

The Federal Government has a great influence on the particular *mixture* of transportation spending in any locale, for it carefully allocates so much of its money for one kind of transportation and so much for another. Each program is funded separately—and even at the State and local level, different agencies frequently administer monies which are designated for different purposes. As a result, it is extremely difficult to achieve sound intermodal planning of comprehensive transportation systems. There is no single place where sufficient resources and authority are available for making wise choices between various transportation alternatives. Nor can anyone effectively coordinate investments in any one mode of transportation with efforts in other transportation fields. We err, in short, by treating the transportation challenge as a series of separate problems rather than as a single problem with many interrelated parts.

The hard fact is that the best mixture of transportation modes is not something that remote officials in Washington can determine in advance for all cities, of all sizes and descriptions, in all parts of the country. Nor do the Federal officials who grant money for specific proj-

ects understand local needs well enough to justify their strong influence over how local projects should be planned and run.

As I have contended in a number of messages to the Congress in the past two years, our society has become too complex and too diversified to profit from such highly centralized control. This is not to deny that improving our transportation systems is a national concern. It *is* a national concern and that is why it should continue to be funded in part from Federal tax resources. But the specific manner in which any city or metropolitan area goes about achieving this goal is *not* something that can be most effectively determined at the Federal level. In fact, transportation needs are among the social and economic factors that vary *most widely* from one place to another. That is why many of our Federal transportation programs can profit so much from conversion to the Special Revenue Sharing approach.

Community organizations, concerned individuals and local units of government should not have to shout all the way to Washington for attention. Community standards and community transportation goals are changing and some of those who only five years ago welcomed the prospect of a new highway or airport are now protesting in front of bulldozers. Transportation planning and appropriations mechanisms must be flexible enough to meet the challenge of changing community values. This flexibility can best be achieved by concentrating more decisionmaking power in the States and the localities.

The purpose of Special Revenue Sharing is to focus Federal resources on major public problems and at the same time maximize flexibility of choice at the State and local level. The Special Revenue Sharing approach provides an ideal means for addressing national problems that have local solutions.

A SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM FOR TRANSPORTATION

The proposal I am submitting today would establish a new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation. In simplest terms, this program means returning Federal tax dollars to States and to local communities for investment in transportation—without the usual Federal controls and restraints. It signals a philosophical return to the days when the man who best understood the local terrain was the man who blazed the trail.

FUNDING

I propose that the Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation become effective on January 1, 1972, and that it be funded initially at an annual level of $2.566 billion. All funds that would be included in this new program would come from twenty-three existing Federal grant-in-aid programs which are now grouped under five major headings: Urban Mass Transit Grants, Airport Grants, Highway Safety Grants, Federal Aid for Highways (but not the Interstate System), and Highway Beautification Grants. The size of these programs in my proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1972 is as follows:

	Millions of dollars
Urban mass transit	$525
Airport grants	220
Highway safety grants	130
Federal aid for highways (except for the interstate system)	1,625
Highway beautification grants	66
	2,566

The money for these programs presently comes from three different funding sources: general tax revenues, the Highway Trust Fund and the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. The two trust funds were established so that money could be collected directly from those who use highways or airports—through special taxes on gasoline and on air tickets—and then used to improve the related transportation mode.

This principle would continue to be observed under Special Revenue Sharing. In the first year of operation, Special Revenue Sharing money would be drawn from the two trust funds and from general revenues in the same proportion as under the existing categorical grant system, though it could be spent as the localities see fit. After that, however, the portion of the Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation derived from the trust funds in any year would equal the portion of the program that was used for highways and for aviation-related purposes in the preceding year. Thus the money in the trust funds would still go to achieve the general purposes for which the funds were established. General funds would pay for all other transportation activities.

The National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would not be included in this Special Revenue Sharing Program. This 42,500-mile system is now 74 percent finished and is scheduled for completion in 1978. The Interstate highways that have been built under this program have helped to open America to new dimensions of intercity travel. The system has advanced the cause of highway safety while at the same time permitting unparalleled individual mobility. In my judgment, it would not be in the national interest to alter the basic funding mechanism for the construction of this system at this time.

Although all Special Revenue Sharing funds would be assigned to governmental units, the recipient government could, in turn, channel the funds to private enterprises which meet public transportation needs. This would include the many urban bus systems that are privately owned and operated.

No State or local matching funds would be required under this program. The Federal Government would not rigidly apportion funds among a variety of narrow transportation programs nor would it approve specific local projects. Thus the Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation would stimulate State and local governments to take the initiative in meeting transportation needs, to experiment with new and more creative projects, to listen to local opinion and to mobilize local energies which are often stifled under present arrangements.

I would emphasize in addition that each State would receive at least as much money from the new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation as it has been receiving under the current categorical grant programs. Each State would thus be "held harmless" against any reduction in the overall level of support it receives from programs which become a part of this Special Revenue Sharing fund.

TWO FUND ELEMENTS

The Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation would consist of two elements, one for General Transportation activities and one for Mass Transit Capital Investment.

GENERAL TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The General Transportation element would total $2.041 billion for the first full year of revenue sharing. This money could be spent for the planning, construction, acquisition, improvement, operation and maintenance of a broad spectrum of transportation systems and services, including highway, aviation and mass transit.

The money in this General Transportation element would be distributed in the following manner: Ten percent would be allocated among the States and localities at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation. This money would be used to encourage planning, to fund research development and demonstration projects, and to finance other activities related to the development and implementation of national transportation objectives.

The remaining 90 percent of this General Transportation element would be allocated to the States according to the following four-part formula: 25 percent of this remainder would be distributed according to the ratio of each State's *total population* to the total population of the United States; 35 percent would go to States according to the ratio of their *population in urban places* (over 2,500 in population) to the Nation's total population in urban places; 20 percent would be given out according to the ratio of the *geographic area* of each State to the total area of the United States; and the remaining 20 percent would be allocated according to the ratio of each State's *star and rural post route mileage* to the total of that mileage in the country.

This formula, which resembles formulas which are used under current categorical grants, would provide the best means for distributing Special Revenue Sharing funds in a similar pattern as under the present system. In addition to the guarantee that it would be held harmless against any reduction in support, each State would be guaranteed a minimum allocation of one-half of one percent of this General Transportation element.

As I have noted above, a percentage of the General Transportation element would be distributed among the States

according to their share of the Nation's population that lives in urban areas. Each State would be required to pass along its share of *this* money directly to its communities of more than 2,500 persons to spend as their local governments think best. If we are to restore confidence in local government then we must give public officials at the local level a reasonable opportunity to make sound plans and courageous investment decisions. This means that they must be able to *rely* upon a certain amount of funding. Our "pass-through" formula is designed to provide this needed assurance.

MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL INVESTMENT ELEMENT

The second part of the new Special Revenue Sharing fund is the Mass Transit Capital Investment element—which would total $525 million for the first full year. This money would be distributed to each State according to its share of the Nation's population that lives in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA). An SMSA is defined as an area which contains a central city or cities with an aggregate population of 50,000 or more and those surrounding counties which have a metropolitan character and are socially and economically integrated with the central city. There are 247 such areas in the United States.

Eighty percent of the funds in this Mass Transit Capital Investment element would be distributed according to each State's share of the Nation's population that lives in SMSA's of *over one million persons*. The remaining 20 percent would be allocated according to each State's share of the Nation's population that lives in SMSA's of *less than one million persons*. Every State would be guaranteed a minimum allocation of $250,000.

In the Mass Transit Capital Investment element as in the General Transportation fund element, I propose that a portion of the funds be passed through the States directly to urban areas. Of the 80 percent distributed to States on the basis of SMSA's of more than one million in population, I proposed that half go directly to the local governments within these SMSA's to spend for mass transit purposes as they see fit. The other half of this money would also have to be spent within these same larger SMSA's, but it would be spent at the State's discretion. Currently, there are 33 SMSA's with more than a million persons in the United States and these are the areas that would automatically receive "pass-through" funds for Mass Transit Capital Investment.

In 1969, I submitted to the Congress a proposal for establishing an Urban Mass Transportation Assistance program. The passage of that legislation helped to create a significant momentum for the rejuvenation of public transit systems. I feel very strongly that this momentum must not be lost and that is why I propose that a part of this new Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation be devoted to this purpose.

I believe that this Mass Transit Capital Investment element would assure continued support and enthusiasm for mass transit initiatives. It would also provide fast relief for many systems which now suffer from inadequate equipment, allowing them to undertake the essential work of modernization without further delay.

COMBINING OLD AND NEW STRENGTHS

Special Revenue Sharing would strengthen our transportation efforts in many significant ways without sacrificing the strengths of our present programs. Any transportation project that is working well today could be continued, and in all probability expanded, under the new arrangements. While narrow grant categories would be eliminated, none of the programs which they now support need be discontinued if the State or locality believes they are worthwhile.

In recent years, governments at all levels—and private groups and individuals as well—have become more sensitive to problems such as transportation safety and the environmental impact of transportation. Our whole society can be proud, for example, of the fact that there were no fatalities from commercial airline accidents in the United States last year. We can be grateful, too, that despite increasing traffic on our highways, automobile fatalities in 1970 decreased significantly for the first time since 1958.

We have also become more alert to the effects which transportation has on the beauty of the landscape and the quality of the environment. Our traditional economic concerns have been complemented by our growing esthetic concerns and the result has been a strong effort at all levels of society to improve the quality of American life.

There is no reason why growing sensitivity on matters such as safety and environmental quality should not continue to grow under this new Special Revenue Sharing program. State and local governments, after all, have often been particularly responsive to citizen pressure in these areas and they have frequently acted as bold pioneers in meeting these concerns. I am confident that as more responsibility is given to governments closer to the people, the true and abiding interests of the people will be even better reflected in public policy decisions.

I would emphasize again, as I have in presenting each of my revenue sharing programs, that there could be no discrimination in the use of any of these monies. All of the funds included in this Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation would be subject to the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING

No transportation system—on the national, regional, or local level—can serve the public with maximum effectiveness unless there is a great deal of cooperative planning between various modes of conveyance and between various levels of government. A multitude of government jurisdictions, public authorities and private companies must learn to work closely together if our needs are to be met in a comprehensive manner. The legislation I present to the Congress will therefore require that transportation plans be developed in coordination with the development plans prepared under my proposed Special Revenue Sharing Programs for Urban and Rural Community Development.

RECOGNIZING DIVERSITY

Just as each unique individual has unique transportation problems, so do cities, States, and other governmental jurisdictions. The single most important fact about our Special Revenue Sharing Program for Transportation is that it recognizes this diversity. It combines the resources of the Federal Government with the flexibility of State and local governments. It provides the best way to meet the problems which diversity implies by utilizing the energies which diversity produces.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 18, 1971.*

DIVERSION OF DOT TRUST FUNDS

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate during this debate on a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Transportation to call attention of my colleagues that virtually every fixed-base operator in general aviation throughout America has registered his indignation over the diversion of aviation trust funds collected for capital improvements and spent for administration last year under the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Act of 1970.

To many aircraft owners, to their friends, to employees around the many airports of America this action was a breach of trust and one which demands correction. Now, we are called upon to vote for an additional $2,398,000,000 as a continuing deficiency appropriation for a Department that appears to be doing a less and less satisfactory job and I think Members would be interested in this matter. It is an outright breach of trust. The Department of Transportation dipped into the till to use for its administrative purposes the moneys that were collected under a law passed by this Congress and specifically earmarked for airways and airport improvements only.

Following is an excellent summation of this sorry case. It was prepared by Mr. Robert E. Monroe, congressional liaison officer for the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. I submit it today in the hopes that my colleagues will consider it well before just voting willy-nilly another vote by rote. A shrugging approval of this $2¼ billion will be another step in the pell-mell road to ungovernability which seems to be in store for us. The patterns of voting about which I formerly addressed this House and which are apparent in this very debate today on the SST should not be continued in this Congress.

The article follows:

DIVERSION OF AVIATION TRUST FUND TAX REVENUES

P. L. 91-258, the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970, as a study of the hearings, reports and debates will reveal, was justified and enacted because extensive capital investments were considered to be essential and needed to be made as quickly as possible to alleviate an existing crises in air commerce and prevent it from becoming worse as air traffic continued to increase in the future.

Administration witnesses, as well as others, placed great emphasis on the need for immediate action to expand and improve the nation's aviation system.

Special taxes were imposed upon selected users of the airport and airway system to finance this expansion program and a trust fund was established to make sure that these special tax revenues were available and used for that purpose.

Since enactment of the law, the Administration has not followed through as it should. It has delayed action. It has managed to divert tax revenues from their intended purposes. And it has confused the issue as much as possible.

It is true that Section 208(f)(1) of the law is written in such a way that trust funds may be appropriated and expended for day-to-day routine expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration for administration, operations, maintenance, research and development, as well as for capital investments for expansion and improvements, but the approach pursued by the Administration is neither in full conformance with the entire language of the law or the spirit and rationale for its enactment.

Section 208(f)(1)(A) is the first of three subsections dealing with expenditures from the trust fund for aviation purposes. It specifically refers to "title I of this Act" and the reference is principally to Sections 13 and 14 which authorize expenditures.

Section 14 is particularly important since it contains the largest authorizations and states the ground rules for their application. Note that this language authorizes "not less than" $250,000,000 and $30,000,000 respectively, a total of $280,000,000, for development of two categories of airports for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975; "not less than $250,000,000" for purchase, installation and improvement of airway facilities each year for the same years; and authorizes only "The *balance* of the moneys available in the trust fund" to be used for administrative, maintenance, operations, research and development expenses. (Emphasis supplied.)

In other words, at least $530,000,000, more if needed, but at least that much, must be devoted to capital investment in airport development and airway facilities and only whatever amount remains may be used for routine purposes.

Thus, it appears to us that, Section 208(f)(1) must be read and interpreted in the light of the requirements contained in Section 14. The Administration has not done this. Instead, it has relied solely upon the language of Section 208(f)(1) and imposed its own ideas, rather than those of the law, as to the amounts which should be allocated to the purposes set forth in subsections (A), (B) and (C) of that section. As a result, the basic objectives of the law have been frustrated and tax revenues intended for capital investment in airports and airway facilities have been diverted to finance routine expenses of the FAA.

The first application under this law went to Congress as a request (H. Doc. 91-408) for supplemental appropriations for F.Y. 1971, almost six months after the law was signed on May 21, 1970. This was not very expeditious action in response to what had been described as a "pressing crisis."

Parenthetically, it must be noted that the regular Transportation appropriations bill (H.R. 17755) was already in process, had passed the House on May 21, 1970, still awaited action by the Senate, contained an appropriation of only $190,000,000 for airway capital investment, and also, in prospect of enactment of P.L. 91-258, carried a provision which had the effect of limiting potential contract authority obligations for airport assistance to $220,000,000, the amount which the 1971 Budget said would be requested if the airport-airway legislation and aviation user taxes were enacted. The Administration delayed and did not so request.

Instead, the supplemental message requested only $10,000,000 for airport planning pursuant to Section 13 in contrast to the maximum allowable authorization of $15,000,000.

With respect to airport development pursuant to Section 14, the message indicated that only $100,000,000 of the $840,000,000 authorized in contract authority would be used and requested only $40,000,000 in contract liquidation cash instead of the $280,000,000 authorized for such liquidations. Thus, in no case could the requirement for the use of "not less than" $280,000,000 for airport development in F.Y. 1971 be met.

With respect to investment in airway facilities pursuant to Section 14, the message requested only $36,000,000, in addition to the $190,000,000 already in the regular bill, making a total of $226,000,000, instead of the $250,000,000 required by the "not less than" phrase.

The Administration proposed to use the difference between the amounts requested and the amounts required, $264,000,000, for routine expenses. The message also completely restructured the appropriation accounts in a very confusing but hardly essential way.

Congress did not permit the FAA to completely restructure its accounts in the manner requested and limited diversion of trust funds appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1971 (P.L. 91-665) to $6,000,000 in the routine operations account.

However, in dealing with the regular bill for Transportation Appropriations for 1971—which still has not been enacted, though operations are permitted until March 30, 1971 under the terms of a continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 1421) according to the compromises reached in the Conference (H. Rept. 91-1730)—Congress allowed diversion of another $28,000,000 to finance anti-hijacking guards on airline aircraft; an activity which may be justifiable in itself but which does not seem to come within the scope of the activities authorized or intended by P.L. 91-258. Moreover, Congress denied an Administration request for a tax increase to cover the cost of these guards.

The second request under this law went to Congress January 29, 1971, in the President's Budget for F.Y. 1972. Again, the FAA restructured the appropriation accounts in the manner previously denied.

The Budget requests full funding of airport planning grants pursuant to Section 13 at the $15,000,000 authorized.

With respect to airport development pursuant to Section 14 however, the Budget indicates that contract authority obligations will be administratively limited to $205,000,000 and the request for liquidating cash for these contracts is only $92,000,000. Again, the minimum requirement of "not less than" $280,000,000 will not be satisfied unless Congress decrees otherwise.

With respect to airway capital investment pursuant to Section 14, the Budget requests $274,000,000 which meets the minimum requirement and picks up the shortage from the previous year.

Thus, the total capital investment in airports, including airport planning grants, and airways requested by the Budget amounts to $381,000,000 in contrast to the minimum required of $530,000,000 exclusive of airport planning.

The Budget requests that the entire balance of tax revenues in the trust fund be allocated to routine expenses.

The balance in the trust fund is substantial. Due to the treatment of the 1971 appropriations outlined above, the Budget shows a balance carried forward from 1971 of $402,500,000 in user tax revenues. Trust fund revenues for 1972 from existing user taxes are estimated at $673,000,000 making with the carryover a total of $1,075,500,000. The Budget also envisions enactment of the additional taxes to support anti-hijacking guards, previously denied, for another $53,000,000. This addition would make a total of $1,128,500,000 in tax revenues.

The Budget is clear that the Administration intends to exhaust the trust fund completely for it shows no ending balance for 1972. This means that $1,128,500,000 minus $381,000,000 or $747,500,000 of user tax revenues is to be used for day-to-day operations and expenses of the FAA. It also means that $188,000,000 which should have been used in 1972 alone for required capital investments in airport development will not be so used or preserved for such use.

If we aggregate the amounts for the two years, 1971 and 1972, we find the cumulative results even more abusive. As pointed out above, the law calls for minimum annual expenditures for airports and airways of $280 and $250 millions respectively, and if we add the $15 millions for planning grants these total $545 million per year or $1,090 million for the two year period. Omitting the book-keeping recycling of previous appropriations, FAA will use only $475 million for these purposes during the two year period while collections of existing user taxes will total $1,247 million. The total diversion of funds which should be used for capital investment will amount to $615 million. Even counting the amount appropriated from the general fund last year for airways investment, in order to place the best possible face on the entire capital investment program, the total capital investment in airport planning and development and airways facilities would only amount to $677 million and the program would still be short of the total intended by $413 million.

Further verification of this state of affairs is provided by the fact that in the 1971 Supplemental request, the FAA asked for an appropriation, which was denied, from general funds to the trust fund of $576,989,000 to make up the difference between trust fund tax revenues and what the FAA intended to spend from the trust fund, whereas in the 1972 Budget the request is for only $293,144,000 for this purpose even though the intended spending level is some $200,000,000 higher.

It is clearly apparent that aviation trust fund tax revenues have been diverted from the purposes intended by the law which imposed those taxes and that the DOT/FAA are incorrect in their view of the matter. It is also apparent that the Administration intends to pursue this course unless prevented from doing so by Congress.

If the Administration will not administer the law in the manner intended, the law and its accompanying taxes should be repealed.

NEED FOR DEVELOPING A METHOD OF EXAMINING THE CROSS IMPACT OF MANY PROGRAMS ENACTED IN CONGRESS

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, recently, an incident in my district demonstrated to me the need for developing a method of examining the cross impact of many of the programs we enact in Congress. This could be done either through a legislative or executive mechanism. I strongly suspect that in some cases one Government program cancels out the impact of another program. It also appears that one Government agency, working to implement its programs, can have a detrimental effect on other Government agencies and the overall well-being of the Nation and its economy.

The specific incident that brings this to mind concerns a manufacturer of raincoats in Boston. This case is of serious consequence in the Boston area because of the many people involved, but it is also important as an example of the complexities of our Government.

This company, Blauer Manufacturing, was located in Boston for many years, was a large manufacturer and had a skilled and stable labor force. The employer was under union contract with the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union for 30 years.

For the past several years, Blauer Manufacturing has been cutting down its Boston work force and opening up production facilities in other areas. Finally, they completely closed the Boston factory and terminated all of its workers. The move was a shift from an area of higher wages to an area of lower wages.

The reason I am discussing this particular case is that Blauer Manufacturing produced rainwear, a product which was purchased almost exclusively by various Government agencies. The largest purchases were made by the Defense Department. The purchase policy under which this rainwear was acquired is that of making contract awards to the lowest bidder.

Of course, we all support economy in Government, but this is false economy that ends up costing the Government more in unemployment compensation, lost taxes, and training and retraining programs. Whatever benefits this firm may have derived from the move away from the Boston area, and whatever harm to the work force, the immediate cost to the Government is obvious. Whereas the Defense Department as a separate entity may have economized, Government as a whole is losing a great deal more than these small and illusionary savings. Unemployment compensation has to be paid to those people who lose their jobs, and in this period of high unemployment, it seems likely that other jobs will not be easily found.

During this period of decreased earning or no earnings, the Government loses revenue because these former taxpayers no longer have income on which to be taxed. There are various manpower programs for which many of these people would be eligible and of course that will cost money for job training in new fields.

All levels of government, local, State, and Federal, will lose revenue because of this move, and it is all caused by a Government policy that is supposed to save money—that is awarding contracts to the lowest bidder. But if we award these contracts without examining the practices of a firm that may be injurious to a local community or to the national economy, we are perhaps not pursuing the most economically feasible course. By making cost the sole factor, we are, unwittingly, encouraging firms to move from higher to lower wage areas, to pursue policies that injure employees, create unemployment, and multiply many costs of local, State, and Federal Government.

The purpose of this policy is to save money, but if one agency of Government saves money by multiplying other costs of Government and the demands on other agencies' resources, then the people and its Government as a whole have not saved money.

With this particular example very much in mind, but also with an eye to the ramifications of this practice multiplied all over the country, I suggest that the Congress of the United States should make a much more thorough investigation of the purchasing policies of the Department of Defense. What should be taken into consideration is how those policies affect unemployment and indirect costs to Government.

When unemployment is increasing in so many parts of the Nation, in so many sectors of the economy, I think it is imperative that we begin this now. I think what we are seeing is a policy that removes jobs from one area of the country and takes them to another. There are no new jobs created, and if the move is for lower wages, tax money is lost as well as the loss from unemployment compensation and other benefits.

I think it is extremely important that we do not accept apparent savings that may indeed be actual losses.

REPRESENTATIVE CEDERBERG COSPONSORS LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD ENCOURAGE STATES TO ESTABLISH ABANDONED AUTOMOBILE REMOVAL PROGRAM

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 5646, legislation which would encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs. I believe this type of program is needed now and I want to take these few minutes to expand on the provisions of this measure and to describe how it can help solve a very difficult environmental problem.

In a recent flight over one of the small counties in my congressional district, approximately 2,500 to 3,000 derelict automobiles were spotted. Undoubtedly there were many, many more which were not located due to deep snow. This situation is not unique to Michigan or Mecosta County. I have driven through many parts of the United States and these heaps of metal stick out like a sore thumb. This littering of the American landscape can no longer be tolerated as it is a constant drain on our natural resources.

The crux of the problem is that our smaller counties and cities throughout the Nation do not have the funds to finance a project of the magnitude it would take to clear away these eyesores. I believe Mecosta County is typical of many others across the Nation whose citizens have recognized the problem and want to do something about it. The citizens of this county have made a valiant effort to solve the problem on the local level, with local funds; however, in spite of their hard work, they are unable to continue the project due to the lack of funds.

In relating their story I hope that I can demonstrate the need for action on H.R. 5646. Mecosta County is a rural county of native beauty, of splendid streams and lakes which its citizens set out to protect. Their stated goal was, "Getting these junked vehicles back into productive use via the scrap route."

Appeals were made through local newspapers for public support and assistance. They employed 4–H groups, Boy Scouts, and other youth groups, setting a $2 fee for every old car they could get county residents to donate to the cause. It was at this point that several legal problems arose: How to find the legal owner of the car and transfer the title to the State so that the junked car could be recycled. My bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe regulations for effective means of transferring titles of abandoned automobiles to a public agency or private business which will dispose of such automobiles.

Another major problem is the machinery that will be needed to crush the old cars into a compact unit, which is then loaded on a tilted bed winch truck and hauled to a commercial reclamation center where the metal would be reclaimed for further use. My legislation would offer rapid amortization tax benefits to scrap processors who install modern, more effective equipment with which to reduce old cars to reusable scrap. In this way the local units of government will not be strapped with the high cost of providing this type of machinery.

In the case to which I have been referring, the county had access to the recycling equipment but as the officials informed me, "We have the depot sites ready throughout the county but what we need is equipment to transport cars to these sites." H.R. 5646 provides that the State removal plan should include means for the prompt removal to scrap-processing facilities of all abandoned automobiles in the State.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress one more time that action on this legislation is absolutely necessary and that the need is not restricted to one area of the country. Passage of H.R. 5646 would greatly benefit not only individual districts but the Nation and its citizens as a whole.

TO EVOKE DISCUSSION AND CLOSER STUDY OF A REVENUE-SHARING FORMULA

(Mr. DANIELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday—March 10—in a discussion of the administration's general revenue-sharing plan, the esteemed dean of the California delegation (Mr. HOLIFIELD) included in his remarks a table which I had developed showing relative projected per capita allocations for cities within Los Angeles County.

This little study has caused a good deal of interest and, for this reason, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a slightly revised and more accurate version of what was a rather hastily prepared document designed to show broad comparisons more than fine details.

I think that the table has served its primary purpose, which is to evoke discussion and closer study of a revenue-sharing formula which results in glaring inequities such as are so readily evident. I welcome suggestions as to how these inequities can be eliminated if, in the end, we do adopt the administration formula substantially as it has been proposed.

The revised document follows:

PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS UNDER THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S GENERAL REVENUE SHARING PLAN

[Prepared by Congressman George E. Danielson (California, 29th)]

	Per capita allocation	Total allocation	1970 population	1960 median income
County of Los Angeles	$9.13	$64,206,019	7,032,075	$7,046
Commerce	47.78	503,444	10,536	5,827
Beverly Hills	24.30	811,871	33,416	11,977
Long Beach	20.05	7,191,917	358,633	6,570
Signal Hill	19.29	107,696	5,582	5,542
El Segundo	19.17	299,479	15,620	7,783
Santa Fe Springs	19.15	282,446	14,750	6,986
Culver City	15.90	493,526	31,035	7,862
Santa Monica	13.78	1,216,458	88,289	6,845
Los Angeles	12.33	34,721,456	2,816,061	6,896
Pasadena	12.31	1,394,982	113,327	6,922
Burbank	11.54	1,025,646	88,871	7,757
Redondo Beach	10.40	583,003	56,075	6,880
San Fernando	9.71	160,843	16,571	6,270
San Marino	9.29	131,736	14,177	16,728
Covina	9.11	276,732	30,380	7,865
Alhambra	8.82	547,751	62,125	7,185
South Pasadena	8.70	199,868	22,979	8,245
Montebello	8.52	364,808	42,807	7,351
Pomona	8.45	738,348	87,384	6,585
Monrovia	8.35	250,752	30,015	6,630
Glendale	8.19	1,086,770	132,752	7,563
Arcadia	8.04	344,649	42,868	9,526
Huntington Park	7.98	269,186	33,744	6,285
Inglewood	7.84	705,899	89,985	7,764
Hawthorne	7.78	414,937	53,304	7,645
Torrance	7.54	1,015,296	134,584	8,050
Azusa	7.39	186,393	25,217	6,501
Whittier	6.87	500,857	72,863	7,740
Manhattan Beach	6.86	242,343	35,352	8,289
Gardena	6.82	279,643	41,021	7,741
Hermosa Beach	6.72	116,967	17,412	7,050
Palos Verdes Estates	6.64	90,555	13,641	10,000
South Gate	6.24	355,214	56,909	6,892
Sierra Madre	$6.12	$74,277	12,140	$8,172
South El Monte	5.82	78,266	13,443	4,834
Monterey Park	5.70	280,398	49,166	7,650
San Gabriel	5.60	163,323	29,176	7,814
Claremont	5.59	131,089	23,464	8,188
Downey	5.35	472,828	88,445	8,265
West Covina	5.23	355,537	68,034	8,580
Glendora	5.08	159,226	31,349	7,557
Compton	5.06	398,012	78,611	6,256
El Monte	4.98	348,099	69,837	6,559
Rolling Hills Estates	4.90	29,538	6,027	10,000
La Verne	4.84	62,742	12,965	6,013
Bell	4.70	102,521	21,836	6,438
Lynwood	3.90	169,036	43,353	7,182
Maywood	3.63	61,772	16,996	5,951
Lakewood	3.15	261,316	82,973	7,600
Bellflower	3.02	155,561	51,454	6,834
Duarte	2.84	42,475	14,981	6,810
Palmdale	2.72	23,178	8,511	7,325
Paramount	2.60	90,232	34,734	6,230
Baldwin Park	2.57	121,711	47,285	6,186
Pico Rivera	2.52	136,372	54,170	7,069
La Mirada	2.34	72,013	30,808	
La Puente	2.31	71,690	31,092	6,718
Norwalk	2.11	193,616	91,827	7,015
Lawndale	1.89	46,895	24,825	6,303
Artesia	1.87	27,598	14,757	5,732
Rosemead	1.81	74,169	40,972	6,924
Hawaiian Gardens	1.73	15,200	8,811	
Bell Gardens	1.71	50,021	29,308	5,567
San Dimas	1.67	26,196	15,692	
Lomita	1.64	32,449	19,784	6,194
Temple City	1.42	42,259	29,673	7,782
Cudahy	1.31	22,315	16,998	

ARMS LIMITATION IN LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, according to some observers, newspaper readers in Washington are better informed and more exacting than media audiences in some other urban centers of our country. They are also exposed to more bad news.

It is for that reason that Mr. Louis H. Diuguid's story in yesterday morning's edition of the Washington Post provided such a refreshing and exciting contrast to the news which we are accustomed to digesting with our breakfast coffee.

The story, filed in Bogotá, Colombia, describes the Colombian President's proposal for an OAS review of military expenditures in Latin America with a view to arriving at a regional arms limitation agreement.

This is exciting news, indeed; for if our neighbors to the south can demonstrate self-restraint and self-denial in the area of military spending, could not their example become the turning point in the world armaments race?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that President Misael Pastrana Borrero is to be commended for his daring proposals—and the foreign ministers of our hemisphere, who will be meeting next month in San Jose, Costa Rica, should be urged to give him the thorough consideration that they deserve.

The Colombian proposal singles out three areas of military expenditures for particular study of the OAS system. They include—

First, the influence of unnecessary military spending on economic and social development of the countries of our hemisphere;

Second, expenditures on arms which, because of their excessive cost and clearly offensive nature, are disproportionate to the requirements of internal security and could, by common agreement, be eliminated; and

Third, the adoption of the principle of proportionality between the arms, territorial area, population, and economic potential on the one hand, and the basic requirements of national security on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals may be said to flow from, and certainly are consistent with, the declaration of the Presidents of the Americas, drawn up at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1967.

In my view, they are to be welcomed and supported.

I sincerely hope that the U.S. delegation to the forthcoming meeting of the OAS General Assembly will address itself to this matter with the energy, enthusiasm and openmindedness it deserves.

For the information of my colleagues, I should like to place in the RECORD a translation of the Spanish text of the Colombian arms control proposal.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF COLOMBIA

1. The Declaration of the Presidents of America drawn up at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1967 dealt amply with the problem of the Latin American Common Market, the incorporation into our hemisphere of the benefits of scientific and technological progress, and the fundamental role of the utilization of all resources in order to promote economic and social development.

2. The presidents of America also expressed "their intention to limit military expenditures in proportion to the actual demands of national security in accordance with each country's constitutional provisions, avoiding those expenditures that are not indispensable for the performance of the specific duties of the armed forces and, where pertinent, of international commitments that obligate their respective governments."

3. The foregoing statement was the object of the recommendation contained in chapter VI of the declaration of Punta del Este concerning the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures.

4. Colombia feels that the moment has come to study measures that will implement the intentions of the presidents of America. Unquestionably, this is not a case of speaking of disarming Latin America, in view of the internal security needs of each country, as well as the commitments of mutual assistance deriving for each of them from the obligations of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio, but is rather a

matter of studying the problem of unnecessary military expenditures with relation to:

A. The influence of unnecessary military expenses on economic and social development;

B. Arms which, because of their excessive cost and clearly offensive nature, are disproportionate to internal security, could, by common accords, be eliminated.

C. The adoption of a criterion of proportionality between the arms, territorial area, population, and economic potential on the one hand, and the basic requirements of national security on the other hand.

Undoubtedly, these questions cannot be examined immediately without a thorough study of the problem, and for that purpose it would be advisable to establish a special committee, on which all the member states of the Inter-American system would be represented and which would submit specific proposals to the regular general assembly of the Organization of American States next year.

5. To this end, Colombia wishes to place the following topic before the regular general assembly of the Organization of American States, to be held in San Jose, Costa Rica, beginning April 14 of this year: "Study of measures designed to implement chapter VI of the Declaration of the Presidents of America, issued at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, in 1967, for the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures."

6. At the same time, Colombia believes that it is essential to obtain the fullest possible cooperation from all the states forming part of the Inter-American system to support the inclusion of the topic in the agenda of the Inter-American general assembly and to study gradually the measures that will contribute to the implementation of the purposes of the Presidents of America concerning the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures in Latin America, as an encouraging factor for peace and economic and social development.

7. Colombia is earnestly engaged in an undertaking for social progress and economic development and does not wish to invest in arms any more than is needed to meet its real requirements for national security. Hence, it is ready to cooperate with the member states of the inter-American system in studying the most appropriate procedures and solutions, in harmony with the desire of the nations of this Hemisphere to improve their present standards of living.

8. This proposal is consistent with Colombia's steadfast adherence to the principles of international law and, especially, the free determination of peoples, and its fervent desire always to utilize the procedures of peaceful settlement of international differences. In its judgment, the strengthening of the inter-American system requires an irrevocable commitment to the maintenance of peace in the Americas and a greater effort to limit unnecessary military expenditures that endanger economic and social development.

9. Colombia awaits with interest the replies or comments that the governments of the members states of the regional organization may wish to make on the proposal for the presentation and discussion of the aforementioned topic, as set forth in this memorandum.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT A PERSON CAN EARN AND STILL OBTAIN SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing legislation which would remove the limits on the amount a person can earn as wages and still obtain social security benefits. My bill would also provide that once a person reaches 65 and has paid into social security for at least 30 years, no social security taxes will be deducted from his pay.

Under the present law, one can earn as wages a maximum of $1,680 without a reduction in social security payments. Earned income above that figure decreases one's benefits. One dollar in benefits is withheld for every $2 that is earned between $1,680 and $2,880 but above $2,880, $1 in benefits is withheld for each dollar in earnings.

As you know, a person must work for 30 years in order to be eligible for full social security benefits. Many of our older citizens have worked for these 30 years but wish to continue to work on a full- or part-time basis. Yet do they not deserve to receive their social security benefits?

In 1936, when the Social Security Act was passed, the old age survivor's insurance program was established. The original concept was that this was to be an insurance program in order to provide supplemental income for our senior citizens. If this is to be an insurance program similar to that which is available in private industry, the same principles of equity should apply. Thus, the income limitation should be removed.

In private industry or even the military, a person can retire and continue to received earned income from some endeavor without any reduction in one's benefits. This is a matter of equity which they have built up over numerous years of service.

In researching the reasons for the original implementation of this limit, I found the economic conditions of the time to be the cause. The Government was trying to encourage our older citizens to retire and make room in the labor market for younger men. In a time of depression, this was considered a very feasible way to reduce high unemployment. These conditions no longer exist today. In many of our industries, the experience and knowledge of our senior citizens would be appreciated and is needed. Furthermore, many of our senior citizens feel that they should not be forced to live out their last years in idle complacency when they would rather work and attempt to do something useful.

Another great inequity which is imposed on our older citizens is that if they choose to continue to work even though they paid into social security for over 30 years, they must continue to pay social security taxes on the money they earn. Thus, the working elderly are being discriminated against on two counts. In my opinion, this tax is equal to a "penalty tax."

Most of these elderly who are still working have been paying into social security since its inception. Thus, every month they continue to work, they reduce the Federal Government's liability to provide them with the benefits they more than deserve.

Therefore, as part of the legislation which I am introducing, I have included a provision which would prevent social security taxes from being deducted from the pay of a person who has reached 65 and has paid into social security for at least 30 years.

This House, last year, passed a bill which would guarantee an annual income to all citizens whether or not they wish to work. I cannot see how we can logically guarantee an income to people who may refuse to work and then turn around and penalize those who have worked for over 30 years in order to receive their full social security benefits.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my bill is promptly enacted into law.

DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE REORGANIZED

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Democratic steering committee held its organization meeting this afternoon. Representative RAY J. MADDEN was reelected as chairman while Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA was reelected secretary. John E. Barriere was reappointed as executive director.

The committee voted to hold regular meetings during the 92d Congress on the first and third Wednesdays of the month at 2 p.m.

The committee agreed unanimously that in the future the committee would keep in continuous contact with the chairmen of the various legislative committees so as to assist the majority leadership in better apprising the Democratic Members of the House as to content and status of the legislative program.

SUPPORT FOR ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, support for the Atlantic Union Resolution has reached a record high. For the first time since the resolution was introduced over 20 years ago, the number of sponsors in the House of Representatives has topped 100. The additional resolution which I am introducing today is sponsored by 21 Members of the House. They are:

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

BOB BERGLAND, Democrat of Minnesota.

HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat of New York.

FRANK M. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican of Pennsylvania.

HAMILTON FISH, JR., Republican of New York.

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Democrat of Washington.

WILLIAM D. FORD, Democrat of Michigan.

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat of Michigan.

JAMES M. HANLEY, Democrat of New York.

JAMES HARVEY, Republican of Michigan.

TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat of Massachusetts.

JOHN MELCHER, Democrat of Montana.

LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat of Michigan.

ROBERT N. C. NIX, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat of Florida.

OGDEN R. REID, Republican of New York.

PHILIP E. RUPPE, Republican of Michigan.

B. F. SISK, Democrat of California.

HENRY P. SMITH III, Republican of New York.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat of New York.

This brings to 105 the total number of Representatives who have this year cosponsored identical resolutions urging the exploration of Atlantic Union.

I am confident the list will lengthen. In ensuing days, I anticipate that additional resolutions will be introduced by other Members. In addition, several Members have informed me that, while they have not become sponsors of the resolution, it has their support and will receive their vote.

Support for Atlantic Union also is growing across the Nation. On February 26, 1971. The Des Moines Register editorialized:

The major arguments for Atlantic union have been political and economic. It could be a gigantic nucleus of political strength. It could be a huge co-prosperity sphere as a common market with a single currency, a single banking system and union-wide opportunities for employment and sales and purchases.

Representative Jim Wright (D-Tex) has also added a new argument. The Atlantic countries consume 80 per cent of the world's annual production and cause about 80 per cent of the world's population. "If we can find an effective way to attack these problems together," he said, "there is much that we can do for the future of the human race; but it cannot be done through any existing institution."

The Register reminded its readers that:

President Nixon in 1966 (then a private citizen) made a strong statement in support of a very similar resolution to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. "It is fitting," said Citizen Richard Nixon on September 1, 1966, "that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be the main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations."

The Register then asked rhetorically:

Does President Nixon in 1971 still see the issue as Citizen Nixon did in 1966?

The Cincinnati Enquirer, which has spoken out in the past in favor of the Atlantic Union resolution, did so again on March 11, 1971, and that editorial follows:

ATLANTIC UNION—AGAIN

There is no longer a great deal of news value in the introduction of the Atlantic Union resolution in Congress. It has occurred in every congressional session since 1949. The news lies in the circumstance that each year finds a larger and more broadly based group of legislators supporting the resolution.

The original sponsor was Sen. Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.), who later became the Democratic Party's vice-presidential nominee in 1956. This year no fewer than 71 representatives are urging favorable congressional action. They come from both parties, from 25 states and from every region of the country. Ohioans among the sponsors are Reps. Charles A. Mosher (R) and Thomas L. Ashley (D).

In essence, the Atlantic Union resolution calls for the creation of an Atlantic Union delegation of 18 eminent Americans to meet with similar delegations from the other nation identified with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Together the Atlantic Union delegates, in the language of the resolution, would explore the possibility of agreement on:

"A declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union.

"A timetable for the transition to this goal.

"Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve the objective in time to save their citizens from another war or depression, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought free people in the past."

Any plan devised by such an assemblage of delegates from the Atlantic nations, of course, would be subject to approval by the constitutional processes of the nations involved.

The Atlantic Union idea had its origins in the fertile, creative mind of Clarence K. Streit, who, during the span between World Wars I and II, covered the League of Nations for the New York Times. As the menace of Nazi Germany grew unchecked, Mr. Streit was struck by the manner in which the Western democracies were dissipating their strength and influence by failing to act together. The product of his concern was a book, "Union Now." Later when Hitler had overrun most of Europe, he produced another volume, "Union Now with Britain."

The supporters of the Atlantic Union idea see an arresting parallel between the democracies of the contemporary world and the individual states of the United States in the years immediately following the revolution—states that were bound together by nothing more than a "league of friendship." Only when their freedom was imperiled by internal quarrels and external threats did they see the prudence of establishing a federal union to make them one nation. The federal-union idea became, in consequence, the United States' most distinctive contribution to the world of political thought.

It seems only logical that there should now be a formal effort to determine whether the same principle has any applicability to today's world.

The Atlantic Union resolution, which has earned the support of political figures ranking from former Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy (DFL-Minn.) to President Nixon and from Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York to Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (R-Ariz.), opens doors the free world can ill afford to see remain closed.

YATES AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a telegram from Michigan's Govenor, William G. Milliken, in support of the Yates amendment. The telegram follows:

LANSING, MICH.,
March 18, 1971.

Hon. GUY VANDER JAGT,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand the debate and vote on the Supersonic Transport will be coming up shortly in Congress. Although many of the environmental questions now appear to have answers, most will take large additional sums of money and research. The SST program is clearly one of misplaced priorities for limited tax dollars. There is a much greater need for research and development on short take-off and landing aircraft and rapids transit systems which would provide an equal number of jobs in our economy. I am opposed to further spending for SST development at this time and therefore urge you to vote yes on the Yates amendment.

GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
State of Michigan.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post last Tuesday joined the chorus of those complaining about recent improvements made in the food stamp program jointly by the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I think the Congress should be aware of some key facts involved in this situation so that the progress the food stamp administrators have made is not obscured by well-intentioned, but misleading news stories and editorial writers.

Following a joint request by the Food and Nutrition Service—the agency within the Department of Agriculture which administers the food stamp program—and the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources, the Agriculture Department's Office of Inspector General conducted a special audit of the District of Columbia program. Both agencies were concerned about long delays involved in the certification process and the very high number of irregularities incurred in over-the-counter issuances of authorizations to purchase food stamps.

The auditors quickly became aware that significant numbers of recipients were obtaining duplicate authorization cards and, therefore, multiple issuances of food stamps. In June of last year alone, the overissuance of food stamps in the District of Columbia approximated $50,000. Based on that information, the program administrators clearly were obli-

gated to take corrective actions. After lengthy exploration of a variety of alternatives, Federal and District of Columbia officials agreed on the new system which became effective February 1.

The new system is designed to provide the card needed to buy stamps within 3 days. A new application is checked the evening of the same day it is received to insure that the applicant is not already participating in the program. The food stamp authorization card is mailed the next morning. In emergency cases where the processing and mailing delay will create hardship, the District provides a small cash allotment to cover the period until the authorization card is received. During the first month of the new system, these emergency payments amounted to a little over $5,000. The early estimate of $33,000 per month erroneously repeated as fact by the Post was obviously grossly overstated.

Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources claims that this is the perfect system. Continuing efforts are being made to improve the current process, and a major project has been initiated to establish a model food stamp program within the District. One thing is clear, however: The current system is a vast improvement over the previous one, and the efforts of community leaders should be directed toward supporting and accelerating the positive steps which are being taken.

Finally, the Post editorial suggests that the distribution of free food demonstrates that large numbers of people are going hungry. It seems to me more likely it demonstrates that one can always find a market for free goods.

EXTENDING LIFE OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS UNDER PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. RUPPE, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to extend the life of the five regional commissions originally created under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. These commissions are: The Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, the Four Corners Regional Commission, the Ozarks Regional Commission, the New England Regional Commission, and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission. The current authorization for these commissions will expire on June 30 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has offered the Nation a comprehensive program of Special Revenue Sharing for Rural Community Development. I laud the President's concern and effort. I believe he is the first President to concentrate national efforts to stem the migration from rural America to the urban centers and to give this vast segment of the Nation equal opportunity for better jobs, better education, and improved community environment. Certainly, any success we realize in meeting the urban crisis will necessarily entail the concurrent strengthening of our nonurban economy.

I support the President's program for rural America. By sharing Federal resources with the State and local governments, the President will have broadened the scope of aid to rural communities and families. At the same time, we will have given those States and communities enough flexibility to deal with local problems more effectively.

My bill today will add to the President's program the Regional Commissions. I do not believe that these commissions are at all incompatible with the concept of Special Revenue Sharing. These commissions, including the Appalachia Regional Commission, were created because the Congress recognized that special problems existed in certain identifiable areas. These problems were not confined to single States, and they were of such magnitude that they require a multi-State approach, including multi-State or regional planning, and special or supplemental resources over and beyond those already available under existing Federal and State programs.

I believe that those special problem areas still exist, and that Congress, in establishing a comprehensive program for all of rural America, must take particular account of these economically lagging areas. I am convinced that these regions still require the special consideration that Congress gave them in 1965.

In fact, the regional commissions as they exist today constitute a viable form of Federal revenue sharing. They utilize Federal funds to provide better regional planning and to augment existing programs within their prescribed areas. Decisions on the use of these Federal funds are not made in Washington. Rather, these decisions are made by the Governors of the States involved, who are regional cochairmen. Not only are these decisions made at the State level, they are greatly facilitated by the built-in flexibility which the Congress envisioned in establishing the commissions. This, incidentally, is the same kind of flexibility to which President Nixon addressed himself in his Rural Community Development message to the Congress.

There is a key provision of the regional commission authorization which I would like to discuss here. This is known as "maintenance of effort." Briefly, it states that commission resources are not provided to replace existing State and Federal programs, but to augment them. This is the key to solving regional problems. These regions have been singled out for special attention. The regional commissions were not created to solve those special problems all alone. They were created to add to the regular and Federal effort regional planning and supplemental funding capabilities. Therefore, I find nothing in the retention of the regional commissions which is inconsistent with the President's Special Revenue Sharing approach. The States, in President Nixon's program, will assume the responsibility for all the major Federal efforts to help rural communities. The regional commissions, as they have done in the past, would add to the efforts generated by the various States. They would also assist those States which share similar problems with other States in a given region by assuming responsibility for multi-State planning.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the Senate acted to extend the authorization for the Appalachia Regional Commission, as well as the five so-called title V regions. I do not question the decision to continue the Appalachia Commission; I fully expect that it will be authorized by the 92d Congress. Yet, if we are to continue the Appalachia program recognizing our special responsibilities to that area, then I believe the other 5 regional commissions, which have particular problems of their own, deserve no less attention by the Congress. Not only must we in the House act to extend the lives of these commissions; we must, at long last, fund them adequately so that they can carry out their assigned tasks within the designated areas.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the text of my bill to extend the authorization of the title V regional commissions.

A bill to extend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for two additional years

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed $255,000,000."

SUPPORT GROWS FOR STUDY OF NATION'S ENERGY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my House Joint Resolution to establish a Select House Committee to study the Nation's energy problems. The text of the resolution follows the conclusion of my remarks.

I am particularly pleased to be able to report that joining with me in cosponsorship of the Energy Study Resolution are 94 of our colleagues.

The names of these cosponsors will appear in that portion of today's RECORD devoted to the introduction of new legislation. Therefore, I will not crowd the RECORD at this point by including their names.

However, it should be noted that this is not regional or partisan groups. It is a bipartisan expression of support extending from Maine to California and from Michigan to Mississippi.

This is gratifying but not surprising because almost every section of the Nation faces the continued threat of power

shortages during the peak load periods which are coming up this summer.

In fact, the Federal Power Commission warns:

Some areas of the country may experience power supply shortages this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads.

This is quoted from the FPC's Preliminary Reports on Summer 1971 Electric Load-Supply Situation which was released February 22.

This report goes on to state:

Reports filed with the Federal Power Commission by the Nation's major electric utility systems and pools indicate that some areas of the country may experience tight power supply problems during this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the expected demands on our Nation's electric power generating capacity are going to be greater, in all probability, than existing capacity can provide. This means, according to the FPC, if everything goes well and there are no breakdowns, shortages of fuel, or unexpected eventualities, then we may just squeak by this summer.

It also means that in all probability there are going to be blackouts, brownouts, power cutbacks, and reductions such as were experienced this past winter, particularly in the New York metropolitan area, simply because everything did not go well and eventualities did occur.

Just what is the outlook for this summer? Well, on a region-by-region basis, it looks something like this, according to the Federal Power Commission.

Northeast region:

The Power supply of the Northeast Region appears to be better than last summer, however, conditions are considered to be tight.

East central region:

This region has less than desirable reserves and some utilities or pools may face a tight supply situation this summer if an appreciable amount of the 3,748 megawatts of new capacity scheduled for service before the end of May is delayed.

Southeast region:

The reserves of this area are less than desirable . . .

West central region:

This region has less than desired reserves, but the addition of 867 megawatts scheduled for June and July should raise the reserve margin to 6,551 megawatts or 17.7 percent. A number of areas in the region have low reserves and problems could develop if some large units were to be forced out of service.

South central region:

The load-supply situation of the Region for the coming summer appears to be satisfactory . . .

West region: Without quoting from the FTC report, the situation for the west region for the summer appears to be good.

Thus, we can see that far more than half the people of this Nation could face the threat of serious power shortages this coming summer.

The reason for all this, according to the Federal Power Commission, is a shortage of adequate generating capacity to meet peak demand.

This is a major national energy problem and by itself it would be worthy of immediate attention.

But this is just one of many, many problems existing in the national energy picture today. These problems grow more numerous and more complex with each passing season.

There is the problem of environmental integrity and of pollution as they relate to power production.

There are the problems of power fuel resources and how they can and should best be utilized in the production of power for our immediate needs today, our intermediate needs of tomorrow and our long-range requirements in the next and following generations.

There are the problems of financing new power facilities and the distribution of the power which these facilities will produce.

There is the problem of financing the research required to enable us to learn to better manage our power production and pollution and to devise methods to reach our objective of low-cost electricity and high-quality environment.

There is the problem of assuring an adequate and dependable long-range, low-cost supply of power fuels as well as the means and methods of transporting them to power production facilities.

There is the problem of ownership of power fuel resources and the necessity of maintaining a viable and financially strong and independent power fuel industry.

We are going to have to face these problems and either solve or alleviate them because over the next 20 years our power demands are going to be tremendous.

Over the next 20 years America is going to increase its electric energy appetite by 248 percent.

To meet this demand our electric utility industry must quadruple its existing capacity requiring the addition of nearly 1 billion kilowatts.

These problems cannot be solved nor will these demands be met without the help of the Federal Government and the Congress.

That is why I propose the establishment of this Select Committee to investigate the energy resources of the United States.

Right here I would like to restate and emphasize two points I stressed when this resolution was first introduced earlier this year.

First, this is not a witch hunt. It would not be the purpose of the Committee or study to seek out and hold up for public scorn some preconceived villain or some fabricated strawman. What we are after and what is demanded is a clear picture of the condition of our national energy capabilities today and how they must be expanded, reshaped and modernized to meet the demands of the future.

Second, and this is of paramount importance, it would be my intent to have this Committee complete its work and report back to this body within 2 years. Once that report was made, I can foresee no reason at this time for the continued existence of the Committee and would recommend that it be terminated.

Mr. Speaker, the Members co-sponsoring this resolution today represent somewhere between 40 and 50 million Americans. They each recognize the need for this Committee and the work which it would undertake.

The so-called "energy crisis" in America has been apparent for almost a year now but what has or is being done?

There have been proposals for Commissions. There have been proposals for studies. There have been demands for investigations and there have been outraged calls for antitrust actions.

Many proposals and suggestions have been offered but like the weather, everyone complains about the energy crisis but no one seems to be able to do much about it.

The primary reason for this, I believe, is that too many agencies and bodies have jurisdiction over some portion of the problem but no one body has overall jurisdiction. This is perhaps as it should be for administrative purposes and I have no quarrel to offer in this regard.

However, for purposes of providing an overall in-depth study of the energy resources of the Nation, these able but dispersed jurisdictions simply are not oriented, staffed, or constituted to undertake such a task.

Thus, the need for and task of a short-term select committee to investigate the Nation's energy resources; to provide this body with a full, factual and fair report upon which our various standing committees could draw in working toward a common goal for the future to insure and assure that we will have the energy capacity and energy resources required to meet our power needs of tomorrow and achieve our dual objective of low-cost energy and high-quality environment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the text of House Resolution 155 as it is being reintroduced today and also the Federal Power Commission report of February 22, 1971.

H. RES. 155

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources in the United States, including (1) the availability of oil, gas, coal, and nuclear energy reserves; (2) the identification of the ownership of such reserves; (3) the reasons and possible solutions for the delay in new starts of fossil fueled powerplants; (4) the effect of pricing practices by the owners of energy reserves; (5) the effect of the import of low sulfur fuels; (6) measures to increase the availability of pipelines, railways, barges, and ships needed to transport fuel materials; (7) measures to close the gap between the supply and demand for electric energy; and (8) the identification of the environmental effects of the electricity industry.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

FPC RELEASES STAFF ANALYSIS OF PRELIMINARY REPORTS ON SUMMER 1971 ELECTRIC LOAD-SUPPLY SITUATION

Some areas of the country may experience power supply shortages this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads, according to an analysis by the Federal Power Commission staff of preliminary reports filed with the FPC by the Nation's major electric utility systems and pools.

The staff analysis indicates that the capacity shortage is due primarily to delays in placing new generating facilities in service. To make up for the delayed capacity utilities are installing large blocks of gas turbine capacity, which while well suited to carry peak loads for short periods, are not completely satisfactory for carrying loads for an extended time, the staff reported.

The staff report emphasizes that the analysis is based on preliminary data. There will be a continuing review and further reports will be issued this spring.

In addition, the staff said, the Nation's electric supply is dependent upon the availability of an adequate fossil fuel supply. Utility stocks of coal are better than last fall, and the outlook for the availability of coal and oil for the coming summer appears good, the analysis shows. However, it is dependent on the rigidity, extent, and timing of air pollution standards, the staff said.

The natural gas supply remains tight and cannot effectively fill the gaps in fossil fuel supply which may develop as a result of coal or residual fuel oil shortage, the staff said. Any delays in scheduling nuclear generating capacity additions or unavailability of existing nuclear capacity could place added strain on the fossil fuel supply for utility generation, according to the report.

The summer's fuel supply is contingent on the availability of continuing transportation, and on the supply from foreign sources.

The FPC report covers 181 major utility systems and pools in all states except Alaska and Hawaii. These major systems and pools include about 350 individual utilities and account for approximately 98 percent of the Nation's total power production.

The accompanying FPC staff analysis compares estimated 1971 summer peak loads with generating capacity scheduled to be in service as of May 31, 1971, increased or decreased by firm purchases or obligations expected to be in effect at the time of the summer peak. Any capacity which becomes available after May 31 to carry load dependably in advance of summer peaks would increase the indicated reserve margins.

The staff analysis reflects only those intersystem transfers that are reported to be covered by firm contracts. The staff made no attempt to account for emergency measures that might be resorted to for the purpose of matching power requirements and supply, such as dropping interruptible loads and reducing voltage. Similarly, the report does not consider any reduction in dependable capacity resulting from scheduled maintenance of units, or other factors.

The staff report points out that to provide a continuity of supply, all power systems must have available more generating capacity than their aggregate loads. The desirable amount of this spare capacity, known as "reserve," varies from system to system. It is affected by a number of factors, including system size, the sizes and types of generating units, extent of interconnections, system load characteristics, required maintenance, uncertainties in load forecasting, delays in placing generating facilities in service, and other contingencies. In some instances, the staff noted, systems that appear to have adequate reserves may experience difficulty if one or more large units is forced out of service. For purposes of this analysis, reserve margins amounting to about 20 percent of expected peak load demands are considered necessary to compensate for these factors.

The following table summarizes the load-supply situation for the summer of 1971:

LOAD-SUPPLY SITUATION FOR SUMMER 1971

Region	Net dependable capacity (megawatts)	Estimated peak (megawatts)	Capacity available for reserves		Additional capacity scheduled for service during June, July, August	
			Megawatts	Percent of peak	Megawatts	Percent of peak
Northeast	68,119	57,198	10,921	19.1	1,006	1.8
East Central	54,355	47,727	6,628	13.9	177	0.4
Southeast	65,979	58,872	7,107	12.1	2,640	4.5
West Central	42,621	36,937	5,684	15.4	867	2.3
South Central	49,147	42,702	6,445	15.1	2,894	6.8
West	64,196	52,788	11,408	21.6	1,286	2.4
Contiguous United States	344,417	296,224	48,193	16.3	8,870	3.0

ANALYSIS BY FPC OF PRELIMINARY REPORTS FILED WITH FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION BY MAJOR ELECTRIC UTILITIES ON SUMMER 1971 LOAD SUPPLY SITUATION

Reports filed with the Federal Power Commission by the Nation's major electric utility systems and pools indicate that some areas of the country may experience tight power supply problems during this coming summer as a result of inadequate installed capacity to meet forecasted summer peak loads. The shortage of capacity is due primarily to delays being experienced in placing new generating facilities in service. To make up for the capacity being delayed, the utilities have been and are continuing to install large blocks of gas turbine capacity. While this capacity is well suited to carry peak loads for short periods of time, it is not entirely satisfactory for carrying loads for extended periods of time. In addition, the Nation's electric supply is contingent upon the availability of an adequate fossil fuel supply. Utility stocks of coal are better than last fall. The outlook for the availability of coal and oil for the coming summer appears good but is dependent on the rigidity, extent, and timing of air pollution standards.

It should be emphasized that this analysis is based on preliminary data. There will be a continuing review and further reports will be issued this spring.

Owing to the delays experienced in completing some scheduled major transmission lines, it is imperative that power systems operations be coordinated adequately to assure the delivery of available supplemental power when needed.

The natural gas supply remains tight and cannot effectively fill the gaps in fossil fuel supply which may develop as a result of coal or residual fuel oil shortage. Any delays in scheduled nuclear generating capacity additions of unavailability of existing nuclear capacity could place added strain on the fossil fuel supply for utility generation.

The summer's fuel supply is contingent on the availability of continuing transportation, and on the supply from foreign sources.

The report covers 181 major utility systems and pools in all states except Alaska and Hawaii. These major systems and pools include about 350 individual utilities and account for approximately 98 percent of the Nation's total power production.

The FPC staff analysis compares estimated 1971 summer peak loads with generating capacity scheduled to be in service as of May 31, 1971, increased or decreased by firm purchases or obligations expected to be in effect at the time of the summer peak. Any capacity which becomes available after May 31 to carry load dependably in advance of summer peaks would increase the indicated reserve margins. The analysis reflect only those intersystem transfers that are reported to be covered by firm contracts. No endeavor has been made to account for emergency measures that might be restored to for the purpose of matching power requirements and supply, such as dropping interruptible loads and reducing voltage. Likewise, no reduction in dependable capacity has been considered due to scheduled maintenance of units or other factors.

In order to provide a continuity of supply, all power systems must have available more generating capacity than their aggregate loads. The desirable amount of this spare capacity known as "reserves," varies from system to system. It is affected by a number of factors, including system size, the size and types of generating units, extent of interconnections, system load characteristics, required maintenance, uncertainties in load forecasting, delays in placing generating facilities in service, and other contingencies. In some instances, systems that appear to have adequate reserves may experience difficulty if one or more large units are forced out of service. For purposes of these analyses, reserve margins amounting to about 20 percent of expected peak load demands are considered necessary to compensate for these factors.

The staff analysis of potential company or system wide problem areas are summarized on a regional basis below. A map showing the regions and Power Supply Areas is attached.

Northeast region

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	68,119
Load	57,198
Reserves (19.1 percent)	10,921

The power supply situation of the Northeast Region appears to be better than last summer, however, conditions are considered to be tight. The capacity for the summer includes 4,124 megawatts of capacity scheduled for this summer's peak period but not yet in service. It also includes 2,560 megawatts of capacity out of service with extensive damage which is also scheduled

back in service before the peak period. Each of the three groups of utilities comprising the region will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

New England pool (PSA 1 and 2)

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	12,711
Load	10,253
Reserves (24 percent)	2,458

The New England Pool peaks in the winter, and summer loads are slightly less than those experienced during the preceding winter. The pool will enter the summer period with about the same capacity as that available last winter, but some of this capacity must be taken out of service for maintenance. During the past winter it was not uncommon for the pool to have 2,000 megawatts out of service because of forced outages of equipment. On eight occasions during January and February 1971, it was necessary to institute load curtailment measures because capacity was limited, however, the load curtailment on one occasion was called primarily to assist a neighboring pool. A new 400-megawatt Montville unit No. 6 at Montville, Connecticut, scheduled for service in June 1971, will improve the power supply situation above that shown. It is probable that this pool may face very tight capacity situations this summer when loads approach or exceed the estimated peak and if large amounts of capacity are forced out of service.

New York power pool (PSA 3 and 4)

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	22,754
Load	18,800
Reserves (21 percent)	3,954

On the basis of capacity and load data, the New York Pool appears to have satisfactory reserve generating capacity. However, conditions are not as satisfactory as indicated. The problem area of the pool is the Consolidated Edison's system around New York City. It is quite likely that the pool will be required to reduce voltage and possibly use other load curtailment procedures at times during the summer. The main cause of Consolidated Edison's condition is due to the company's inability to locate and place in service large generating units in or adjacent to its service area because of environmental controversies. The load-supply situation of the Consolidated Edison's system is as follows:

Consolidated Edison Co. (PSA 4)

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	10,119
Load	8,125
Reserves (24.5 percent)	1,994

The reserves of 1,994 megawatts or 24.5 percent appear satisfactory. This capacity, however, includes 597 megawatts of new gas turbine capacity, all of which may not be available before the summer peak. The 1,000-megawatt Ravenswood unit is currently out of service because of a damaged generator. It is now being repaired, and is scheduled to be in service by mid-May. However, the labor contract covering the repair crews expires on March 10 and there is a possibility that a strike may ensue. Should this happen, the Ravenswood report could be delayed beyond the peak load period.

In view of the difficulties that have been encountered with this large unit, the large amount of gas turbine capacity under construction, and the large amount of over-aged capacity still in operation on the Company's system, the load-supply situation for this summer on the Consolidated Edison Company's system is expected to be one of continuing difficulty.

During January and February the company had 3,000 megawatts or more of capacity unavailable for service almost daily in addition to the Ravenswood unit, and it is reasonable to assume that the company will continue to be plagued with forced outages this summer. The company's 873-megawatt Indian Point unit No. 2 was originally scheduled for service in 1969. It is now about ready for service and is only awaiting an AEC operating permit. Since the unit can be put in service about two months after the permit is issued, a speed-up in the licensing process would greatly enhance the capacity situation in the area.

Consolidated Edison has completed arrangements with Canadian sources in Ontario and Quebec under which they believe they can receive 300 megawatts of power until the end of the summer peak period, but this anticipated importation is not reflected in the dependable capacity shown above.

Pennsylvania - New Jersey - Maryland interconnection (PSA 5 and 6):	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	31,499
Load	27,285
Reserves (15.4 percent)	4,214

The PJM Interconnection should be in a slightly better position than it was last summer, provided the new 558-megawatt Morgantown unit No. 2, near Washington, D.C., and the 820-megawatt Conemaugh unit No. 2, near Johnstown, Pennsylvania, are placed in service as scheduled and are fully dependable. The 820-megawatt Keystone unit No. 1, near Indiana, Pennsylvania, and the 556-megawatt Morgantown unit No. 1 and the 184-megawatt Dickerson unit No. 2, both in the environs of Washington, D.C., are currently out of service for extensive repairs. All, however, are expected to be returned to service before the coming summer peak. It appears that the PJM Interconnection may be facing a difficult power-supply situation for the summer 1971, especially if some of the new large units are delayed or if a large amount of forced outages are experienced.

East central region

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	54,355
Load	47,727
Reserves (13.9 percent)	6,628

This region has less than desirable reserves and some utilities or pools may face a tight supply situation this summer if an appreciable amount of the 3,748 megawatts of new capacity scheduled for service before the end of May is delayed. An additional 180 megawatts of capacity is scheduled for June which will add to the available capacity. There are only four large utilities in the area with less than ten percent reserves, but the indicated reserves of six utilities could vanish if capacity scheduled for service before the summer peak is delayed until after the peak period.

Southeast region

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	65,979
Load	58,872
Reserves (12.1 percent)	7,197

The reserves of this area are less than desirable particularly in view of the fact that 3,729 megawatts of new capacity is scheduled for service during the first five months of the year. This new capacity is equal to about 6.3 percent of the estimated peak load and over half of the indicated reserves. An additional 2,640 megawatts of capacity is scheduled for service in June, July, and August and will improve the reserve capacity situation to the extent that it becomes available before the summer peak.

Virginia-Carolinas pool (PSA 18 and 21)

	Megawatts
Net depenable capacity	19,420
Load	18,272
Reserves (6.3 percent)	1,148

The Virginia-Carolinas Pool consists of Virginia Electric and Power Company, Duke Power Company, Carolina Power and Light Company, and South Carolina Electric and Gas Company. The pool has only 1,148 megawatts of reserves or 6.3 percent of peak demand. The new H. B. Robinson nuclear unit No. 2 near Hartsville, South Carolina, scheduled for February 1971, has a capacity of 700 megawatts which is equal to 3.8 percent of the pool's peak demand. This area could experience problems this summer if the Robinson unit is not fully dependable or if one or two large units are forced out of service. The pool has an additional 1,416 megawatts of capacity scheduled for service in June, July and August. This new capacity if fully dependable before the summer peak would raise the reserve margin to 14.0 percent.

With regard to individual members of the pool, the Virginia Electric Power Company, considering its firm commitments only, has no reserves for the summer period. The company has, however, 141 megawatts of gas turbine capacity scheduled for June, which would bring reserve margins to about one percent. Duke Power Company's reserve margin is 4.6 percent, but it has 53 megawatts scheduled for July and 922 megawatts scheduled for August which would bring its reserve margin to about 20 percent. Both companies can call on the pool's limited reserves as required.

Florida pool (PSA 24)

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	12,274
Load	10,867
Reserves (12.9 percent)	1,407

The pool reserve of 12.9 percent is less than desirable, but the new 725-megawatt Turkey Point nuclear unit No. 3 near Miami, Florida, is scheduled for service in June. The installation of this unit will raise the reserve margin to 19.6 percent. The Florida Power Corporation's reserve is only 5.1 percent. The Florida Power & Light Company's reserve is 3.5 percent. This margin will be improved considerably if the company's Turkey Point nuclear unit becomes available before the summer peak.

West central region

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	42,621
Load	36,937
Reserves (15.4 percent)	5,684

This region has less than desired reserves, but the addition of 867 megawatts scheduled for June and July should raise the reserve margin to 6,551 megawatts or 17.7 percent. A number of areas in the region have low reserves and problems could develop if some large units were to be forced out of service.

These areas are: (1) Eastern Wisconsin (PSA–13) with reserves of 612 megawatts or 12.9 percent; (2) Western Wisconsin and Minnesota (PSA–16) with reserves of 636 megawatts or 13.8 percent; (3) Iowa (PSA–17) with reserves of 277 megawatts or 9.6 percent; and (4) Nebraska (PSA–28) with reserves of 266 megawatts or 12.9 percent.

Commonwealth Edison Company has 1,935 megawatts of reserves or 17.4 percent, but these reserves are based on the availability of the new 809-megawatt Dresden nuclear unit No. 3 which is scheduled for May and 200 additional megawatts from Dresden nuclear unit No. 2 which went in service on a limited basis last August. A delay in the availability of Dresden nuclear unit No. 3 would cause problems. The new 809-mega-

watt Quad City nuclear unit No. 1, near Cordova, Illinois, scheduled for July would improve the power supply situation of both Commonwealth Edison and the Iowa Interconnection if it becomes available before the summer peak.

South central region

	Megawatts
Net dependable capacity	49,147
Load	42,702
Reserve (15.1 percent)	6,445

The reserves in the South Central Region include 2,894 megawatts of new capacity which is scheduled for service in the first five months of the year. An additional 1,056 megawatts of new capacity is scheduled for service during June, July and August. This capacity would increase the available reserves to 17.6 percent of peak load if brought into service before the summer peak.

Of the individual systems within the pool, nine systems will have less than 15 percent reserves at the summer peak. However, one of these systems will have reserves of only 10.7 percent.

The load-supply situation of the Region for the coming summer appears to be satisfactory with no significant problems apparent at this time. The situation can change however, if delays are encountered in the completion of new capacity construction programs. If such unforeseen delays should develop, at least six systems could face the summer peaking season without reserves. No nuclear units are among those scheduled for completion in the region prior to summer 1971.

West region

	Megawatts
Net dependenable capacity	64,196
Load	52,788
Reserves (21.6 percent)	11,408

The Pacific Northwest with reserves of 1,559 megawatts, equal to 11.4 percent of the peak demand, has the lowest reserves of any area in the West Region. These reserves should be ample since the region has 1,546 megawatts of interruptible loads which can be dropped when capacity is not available. The region has 907 megawatts of idle generating capacity in its hydro plants which could be used during periods when other generating equipment is removed for maintenance or repair.

The 800-megawatt Hanford dual purpose nuclear plant was shutdown during the latter part of January. The loss of the electric power from this plant should not be critical this summer because water conditions in the Pacific Northwest are good and because summer is the low load period for the area. The loss of Hanford will be critical during the winter seasons.

The 750-kilovolt D. C. Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie was lost during the Los Angeles earthquake of February 9th. The dc Terminal and Converter (which converts direct to alternating current) Station at Sylmar suffered extensive damage and may be out of service some six to twelve months or longer. A second substation in the same area, which is the receiving point for 212 MW of hydro power was heavily damaged and will have to be rebuilt. The utility is bypassing the sub-station with temporary transmission service.

The two 500 kV alternating current lines are expected to provide reasonable adequate transfer capacity, north and south, for at least the immediate future. Studies are being made of alternative transmission capability to meet peak power transfer requirements over the long term while the dc terminal facilities are being repaired.

The following table summarizes the load-supply situation for the summer of 1971:

LOAD-SUPPLY SITUATION FOR SUMMER 1971

Region	Net dependable capacity (megawatts)	Estimated peak (megawatts)	Capacity available for reserves		Additional capacity scheduled for service during June, July, August	
			Megawatts	Percent of peak	Megawatts	Percent of peak
Northeast	68,119	57,198	10,921	19.1	1,006	1.8
East Central	54,355	47,727	6,628	13.9	177	0.4
Southeast	65,979	58,872	7,107	12.1	2,640	4.5
West Central	42,621	36,937	5,684	15.4	867	2.3
South Central	49,147	42,702	6,445	15.1	2,894	6.8
West	64,196	52,788	11,408	21.6	1,286	2.4
Contiguous United States	344,417	296,224	48,193	16.3	8,870	3.0

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 16, the House considered the conference report on H.R. 4690 which included a 10-percent increase in social security benefits. I understood there would be no legislative business on Tuesday and was unavoidably detained in Chicago when an emergency callup of the bill was requested and granted.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the record show that had I been present I would have voted "yea."

CAREER INCENTIVES FOR ARMED FORCES OFFICERS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced two bills of vital importance to the recruitment and retention of professionally trained specialists in the Armed Forces.

My first bill—H.R. 6374—provides for the extension to judge advocates and legal specialists of pay incentives now available to doctors, dentists, and veterinarians in the Armed Forces. Hopefully, these incentives would make service careers more attractive to legal specialists who are presently hesitant to extend their service terms because of the huge discrepancy in pay between civilian law practice and military legal careers.

When this bill was first introduced in 1969, the Department of Defense reported a shortage of 737 lawyers. Today, that figure is a startling 842 and the services report they are far below the manpower they consider adequate to staff the large number of JAG posts with experienced and knowledgeable specialists.

Draft pressures have been instrumental in attracting lawyers to the services, but the sizable financial disadvantages of military legal careers has produced a disabling turnover rate in the JAG department. Pay incentives would be at least a partial solution to this problem.

The incentive pay would provide for $50 per month for grades O–1 through O–3, $150 for grades O–4 and O–5, and $200 per month for O–6 and above. The continuation pay would be paid to those judge advocates who extend their service on active duty for at least 3 years but not more than 6 years, at the rate of 2 months' pay for each additional year he agrees to remain on active duty. The bonus is payable upon the completion of 4 years' active duty.

My other career incentive bill—H.R. 6373—would provide service credit for time in school for professionals who are ophthomologists, pharmacists, engineers, and lawyers. This bill would credit servicemen with up to 3 years of active commissioned status if he is enrolled in a program of professional study that requires more than 4 years of college. For example, a captain who is an engineer with 4 years of service time would get the pay of a captain with 6 years of service time.

We must act promptly and definitely to make service careers more attractive to professionals and to encourage servicemen to pursue professional courses of study while they are in service. My bills are a step in this direction.

CRITICAL DAYS FOR ISRAEL

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, these are critical days for the State of Israel: not as dramatic perhaps as the 6-day war but more important for the future of that nation. As Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel, visits the United States this week and Israel considers the question of whether it should agree to a return to her old insecure borders, I believe it is appropriate to state my views about this important issue.

The question of Israel's borders must be considered in the context of recent history, and I think history is clear on one point: from its origins through the 1948 United Nations partition to the present day, Israel has sought only one thing—to live at peace with its neighbors and to get on with its work of creating a vibrant and progressive society. Its military actions have been a reluctant and expensive reaction to Arab aggression and terrorism for the Arab nations have never wavered from the announced goal of the destruction of Israel. The history of the Middle East since 1948 demonstrates that if it is to survive Israel cannot rely on the United Nations or on great power gurantees. It must rely on its own power. These are the facts of history.

Because I believe that the fate of Israel is in jeopardy I am fearful of the cavalier attitude being taken by our State Department toward the Jarring negotiations. Our State Department is exerting pressure on Israel to force it to sacrifice its minimum requirements for secure borders in exchange for flimsy international guarantees. I call this a cavalier attitude.

Indeed it is worse—it is hypocritical and desperately dangerous. How different it is from our posture in Southeast Asia. There, in a area where we have no business and where U.S. security is in no way at stake, we are investing tens of thousands of American lives and billions of dollars and are taking a tough uncompromising negotiating stance. In the Middle East, on the other hand, we expect Israel to jeopardize its very existence. There are some who suspect that oil interests which formerly dominated the State Department are ascending again in the formulation of Middle East policy.

It is noteworthy that many of the nations which now call upon Israel to abandon Jerusalem, Sharm el Sheikh, Gaza and the Golan Heights are nations which themselves have relatively recently obtained secure borders. The Soviet Union, for example, does not consider returning portions of Finland, Japan, East Prussia, Poland, and Rumania. And we should not forget that our Southwestern border is the result of a war with Mexico whose causes were by no means altruistic on our part.

I do not wish to oversimplify the Middle Eastern situation. But let us not be deluded by its complexities into forgetting the simple fact that Israel is now engaged in a diplomatic struggle for its survival. The United States should support, not thwart, Israel's efforts to assure a secure future. I want the people and Government of Israel to know that not all Americans agree with our State Department when it presses for a return to the past. The past is the past and the perils that it held should not be revived. The future must be negotiated, and it must be negotiated by Israel with the objectives of permanent peace and security.

THE ADMINISTRATION CUTS IN HEALTH CARE MUST BE STOPPED

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days we have been advised that the administration has cut the budget of the New York metropolitan regional medical program so that a number of very worthwhile programs which were financed by the Federal Government will have to come to an end.

St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York is one of the outstanding hospitals in this country furnishing great service to the community. I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues two of the programs which are being terminated as a result of the Nixon administration's cutbacks. One is St. Vincent's Hospital Mobile Coronary Care Unit and the second which will be dropped is the asthma detection program which is primarily for poor youngsters in the community. These two programs cost very modest sums. The coronary care unit has been funded at the rate of $62,262 a year since its establishment, and it will now be required to terminate July 1, 1971, for lack of funding. The asthma detection program costs $59,962 a year and it, too, will come to an end unless the Federal funding is continued.

Mr. Speaker, considering the enormous sums being spent by our country for destructive purposes we cannot in good conscience terminate these two lifesaving programs which are so modest in cost. These reductions by the Nixon administration in health programs are not limited to the city of New York. That administration is wielding a butcher knife on health programs and I hope we here in the Congress will be successful in resisting the Nixon administration's cuts and compelling the necessary funding of these vital programs.

I have asked Sister Margaret Sweeney, director of St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York, to prepare a statement on the two programs in detail so as to better acquaint our colleagues with the good works of that hospital. The statement with additional matters is appended:

STATEMENT BY MARGARET SWEENEY

St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York protests that this Administration has cut the budget of the New York Metropolitan Regional Medical Program and thereby has put a halt to federal financing for two highly successful programs run by the hospital. The Regional Medical Programs are funded through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare whose budget has been seriously reduced.

One victim of the cut is the hospital's Mobile Coronary Care Unit, the first of its kind in the United States and the model for other such heart teams now used across the country. Dr. William Grace, Director of the hospital's Department of Medicine, says that since his project began three years ago they have noted a reduction of the mortality rate for heart attack victims from 20%, the City's overall average, down to 6%, with *no* deaths on the coronary ambulance. The Coronary Care Unit had been funded at the rate of $62,262 a year since it was established.

The coronary program, which is due to terminate July 1, 1971 is popularly said to make Greenwich Village and Chelsea the safest places in the United States to suffer a heart attack.

The second project to be dropped is the Asthma Detection Program for poor youngsters in the community.

Dr. Vincent Fontana, Director of the Department of Pediatrics, says the Asthma Detection Program, which costs $59,962 a year, has made unusual progress since its inception in October 1968.

This is a joint project of St. Vincent's Hospital with St. Mary's Hospital in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brookyln.

Asthma teams seek out youngsters for treatment in deprived areas and give them complete physical examinations as well. The majority of these children never see a physician except in a crisis. Not only have undetected asthma cases been discovered but many other diseases as well which have been followed up and treated.

Dr. Fontana declared:

"The erratic approach in the provision of medical care to the indigent does not recognize the fears and feelings of the people served by the programs.

"The hard, cold, impersonal approach to these people with the turning of programs on and off, dictated by an uncertain budgetary picture and changing priorities only causes further deterioration of already fragmented health programs and unrest among the people of the ghetto."

The Sisters of Charity came to Greenwich Village in 1849 to care for the sick and indigent people here. This has been our mission for all of these years. How can we continue to fulfill this mission if programs as important as the M.C.C.U. and the Asthma Program are cut entirely with so little advance notice?"

In the case of the coronary program, it has taken a great deal of time to educate the public to become aware of the signs of heart attack and to act promptly to obtain prompt medical care.

The Asthma Program is really just becoming accepted by the people it is meant for and mutual trust has developed, she noted.

ST. VINCENT'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER OF NEW YORK

FACT SHEET

Mobile coronary care unit:

Total Calls—	
October 15, 1968, through December 31, 1970	1,203
Dead on arrivals	109
Died at scene after arrival	7
Arrived alive	956
None died en route.	
Discharge from emergency room not requiring hospitalization	375
Hospitalized:	
Coronary care unit	256
Intensive care unit	132
Other hospital beds	192

11 definite cases where ventricular fibrilation was done on patients on the scene of their attack definitely saved their lives.

STATEMENT BY DR. VINCENT J. FONTANA, DIRECTOR PEDIATRICS ST. VINCENT'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER

The Metropolitan Regional Medical Program for the fiscal year 1971 has been reduced by $500,000 because of a severe budget squeeze in Washington. Reduced funding has resulted in terminating our contract for the Pediatric Asthma Program at St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center of New York and St. Mary's Hospital in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section. We were notified on March 3 of a March 31st termination date after a letter was sent to the Director of the Regional Medical Program stating:

"We unfortunately extend ourselves to the people with a program which is oftentimes short-lived. This is now again happening. Its effects on the community as well as on the Regional Medical Program can only be most harmful.

"Our commitments to the community and to those who are actually involved in the program necessitate that funds for this program be continued through July 1, 1971."

We have attempted in our program at St. Vincent's and St. Mary's Hospital to bring to the children of the slum and ghetto areas the benefits of modern medicine related to bronchial asthma and other chronic lung diseases. Children have been examined in the community schools, in day-care centers, and in neighborhood parks in an attempt to uncover previously undetected lung problems in children. Medical histories were obtained, complete physical examinations done, lung function breathing tests performed, and testing for tuberculosis completed the evaluation.

Teaching programs for the parents, teachers, school nurses, and doctors in the management of the child with asthma was another means utilized to improve the health needs of these children from low income families—only half of whom see any doctor during the span of one year.

I do not know who is to blame for this poor planning that is resulting in the denial of better health care to the children in the ghetto areas.

The Federal government's interest in health is obvious but what can be seriously questioned is whether they properly recognize the realistic needs of the poor neglected sick of the community.

There are dozens of programs on a national level that have been established to promote better health for the people of our nation.

For the most part, the record indicates that they are fragmented, disorganized, and short-lived. This erratic approach in the provisions of medical care to the indigent does not recognize the fears and feelings of the people for which the programs are for. The hard, cold, impersonal approach to these people with the turning of programs on and off dictated by a hodgepodge budgetary picture and changing priorities only causes further deterioration of already fragmented health programs in the community and unrest among the peoples of the ghetto areas. Splintered health services that last for short periods of time and are not ongoing on a continuous basis can only discourage people's confidence in our health programs and encourage the continuance of the health care crisis that our nation and city is faced with at the present time. We cannot deny these children the basic right to health because of budgetary changes and changing priorities dictated by political pressures and not community health needs.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE ACTIVE ROLE IN PROMOTING THE USE OF RECYCLED PAPER IN EVERY DAY BUSINESS

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to extend his remraks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, recycling is a national environment issue that is of increasing concern to all Americans.

In my study of what the Federal Government is doing to keep its own house in order, I have been dismayed to learn that only a very limited effort is being given to the purchase of recycled products by the General Services Administration and the Defense Supply Agency.

I am today offering a bill to require maximum use of recycled paper for all General Services purchases. My recycling bill directs the Administrator of the General Services Administration to proscribe regulations for the purchase of paper to provide for the maximum use of recycled material consistent with the use of the paper.

Because the problem usually falls into the area of definition of recycled material, I have worked out a definition which is supported by those who produce recycled materials. The definition requires the percentage of paper to be computed from that paper which has been previously manufactured, served its purpose, and been scrapped or discarded. The language can be found in the text of the bill at the end of these remarks.

My colleagues do not need to be reminded of the flexibility that is often found between the intent of legislation or administrative fiat and its implementation. This bill assumes that no official will be able to misconstrue the desire of the Congress to move effectively in the area of recycling.

The Federal Government should boost the use of recycled paper in its everyday business to help improve the environment.

Recycled paper can be used for almost any purpose, but the Federal specifications require almost totally virgin material in the paper it buys.

The General Services Administration buys more than 400,000 tons of paper each year at a cost of $140 million. This would be a tremendous market for the recycling industry which could produce an economical product that would also use up the growing supply of waste paper.

The major complaint of the recycling industry is that there is no market for their product; and the Federal Government as the largest single user is the biggest offender.

I feel that as legislators we must set the example, not follow it. The Government by changing its purchasing policies can demonstrate the feasibility of recycled materials both economically and ecologically.

The President's message on the environment sent to the Congress on February 8 stated that the General Services Administration is reviewing the Government's purchasing policies. I applaud these efforts. Martin Skala in the Christian Science Monitor on February 13, 1971, reported that the new specifications will contain a minimum of from 3 to 50 percent reclaimed fibers.

I submit, however, that the effort currently underway needs to be shored up by legislation to assure that the best efforts of the Government are realized. The economic changes caused by an emphasis on recycled use are bound to have their economic effect. Virgin products have been sold for years on the premise that the paper using virgin timber was of superior quality. However, present industry capability has the capacity to produce products of equal quality from recycled materials.

To demonstrate this fact I have decided to print the newsletter I send to constituents in the 27th District of New York, that I am privileged to represent, on recycled paper. I believe that I am the first Member of Congress to take this step.

These efforts are not enough. I am presently drafting additional legislation to require all governmental purchasing agencies to study and report back on what steps they are taking to use recycled material. When this legislation is prepared I will solicit other Members who would like to join me in the effort to emphasize better use of our natural resources at the Federal level.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6368

A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured by executive agencies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) (1) The Administrator shall prescribe regulations establishing standards with respect to the contents of any paper procured by, or for, executive agencies. Such regulations shall specify that the contents of such paper shall consist of as great an amount of recycled material as is possible consistent with the purpose for which such paper is procured.

"(2) For the purposes of any regulations prescribed by the Administrator under this subsection the term 'recycled material' means any paper that meets the following criteria:

"(a) has served the purpose for which it was originally manufactured; and

"(b) has been scrapped or otherwise discarded as an element of solid waste; and

"(c) has been recovered in whole or in part and reprocessed into a new raw material element for the manufacture of a paper product.

"However, for the purposes of the regulations to be established, 'recycled content' shall not include those materials generated and reused within a plant (intraplant) as part of its own manufacturing process."

FLOOR DEBATE ON SST APPROPRIATION

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the question of the supersonic jet transport comes before the House again today and I feel strongly that it is time to halt this program. Over the past few months, I have studied this issue carefully, looking at arguments on both sides and have reached the conclusion that there are still too many unanswered questions.

In addition to the noise factor and other abuse to the environment, I believe that continued Federal funding of the SST will use funds that are more greatly needed in domestic areas. The SST is a subsidy by poor people to permit wealthy people to go to Paris in half the time.

Rather than continuing to dump Federal tax dollars into the SST, we could better spend the money on providing training for doctors and nurses, for more and improved health care facilities, on education and job training, on cancer research, and other long delayed programs.

There may be some reasons to build an SST, but not from Federal funds at a time when there is greater priority on other projects.

A rough sampling of my mail has shown a preponderance of opposition to the SST. In the past few weeks I have had 76 letters from constituents against further funding of the SST and five in favor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Richard T. Lumb of Poughkeepsie, N.Y. He sums up the issue nicely when he says:

To put it simply—there's not enough money to do all we'd like to do. So let's put what there is where it will do the most good.

Mr. Lumb's point as you will see is that we should move faster to improve mass transit facilities before pumping more money into the SST:

MARCH 8, 1971.

Representative JOHN G. DOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOW: The only reasoning I can support for pressing ahead with the development of the SST is to maintain technical parity with France, Great Britain and Russia. It is all too obvious that the commercial airlines will not be able to digest what they have now for many years. In fact, it would appear that there are several airborne Penn Centrals in the making through a combination of governmental support, permissiveness and restrictive controls, and by very short-sighted industry planning. And

there will never be more than limited need for an SST.

There can, of course, be no prediction at this time of the payload possibilities of the SST—if it should become economically feasible in the future. It seems to me that at best it could provide practical service for very few passengers.

The real need—now and urgent—is to pay more than lip service to millions of today's harried commuters—bus, air shuttle and, especially, rail. If the SST development is desirable, direct government assistance to mass transit facilities in massive amounts is required—and at once.

(a) Provide every rider with a comfortable seat under all conditions.

(b) Make it possible for the various transportation authorities or companies to offer fast, frequent, on-time service.

(c) Allow Railpax the money required to include some of the extra amenities to return inter-city passenger travel to respectability—and desirability.

(d) Give equal emphasis to research and development for all sectors of the airline industry.

In other words, I would suggest that the SST program be funded only from the surplus of the money and effort needed now merely to give today's travelers a decent ride to work. To put it simply—there's not enough money to do all we'd like to. So let's put what there is where it will do the most good now.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD T. LUMB.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to tell my colleagues about a group of students from Marist College in Poughkeepsie who came into my district office with a petition signed by 1,300 persons. I am taking the liberty of sharing this petition with Secretary Volpe.

I think I can speak for most Members of the House when I say that we should not be swayed totally by those people who write for and against an issue. As Federal legislators we are called upon to study all sides of an issue and then vote our conscience.

For my own part I strongly believe there are more reasons to vote "no" on the SST appropriation than to vote "yes." For these reasons, I am voting for the amendment to eliminate the SST funds from the Department of Transportation appropriation measure.

POW WEEK SHOULD BE MORE THAN HOT AIR

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, next week has been designated "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action." I have signed the resolution sponsoring this week. But I hope we will be able to do more than simply "show concern." Concern is all very good, but it is not what the POW's and their families need.

I have talked a great deal with many POW-MIA wives. They have told me they have had more than enough of being patted on the head and praised for their bravery. They have had enough of writing letters to Hanoi. None of this has brought their husbands one step nearer to release. What they want is a concrete plan to bring their husbands home.

A number of us have developed such a plan, which we call "proportional repatriation." It involves trading the POW's for the only thing the other side wants from us: Our absence. We shall be introducing it as a concurrent resolution next week. I insert the text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

H. CON. RES. 212

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "Proportionate Repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia

Whereas the Government of the United States has indicated it will not totally withdraw from Vietnam until the American prisoners held in Southeast Asia have been released; and

Whereas the National Liberation Front and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have indicated they will discuss the return of American prisoners once a date for total American military withdrawal from Vietnam has been set; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has an obligation to secure the release of those American citizens held as prisoners in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas the American national interest would best be served by termination of the war in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that American troops should be withdrawn from Southeast Asia and American prisoners in Southeast Asia should be released simultaneously.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to inform the representatives of the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia that the United States is prepared to—

(1) withdraw military and paramilitary personnel from Southeast Asia, including offshore naval air and naval artillery support forces, in proportionate numbers, by stages, each stage equal in percentage to the percentage of American prisoners concurrently released by the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia;

(2) accept the good offices of an intermediary, who would be a neutral nation or international agency acceptable both to the United States and to the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia, whose function would be to (A) receive and hold each contingent of American prisoners as they were released, (B) verify that the appropriate number of American military and paramilitary personnel had left Vietnam, and then to (C) turn the American prisoners over to the American forces;

(3) permit the intermediary to perform whatever unannounced checks and inspections considered necessary by the intermediary to verify that withdrawn American troops are not being replaced under the guise of rotation;

(4) publish, twice monthly, a list of the total number of American military and paramilitary personnel in Southeast Asia; and

(5) complete the withdrawal of all American military and paramilitary personnel, including offshore naval air and artillery support forces, from Southeast Asia by a specified date to be determined by negotiation, which date shall not be later than December 24, 1971.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that actions by the United States to implement the proposals described in section 2 of this concurrent resolution should be contingent upon an agreement on the part of the forces holding American prisoners in Southeast Asia to—

(1) publish a complete list of all American prisoners they hold, including a description of the physical condition of each prisoner;

(2) publish a complete list of American prisoners who died in captivity, including date and cause of death;

(3) return all American prisoners in proportionate numbers, by stages, each stage equal in percentage to the percentage of American military and paramilitary personnel withdrawn from Southeast Asia;

(4) accept the good offices of an intermediary, as outlined in paragraph (2) of section 2 of this concurrent resolution;

(5) allow the intermediary to perform whatever unannounced checks and inspections considered necessary by the intermediary to verify that there are not more American prisoners than were named in the list provided under paragraph (1) of this section;

(6) repatriate American prisoners in the order of the length of their captivity, with the exception that those in serious need of medical attention be returned first;

(7) refrain from initiating military action against departing American troops;

(8) send all Chinese and Soviet military advisers out of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and permit the intermediary to verify that this had been done; and

(9) complete the repatriation of all American prisoners on or before the date of completion of the withdrawal of American military and paramilitary personnel from Southeast Asia.

LEGISLATION OFFERED TO DISCOURAGE PAID BROADCAST TIME BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Army has received extensive publicity about its new $10.6 million campaign to saturate the commercial airwaves with paid-for commercials, aimed at the young and intended to stimulate enlistments.

The notices have been definitely mixed, although the other armed services are understandably intrigued by the Army's enterprise in buying up all that time.

Heretofore, of course, the Army and its sister services have relied on donated time to convey their radio and television messages to the public. Broadcast licenses traditionally have provided such time, at no cost and as a public service, for messages by Government agencies.

I am deeply concerned about the implications of what the Army is doing now.

Accordingly, I am today offering a "sense of Congress" resolution to express the opposition of the House and Senate to the use of public funds at any level of Government for purchase of time on commercial stations.

The wording of my resolution is intentionally vague, because at this point I concede that I do not have all the answers.

While I am strongly opposed in principle to any public agency buying time in this fashion on what are supposed to be the public's airwaves, there may nevertheless be rare instances in which this practice can be justified.

Hearings, involving the Army and any other concerned Federal departments, as well as broadcasters, would at least shed light on existing policies and provide for whatever actions may be necessary in

the future. My proposal is submitted with the hope that it might serve as the vehicle for hearings to explore this complex problem.

A number of broadcasters have turned down the Army's money for the commercials, on grounds they are obligated to provide the time without charge. They should be given the opportunity to testify, as well as the radio and television executives who have agreed to sell the time.

We should also attempt to find out exactly what precedents, if any, exist for the Army's campaign. Have Federal agencies or departments bought time in the past, and under what circumstances?

In drafting the resolution, I have chosen an approach which does not have the force of law—rather than offer prohibitory legislation. This will permit some leeway as we deliberate the propriety of the Army's actions.

The warning implicit in my proposal would apply only to purely governmental agencies, not to quasi-public corporations such as the new Railpax Corp., which are funded by a mix of private and public money.

The text of the resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PAID ADVERTISEMENTS BROADCAST FOR THE FEDERAL OR STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OR DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES

Whereas, radio and television broadcasters are licensed to serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

Whereas, the Advertising Council and numerous radio and television broadcasters have, voluntarily and without charge, cooperated in presenting public service announcements for the Federal and State and local governments, and departments and agencies thereof; and

Whereas, the United States Army Recruiting Command has committed itself to the expenditure of $10.6 million for a four month radio and television recruiting campaign; and

Whereas, freedom of expression and vigorous and unfettered media for the dissemination of news, views, and information are essential parts of this Nation's legal and social traditions and are absolutely necessary to the existence of any free democratic society; and

Whereas, the receipt of significant sums of money by radio and television broadcasters from a department of the Federal Government raises the spectre of government influence over this sensitive media: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government, State and local governments, and departments and agencies thereof should not expend public funds to purchase time for the carriage of advertisements by radio or television broadcast stations.

NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORP. ACT

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin and I along with more than 100 other Members in both Houses of Congress are today introducing legislation to give independent status to the Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services program.

Legal services has proven itself as one of our most effective tools in redressing the problems of poverty. It has given millions of our Nation's poor renewed hope and developed new confidence in the American system of law and government. "Equal justice under law" is now within reach for everyone.

Despite the program's success, legal services attorneys are confronted with conflict-of-interest problems and political interference because the program is located in OEO and the executive branch. Special problems have arisen when suits were brought against agencies of the Federal Government or against State and municipal governments.

The bill being introduced today is designed to remove legal services from the political arena. The measure would provide legal services through a private, nonprofit corporation—the National Corporation for Legal Services. The 19-member board of directors would operate the corporation free of the veto power of State Governors that has caused major poverty law battles of recent years.

This plan has been endorsed in principle by two committees of the American Bar Association and by the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization.

The corporation would be funded through the Economic Opportunity Act; $140,000,000 is authorized for the first year of operation. This amount is nearly twice that now spent by Legal Services, but former OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld generously estimated that only 28 percent of the legal assistance need of low-income Americans is presently being met. This legislation would more fully meet the need for new programs and additional services in existing programs.

The National Corporation for Legal Services will insure unfettered legal representation for low-income Americans. Only when the attorney-client relationship is free from political manipulation will we truly have "equal justice under law."

At this point in the RECORD, I request that the bill for a National Legal Services Corporation be printed in full.

The bill follows:

H.R. 6361

A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Legal Services Corporation Act".

SEC. 2. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 901. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(1) it is in the public interest to encourage and promote resort to attorneys and appropriate institutions for the orderly resolution of grievances and as a means of securing orderly change, responsiveness and reform;

"(2) many low income Americans are unable to afford the cost of legal services or of access to appropriate institutions;

"(3) access to legal services and appropriate institutions for all citizens of the United States not only is a matter of private and local concern, but also is of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) the integrity of the attorney-client relationship and of the adversary system of justice in the United States require that there be no political interference with the provision and performance of legal services;

"(5) existing legal services programs have provided economical, effective, and comprehensive legal services to the client community so as to bring about a peaceful resolution of grievances through resort to orderly means of change;

"(6) a private nonprofit corporation should be created to encourage the availability of legal services and legal institutions to all citizens of the United States, free from extraneous interference and control.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 902. (a) There is established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the 'National Legal Services Corporation' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation') which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this title, and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this title is expressly reserved.

"(b) No part of the net earnings of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any private person, and it shall qualify as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

"PROCESS OF INCORPORATION AND ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 903. (a) There shall be a transition period of six months following the date of enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act for the process of incorporation and initial organization of the Corporation.

"(b) There is established an incorporating trusteeship composed of the following persons: the president of the American Bar Association, the president elect of the American Bar Association, the president of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, the president of the American Association of Law Schools, the president of the American Trial Lawyers Association, and the president of the National Bar Association. The incorporating trusteeship shall meet within 30 days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(c)(1) Not later than sixty days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act the Incorporating Trusteeship shall establish the initial Clients Advisory Council to be composed of 11 members who are selected, in accordance with procedures established by the Incorporating Trusteeship, from among individuals recommended by the governing boards of existing legal services programs who are representative of the class of clients served by any such program.

"(2) Not later than sixty days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act the Incorporating Trusteeship shall establish the initial Project Attorneys Advisory Council to be composed of 11 members to be selected, in accordance with procedures established by the Incorporating Trusteeship, by attorneys who are actively engaged in providing legal services under any existing legal services programs from among individuals who are attorneys actively engaged in providing such services.

"(3) To assist in carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall compile a list of all legal services programs publicly funded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the subsequent fiscal year and

furnish such list to the Incorporating Trusteeship. In order to carry out the provisions of this subsection the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall make available to the Incorporating Trusteeship such administrative services as it may require.

"(d) Not later than ninety days after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act the Clients Advisory Council and the project Attorneys Advisory Council shall each meet and each appoint three representatives to serve on the initial Board of Directors of the National Legal Services Corporation.

"(e) During the ninety day period of incorporation of the Corporation the Incorporating Trusteeship shall take whatever actions are necessary to incorporate the Corporation, including the filing of Articles of Incorporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, and to prepare for the first meeting of the Board of Directors, except the selection of the Executive Director of the Corporation.

"(f) During the 90 day period immediately following the period specified in subsection (e) of this section the Board shall take whatever action is necessary to prepare to begin to carry out the activities of the Corporation six months after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act.

"DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

"SEC. 904. (a) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors consisting of 19 individuals, one of whom shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

"(1) Public Members. Five members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States. After giving due consideration to individuals recommended by associations of attorneys whose membership is actively engaged in conducting legal services programs the President shall make the appointments under this paragraph to the initial Board of Directors. After giving due consideration to recommendations of individuals recommended by the Board the President shall make the appointments under this paragraph for any Board subsequent to the initial Board.

"(2) Legal organization members. Six individuals shall be members of the Board by virtue of holding the following offices:

"(A) The President of the American Bar Association.

"(B) The President-elect of the American Bar Association.

"(C) The President of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

"(D) The President of the American Association of Law Schools.

"(E) The President of the American Trial Lawyers Association.

"(F) The President of the National Bar Association.

"(3) Attorney-client members. Six members of whom three shall be selected by the Clients Advisory Council and three shall be selected by the Project Attorneys Advisory Council. Any Board after the initial Board shall, in consultation with the respective Advisory Councils, provide for the rules with respect to the subsequent meetings of the Clients Advisory Council and the Attorneys Advisory Council and the process of selection of members of the Board in accordance with this paragraph.

"(4) The Executive Director of the Corporation.

"(b)(1) Members appointed under paragraph (1) of the preceding subsection shall be appointed for terms of three years except that—

"(A) the terms of the directors first taking office shall be effective on the ninety-first day after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act and shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of three years, two at the end of two years, and in the case of the Director appointed by the Chief Justice two years; and

"(B) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder Justice, two years; and

"(2) The members selected under paragraph (2) of the preceding subsection shall serve for the term of office for which they are elected and by virtue of which they become members of the Board except in no case shall a term exceed three years. If anyone of the organizational members' term will exceed three years by virtue of holding a position more than three years, the Board shall provide for the appointment of a successor by the appropriate organization.

"(3) The members selected pursuant to paragraph (3) of the preceding subsection shall serve for a term of three years except that—

"(A) the terms of the directors first taking office shall be effective on the ninety-first day after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act and shall expire as designated by the selecting Advisory Council, one at the end of one year, one at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years after such date; and

"(B) any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(c) The Corporation shall have an Executive Director, who shall be an attorney, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board of Directors, at rates of compensation fixed by the Board, and serve at the pleasure of the Board. No individual shall serve as Executive Director of the Corporation for a period in excess of 6 years.

"(d) No political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, or promoting any officer, attorney or employee of the Corporation. No officers or employees of the Corporation shall receive any salary from any source other than the Corporation during the period of employment by the Corporation.

"ADVISORY COUNCIL: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"SEC. 905. (a) The Board shall provide for the selection of a Clients Advisory Council subsequent to the first such Council to be composed of not more than 11 members, selected in accordance with procedures established by the Board, from among individuals who are representative of the class of clients served by the legal services programs conducted or assisted by the Corporation. The Clients Advisory Council shall be available to advise the President on general policy matters relating to the needs of the members of the client community and to select members of the Board in accordance with section 904.

"(b) The Board shall provide for a Project Attorneys Advisory Council subsequent to the first such project. Project Attorneys Advisory Council shall be composed of not more than 11 members to be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Board, from among individuals who are attorneys actively engaged in providing legal services conducted by the Corporation. The Project Attorneys Advisory Council shall be available to advise the President on general policy relating to the furnishing of legal services to members of the client community and to select members of the Board in accordance with section 904.

"(c) The Board may establish an Executive Committee of not less than five members nor more than seven members which shall consist of the Chairman of the Board, the Executive Director of the Corporation, one director appointed pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 904(a), one director appointed pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 904(a), and one director appointed pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 904(a).

"ACTIVITIES AND POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 906. (a) Effective six months after the enactment of the National Legal Services Corporation Act, in order to carry out the purposes of this title, the Corporation is authorized to—

"(1) provide financial assistance to qualified programs furnishing legal service to members of the client community;

"(2) provide financial assistance to pay the costs of contracts or other agreements made pursuant to section 3 of the National Legal Services Corporation Act;

"(3) carry out research, training, technical assistance, experimental and clinical assistance programs designed to improve the provisions of legal services to members of the client community;

"(4) increase opportunities for legal education among individuals who are members of a minority group or individuals who are economically disadvantaged;

"(5) collect and disseminate information designed to coordinate and evaluate the effectiveness of the activities and programs for legal service in various parts of the country;

"(6) assist and coordinate all programs for the provision of legal service and legal assistance to the client community conducted or assisted by the Federal Government including—

"(A) reviewing all grants and contracts for the provision of legal services to the client community made under other provisions of Federal law by any agency of the Federal Government together with making recommendations to the appropriate Federal agency;

"(B) reviewing and making recommendations to the President and Congress concerning any proposal, whether by legislation or executive action, to establish a federally assisted program for the provision of legal services to the client community; and

"(C) upon request of the President, providing training, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation services to any federally assisted legal services program;

"(7) establish such procedures and take such other measures as may be necessary to assure that attorneys employed by the Corporation and attorneys paid in whole or in part from funds provided by the Corporation carry out the same duties to their clients and enjoy the same protection from interference as if such an attorney was hired directly by the client;

"(8) establish standards of eligibility for the provision of legal services to be rendered by any grantee or contractee of the Corporation with special provision for priority for members of the client community whose means are least adequate to obtain private legal services;

"(9) establish policies consistent with the best standards of the legal profession to assure the integrity, effectiveness and professional quality of the attorneys providing legal services under this title; and

"(10) carry on such other activities as would further the purpose of this title.

"(b) In the performance of the functions set forth in subsection (a) the Corporation is authorized to—

"(1) make grants, enter into contracts, leases, cooperative agreements or other transactions, in accordance with by-laws established by the Board of Directors appropriate to conduct the activities of the Corporation;

"(2) accept unconditional gifts or donations of services, money or property, real, per-

sonal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, and use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the purpose of carrying out its activities;

"(3) appoint such attorneys and other professional and clerical personnel as may be required and fix their compensation;

"(4) promulgate regulations containing criteria specifying the manner of approval of applications for grants based upon the following considerations—

"(A) the most economical, effective and comprehensive delivery of legal services to the client community;

"(B) peaceful resolution of grievances and resort to orderly means of seeking change; and

"(C) maximum utilization of the expertise and facilities of organizations presently specializing in the delivery of legal services to the client community;

"(5) establish and maintain a law library;

"(6) establish procedures for the conduct of legal services programs assisted by the Corporation containing a requirement that the applicant will give assurances that the program will be supervised by a policymaking board on which the members of the legal profession constitute a majority and members of the client community constitute at least one-third of the members of such Board.

"(c) In any case in which services are performed for the Federal Government by the Corporation the Corporation shall be reimbursed for the cost of such services pursuant to an agreement between the executive director of the Corporation and the head of the agency of the Federal Government concerned.

"NON-PROFIT AND NON-POLITICAL NATURE OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 907. (a) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(b) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any Director, officer, employee or any other individual except as reasonable compensation for services.

"(c) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"ACCESS TO RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 908. (a) Copies of all records and documents pertinent to each grant and contract made by the Corporation shall be maintained in a place readily accessible and open to public inspection during ordinary working hours for a period of at least five years subsequent to the making of such grant or contract.

"(b) Copies of all reports pertinent to the evaluation, inspection or monitoring of grantees and contractees shall be maintained for a period of at least three years, subsequent to such evaluation, inspection or monitoring visit. Upon request, substance of such reports shall be furnished to the grantee or contractee who is the subject of the evaluation, inspection or monitoring visit.

"(c) The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.

"FINANCING OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 909. In addition to any funds reserved and made available for payment to the Corporation from appropriations for carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for any fiscal year, there are further authorized to be appropriated for payment to the Corporation such sums as may be necessary for any fiscal year. Funds made available to the Corporation from appropriations for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

"RECORD AND AUDIT OF THE CORPORATION AND THE RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 910. (a) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by any independent licensed public accountant certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. Each such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person conducting the audit, and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balance, or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to any such person. The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required under this title. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit of the Corporation, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the income and expenses of the Corporation during the year, and a statement of the sources and application of funds, together with the opinion of the independent auditor of those statements.

"(b) (1) The financial transactions of the Corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operations may be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Corporation shall remain in the possession and custody of the Corporation.

"(2) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto, as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the Executive Director and to each member of the Board at the time submitted to the Congress.

"(c) (1) Each grantee or contractee, other than a recipient of a fixed price contract awarded pursuant to competitive bidding procedures, under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(2) The Corporation or any of its duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination of any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this section. The Comptroller General of the United States, or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose during any fiscal year for which Federal funds are available to the Corporation.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 911. The Corporation shall prepare an annual report for transmittal to the President and the Congress on or before the thirtieth day of January of each year, summarizing the activities of the Corporation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. This report shall include findings and recommendations concerning the preservation of the attorney-client relationships and adherence to the Code of Professional Responsibility of the American Bar Association in the conduct of programs supported by the Corporation. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the operations, activities, financial condition and accomplishments of the Corporation together with dissenting views and recommendations, if any, of Members of the Board.

"SEC. 912. As used in this title the term—

"(1) 'client community' means individuals unable to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate financial means;

"DEFINITIONS

"(2) 'member of the client community' includes any person unable to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate means;

"(3) 'representative of the client community' includes any person who is selected by members of the client community whether or not a member of that community;

"(4) 'legal services' includes legal advice, legal representation, legal research, education concerning legal rights and responsibilities and similar activities;

"(5) 'legal profession' refers to that body composed of all persons admitted to practice before the highest court of at least one State of the United States;

"(6) 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(7) 'nonprofit' as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual;

"(8) 'Corporation' means the National Legal Services Corporation to be established pursuant to this title.

"FEDERAL CONTROL

"SEC. 913. Nothing contained in this title shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors or employees, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation, or over the attorneys providing legal services pursuant to this title, or over the members of the client community receiving legal services pursuant to this title."

SEC. 3. (a) During the fiscal year 1972 the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall take such action as may be necessary, in cooperation with the Executive Director of the National Legal Services Corporation, to arrange for the orderly continuance by such Corporation of financial assistance to legal services programs assisted pursuant to sections 222(a)(3), 230, 232 or any other provision, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Whenever the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity determines that an obligation to provide financial assistance pursuant to any contract or grant agreement for such legal services will extend beyond six months after the date of enactment of this Act, he shall include in

any such contract or agreement provisions to assure that the obligation to provide such financial assistance may be assumed by the National Legal Services Corporation, subject to such modifications of the terms and conditions of that contract or grant agreement as the Corporation determines to be necessary.

(b) Effective six months after the date of enactment of this Act, section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is repealed.

SEC. 4. (a) Of the amounts appropriated to the Office of Economic Opportunity for carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there shall be reserved and made available to the Legal Services Corporation established pursuant to title IX of such Act, not less than the sums of $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the enactment of this Act but prior to the enactment of appropriations to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall, out of appropriations then available to him, make funds available to assist in meeting the organizational expenses of the Corporation and in carrying out its activities.

SEC. 5. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after section 622 thereof the following new section:

"RESPONSIBILITY FOR NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

"SEC. 623. Nothing in this Act, except title IX, and no reference to this Act unless such reference refers to title IX, shall be construed to affect the powers and activities of the National Legal Services Corporation."

THE REVENUE SHARING TRAP

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1971, I was privileged to address this House for 60 minutes on the politics and pitfalls of the administration's revenue sharing proposals. Subsequent to my speech, three articles in the Sacramento Bee have been brought to my attention. These articles clearly point out the folly of approaching solutions to national problems through the distribution of Federal funds to State and local governments with little or no Federal control.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting these articles in the RECORD, and I highly commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Mar. 7, 1971]

OPPONENTS MISS POINT OF NIXON PROGRAM FOR REVENUE SHARING

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's plan to return "power to the people" by sharing federal revenues with state and local governments deserves a better critique than it has received so far from political opponents.

Many Democrats in Congress have been quick to reject the proposal simply on the ground that state legislatures and city councils cannot be trusted to handle major new responsibilities.

Evidence of corruption and malfeasance is being compiled gleefully on Capitol Hill to show how the taxpayers' money would be squandered if Washington began to turn it over to state and local officials with no strings attached.

This crude attack, however, completely misses its target. Every lapse of virtue in statehouses and city halls can be duplicated by an instance of wrongdoing at the federal level. It would be difficult to pick the winner between Washington and other levels of government in a contest centering on honesty, intelligence or dedication.

But that is not—and should not be—the decisive criterion. What matters is whether at this stage in American history major problems lend themselves better to solutions at the national level—or can be neatly cut up and treated within the confines of state and local jurisdictions.

The question really boils down to one of practicality. Which approach is likely to produce a greater measure of success?

EASILY RESOLVED

Viewed in that light, the issue is easily resolved. Given the increasing "national" character of most of our social and economic problems, it is sheer delusion to pretend that a return to simpler days offers any real hope.

State and local governments cannot regulate conglomerate empires, oil cartels and utility combines which stretch across many states and even take on global dimensions. Nor can they cope with problems of economic dislocation, poverty, welfare dependence, rural migration and inadequate health care, which are rooted in developments hundreds and thousands of miles beyond their immediate borders.

Nixon himself has recognized this unavoidable set of affairs by a number of actions which have tended to centralize and expand power at the national level—in complete disregard of his official rhetoric.

It was under his administration that rail passenger service became effectively nationalized with the creation of Railpax—a move which abolishes the last vestiges of state control in this vital field.

It is under this administration that the federal government is expanding by quantum leaps its authority to control air and water pollution.

And it was Nixon who only recently recommended a new comprehensive health care system which for the first time would set national standards for the insurance industry and impose additional federal requirements on practically every employer in the nation.

Similarly, the President continues to fight for a welfare reform plan which would go a long way toward eliminating states and counties from any effective decisionmaking roles regarding public assistance programs. In education, he is recommending creation of national research institutes which could undermine much of the curriculum diversity now evident at elementary, secondary and university levels.

All these actions, of course, are triggered as practical responses to national problems which simply will not go away. The federal government may not have the best possible solutions. Or sometimes not even workable ones. But in these, as in so many other fields, it often turns out to be the only place where a critical problem can be tackled with some realistic expectation of success.

Even Gov. Ronald Reagan, whose rhetoric at times borders on secessionism, now clamors for federal action to solve farm labor disputes—a rank admission that "sovereign" California occasionally must turn to Washington for help.

WHY THE PUSH?

Why then the big push for revenue sharing, less power in Washington and a rebirth of state and local governments?

To some extent, this rhetoric satisfies a romantic longing in all of us for less complicated institutional mechanisms.

To the President it offers a potential means of dumping unpopular problems and decisions on state and local officials, while it camoflauges his opposite moves in the direction of concentrating power along the banks of the Potomac.

After all, revenue sharing and decentralization are being recommended by a President who so far has doubled the White House staff and tripled its budget.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee Mar. 9, 1971]

SHARING PLAN FAVORS LEAST NEEDY CITIES

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Beverly Hills would receive $24 for every resident under President Nixon's revenue sharing plan—twice as much as Sacramento's $12-per-capita share.

The municipal treasury of Palm Springs would be enriched by $26 for each inhabitant of that plush resort—double the $13-a-head slice earmarked for Fresno.

The City of Commerce in Los Angeles County, with one of the wealthiest tax bases in California, could claim $47 a person—more than five times as much as Modesto's $9 level.

These sharp disparities, which are just coming to light, are expected to intensify Democratic opposition to the President's tax-sharing plan—the cornerstone of his domestic program.

CENSUS FIGURES

A check of 1970 census figures shows practically every section of California would experience wide variations in revenue-sharing allocations from one city to another.

In many instances, communities with high levels of poverty would end up at the bottom of the list.

For example, affluent Carmel would qualify for $19 per capita while neighboring Monterey, faced with a growing list of urban problems, would be compensated only at the rate of $11.

In Los Angeles County, comparatively well-off Long Beach would receive $20 a person while economically depressed Compton would have to settle for a $5 level.

Even so, Compton would be more fortunate than several other communities in its county, including Norwalk, $2.10; Culver City, $1.60; Hawaiian Gardens, $1.70, and Cudahy, $1.30.

BASIS OF FORMULA

The highly varied pattern of per-capita rates is due to a White House decision to distribute revenue-sharing sums within each state on the basis of the tax effort of each jurisdiction.

The formula ignores such factors as population and need.

Thus, a city with a high tax base which has an easy time raising sufficient funds for municipal services would fare better than a community struggling with a rising population and low assessments.

STATE GOVERNMENT

California would receive $590 million in unrestricted grants under Nixon's plan to share $5 billion a year with smaller parts for state, county and city governments.

In determining each state's allocation, population would count as a major factor. But, when it comes to dividing those slices into smaller parts of state, county and city governments, each jurisdiction's revenue-raising effort becomes the governing element.

Thus, California's state government would keep $273 million—or about 46 per cent—because its tax collections are slightly less than the combined total of all revenues raised by city and county governments.

In turn, cities and counties would split the rest—$317 million, or 54 per cent of California's over-all allocation.

Of the $317 million, the cities would keep $154 million and the counties $163 million—again a split reflecting their respective tax-raising efforts.

Finally, the share of each city and county also would be determined by its relative performance in raising revenues.

For example, the Treasury Department places current revenues of the City of Sacramento at $29.5 million—about $116 a person.

SOME EXAMPLES

Beverly Hill's revenues are figured at $7.5 million—about $224 per capita, or just about double Sacramento's rate.

Thus, Beverly Hills would be entitled to $811,871 for its 33,416 residents under revenue sharing—or $24 per capita—while Sacramento would receive $3,179,135 for its 254,413 inhabitants—a rate of $12.

With eight times the population of Beverly Hills, Sacramento would receive only four times as much from Washington in revenue-sharing money.

In contrast, San Francisco would top them both—with $33 per capita. The bay city's high standing under the President's plan is traceable to two factors—a declining population and a fast rising commercial tax base.

Oakland would receive only $15 per capita.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Mar. 8, 1971]

STATE HAD RECORD YEAR GAIN IN U.S. FUNDS

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Figures released by the Treasury Department show California registered a record one-year gain of $775 million in federal grants to its state and local governments.

California's share rose to $2.998 billion in the last fiscal year, compared with $2.223 billion in the previous year.

Federal support for the state's welfare programs accounted for the lion's share of the new total and the huge jump.

FROM HUD

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare funneled $1.446 billion into California for various public assistance programs, an increase of $342 million over fiscal 1969.

Another major jump took place in federal highway aid, with payments to the state rising from $300 million to $495 million.

In contrast, California received $20.9 million for urban mass transportation, a drop of $3.3 million from the year prior.

12% OF TOTAL

The state's overall take of nearly $3 billion represents more than 12 per cent of a national total of 524.2 billion.

Nationally, grants to state and local governments rose by about $4 billion with California accounting for nearly 20 per cent of the increase.

New York remained in No. 2 position with $2.365 billion—$633 million behind California, New York's one-year gain totaled $318 million, less than half the increase registered by California.

BOUND TO INTENSIFY

By putting into sharp relief California's huge stake in existing federal grant-in-aid programs, the new figures are bound to intensify questions about the state's potential gains or losses under President Nixon's $5 billion revenue-sharing plan.

Under the President's proposal, California's state and local governments would receive $590 million a year in unrestricted funds. The White House maintains this money would be on top of the amounts the state now receives from grant-in-aid programs.

But critics contend congressional approval of revenue sharing inevitably would lead to a contraction or leveling off of existing grants. Were this to happen, California would be accepting an additional $590 million under revenue sharing but having to forego much bigger annual jumps in existing grants-in-aid.

BY NJ SOLON

The new statistics on federal grants were obtained by Rep. Charles W. Sandman Jr., R-NJ, in advance of official publication. Treasury officials said they remain subject to final review.

The congressman, who inserted each state's total in the Congressional Record, said the information should prove "most interesting" in the consideration of Nixon's revenue-sharing plan.

The grant totals are limited strictly to funds channeled to state and local agencies. They do not include federal payments to individuals, such as Social Security and veterans' benefits.

NOT REFLECTED

Nor do they reflect defense and other outlays for federal activities in the various states.

Thus, California's share of nearly $3 billion in federal grants represents only about 10 per cent of the estimated amount actually spent in the state by Washington in the last fiscal year.

The Treasury figures show the following changes in California's grant allocations from 1968–69 to 1969–70:

Agriculture—Food stamps, up from $20.6 million to $60.6 million; surplus commodities distribution, up from $13.4 million to $16.1 million; child nutrition, up from $8.6 million to $22.7 million.

Disaster relief—Up from $2.2 million to $60.9 million.

War on Poverty—Community action programs down from $91.6 million to $77.2 million; adult work training, up from $16.7 million to $18.6 million; Neighborhood Youth Corps, up from $22.9 million to $23.2 million; work experience training, up from $791,000 to $25.5 million.

Education—Elementary and secondary programs, $106 million, no change; "impact" aid to districts near federal installations, up from $55.8 million to $95.4 million; vocational education, up from $20.2 million to $22.5 million.

Health—Hospital, health research and health education facilities, down from $23.4 million to $21 million; comprehensive health planning, down from $13.4 million to $9.8 million; health manpower education, up from $5 million to $6.2 million; mental health research and services, up from $7.9 million to $18.1 million.

Housing and urban development—Low-rent public housing, up from $20.5 million to $31.8 million; urban renewal, up from $64 million to $65.3 million; open space grants, down from $9.5 million to $5.7 million; model cities, up from $258,000 to $2.5 million; urban planning, up from $2.1 million to $2.8 million.

Pollution control—Waste treatment facilities, up from $10.5 million to $13.2 million.

Law enforcement—Manpower training, up from $1.5 million to $37.6 million.

Unemployment compensation—Up from $69.2 million to $72.4 million.

Transportation—Airports, down from $6.7 million to $3 million.

WE MUST COMPLETE OUR JOB ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

(Mr. GROVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, the House took up without prior notice to the membership, and on a day when no business was scheduled, a conference report on the debt ceiling legislation to which the Senate had attached an amendment increasing social security benefits by 10 percent across the board. The increase is retroactive to the first of the year and includes a 5-percent increase in special payments to noninsured persons aged 72 and over.

I have two regrets, Mr. Speaker. One, that the legislation was brought in without due notice, depriving me of the opportunity to be recorded in favor of this long-delayed increase to help our retired citizens, those who are hardest hit by the insidious backdoor tax of inflation.

The other is that the conference report did only a half-way job. It struck out the proposed increase in allowable income, also referred to as an "increase in earnings test." At the present time social security beneficiaries may only earn up to $1,680 annually before loss of benefits.

Older people blessed with good health and talent should be encouraged to work, not penalized. We should set our sights on an increase now in the earnings test with a programed elimination over a reasonable period.

The conference report also neglected the very desirable feature of gearing benefits to the cost of living.

The job is only half done after months of promise and delay which has caused much suffering to our older citizens so many of whom face serious economic hardships.

Let us urge our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to complete the job swiftly.

DYNAMIC PROPOSAL BY GOVERNOR REAGAN ON WELFARE

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of welfare is escalating at an alarming rate, and this is certainly demonstrated by the rising welfare rolls. Many proposals and alternatives have been suggested. Most of them have been extremely costly, and offer no tangible or realistic hope for real and constructive reform. However, on the 3d of March 1971, the Honorable Governor Ronald Reagan of California, in an address, offered a sensible and feasible plan for the State of California. The Governor's plan would bring relief to the already overburdened taxpayer, and at the same time, would not penalize those on welfare in real need, or who have a desire to work and a desire to better themselves. His proposal is a dynamic example of State and local leadership taking the initiative to solve America's No. 1 domestic problem. If successful, Governor Reagan's plan can serve as a model for other Governors and other States to follow, as well as this entire Nation.

Governor Reagan's plan and speech of March 3, 1971, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN

Mr. Chairman, Members of Town Hall, Ladies and Gentlemen:

First let me thank you of Town Hall for your thoughtful and timely invitation. I suspect that you were aware you were providing a forum through which the people of California could be reached. In doing so, you

have been of great service because the people of California are confronted by a most serious problem.

In the last few days, I have been asked a number of times if the political honeymoon is over. I am not sure it ever started. On the wedding night someone said something about stepping into the next room to slip into something comfortable—and they never came back.

On January 4, in my inaugural remarks I said that unless we who had been elected to office were willing to completely reform our programs of social welfare, we would have to ask you for a tax increase this and every succeeding year as far as we could see into the future.

What we call California's welfare and health care system is in reality nothing more than a state implementation of federal mandates approaching $3½ billion in cost and leading us into sure bankruptcy unless we have the courage to choose another course before it is too late.

If misery loves company the theme music for the National Governors Conference in Washington last week must have been "Hearts and Flowers." Those states which have breezed along without having to tap all the potential tax sources such as the sales or statewide income tax are now adopting one or the other, or both. In an unprecedented crisis Pennsylvania ran totally out of state funds four days ago.

There was no partisanship at this conference nor in the unanimous endorsement of federal revenue sharing. But the topic dominating all others was welfare and how long government at any level could keep pace with it's ever increasing cost. I might add there was great interest in California because we were the only state readying a concrete proposal for welfare reform. Surprising was the general acceptance that added revenues were only temporary expedients and not a permanent answer to the problem.

Certainly this is true in California. The biggest of our welfare programs, Aid to Dependent Children, increased its case load 39 percent last year and its cost 42 percent. Medi-Cal is increasing more than twice as fast as our normal increase in revenues. One out of nine Californians is drawing some form of welfare now and by the end of the next fiscal year, if welfare goes on increasing at the present rate, it will be one out of seven.

Even cutting back legitimate government services and postponing important and needed projects, we face the fact that to continue the present welfare and Medi-Cal programs without change will require $220 million more than we have. To save the state $220 million in welfare means reducing the total costs more than $600 million. We cannot reduce our share without reducing costs at the county and the federal level. Or put another way, if we have to ask the taxpayers for an additional $220 million in state revenue, we force the counties to raise property taxes another hundred million and add roughly $300 million to federal costs. And of course the same citizen pays it all—county, state and federal. Right now, Californians are paying $32 billion in taxes of which more than $20 billion goes to Uncle Sam. That is a tax burden that pro-rates out at $4,152 for every average family of four in California. A choice has to be made. Either we tighten government's belt or we loosen your purse strings and extract even more money than we are now taking. I am unalterably opposed to that latter choice.

Last month I submitted to the legislature a budget which can be balanced without increased taxes if we undertake a total reform of welfare and Medi-Cal. About two hours ago a message outlining this reform was delivered to both chambers of the legislature. I had planned a more personalized delivery of this message but a funny thing happened to me on the way upstairs.

Perhaps it is just as well, for the message is probably the most comprehensive and detailed ever submitted by any governor of this state. It calls for a sweeping 70 point reform of the entire welfare system. Legislation by the Senate and Assembly will be required in some of the proposed changes. Others can be made administratively and we will need the cooperation of the federal government to complete the package. The Social Security Act says that states should be encouraged to experiment with demonstration projects. On this basis, we are requesting the necessary waivers.

If there were no fiscal crisis, we would still have to urge welfare reform on the grounds of common sense. Present regulations are so ambiguous that court decisions have added $441 million to the cost of California welfare since 1967 and if we lose the cases still pending, another $1.8 billion will be added. But an even more compelling reason for reform is one of moral responsibility.

We had a task force of volunteer citizens and our own appointees and staff working on this problem last summer. The counties were doing the same and some of our reform proposals, incidentally, reflect their findings.

Reform is needed not only because welfare is an administrative disaster leading us to bankruptcy, but because it is a tragic failure for those who are destitute and who have nowhere else to turn for the most basic requirements of living. Let me emphasize this latter point because any time changes are proposed in welfare there are those who will raise a cry that we are lacking in compassion for the poor. The very opposite is true. Welfare today is spread so thin it is incapable of properly caring for the truly needy and destitute. It is spread thin in attempting to provide for too many who are not needy but who through loopholes are legally eligible to claim welfare benefits, and too many who are receiving aid illegally because there is just no way to prevent their cheating and because there is a gigantic extravagant administrative overhead bound in endless miles of red tape and born of overlapping and duplicating agencies.

I have heard the repeated statements that welfare fraud is only one or two percent and not really an item of concern—or even something you can do much about. The truth is no one knows. No one in the United States knows how many people are receiving welfare. We all know how many checks are being mailed out but we have no way of knowing how many individuals are getting several checks under different names. We do not know because regulations keep us from checking on an applicant's declaration—we must accept his word as to his need.

Recently in the San Francisco bay area, a group of citizens set out to show how easy it is to get on welfare. Some of them managed to get on as many as four times in one day in a single office. In our neighbor state of Nevada, the governor (who declared himself to me as a liberal Democrat), ordered a house to house canvas of welfare recipients. (They have a limited enough population to be able to do this.) This actual head count revealed 22 percent of their welfare recipients are receiving welfare dishonestly. Some time ago a welfare conducted investigation in the District of Columbia turned up less than two percent of fraud—a congressional investigation then found it was 57 percent. Even so, I have to question whether fraud costs as much as the legal kind of cheating we have created by our own well intentioned effort to provide work incentives. This idea (spawned in Washington) has created a whole new class of affluent poor.

An answer was needed for the individual who sees no reason to work if the dollars for working only replace the dollars he or she can get from welfare. It was decided that a proper incentive would be to supplement earnings by continuing to pay at least a part of the welfare grant. By the time they had finished "thinking of everything", the intended incentive had become a windfall known in the welfare trade as the 30 and a third formula. It goes to work when the recipient gets a job. How much of the welfare grant he keeps is determined by not counting $30 of his earnings as eligible income, nor do you count one-third of the remainder, nor deduction for income tax, union dues, or pension plan. Additional allowance is made for clothing, child care, transportation (and this includes car payments) and finally $25 miscellaneous. There is virtually no ceiling on earnings above which you become ineligible for welfare although we have found it usually does not go much above $1,200 a month. At least one man in California, however, managed to keep his welfare grant plus $16,800 a year in salary. More typical is the case I described in the current issue of "U.S. News and World Report". I gave an example of a California recipient receiving a grant of $339 a month who took a job paying $582 a month. The formula reduced the $582 to $42 countable income and thus the $339 grant was only cut by $29. This individual now has an income of $892 a month—a good portion of it tax free—and is eligible for Medi-Cal and food stamps.

Our task force surveyed those counties which together carry 40 percent of the welfare case load. We learned that working welfare recipients have average earnings of $346 a month. Their grants in aid not counting Medi-Cal (for which they remain eligible) averaged $186. The grants for those with no outside earnings or income are only $21 more or $207 a month. Simple decency suggests reducing the supplemental grant and increasing the $207 so as to provide a more decent living for the totally destitute. Our reform proposes doing this. We will first of all provide better for the truly needy. Admittedly our first requirement in these stringent times must be balancing the budget but even so we can also improve the lot of the poor and as we put our financial house in order do so even more substantially.

Some will accuse me of citing horror stories which they claim are only isolated cases. But they are wrong, Contra Costa County estimates it has 2500 people fully employed and on welfare; 148 of them earn more than $600 a month. Alameda County puts its figure at almost 4000 with 198 earning more than $600.

We can have realistic eligibility procedures to eliminate or at least curtail fraud, a ceiling on earnings above which no welfare payments will be made and a reduction in the grants to those who have outside income. Able-bodied and employable recipients will be required to work or take job training and we will go after those fathers who have deserted their families, contributing nothing to their support. In California they number 250,000. We intend to provide the counties with the financial incentive to solve this problem. Properly pursued it could be used to help the counties offset their welfare expenses.

Strengthening the role of the family is basic to our proposal. It is called: "Meeting the Challenge: a responsible plan for welfare and Medi-Cal reform." Obviously time will not permit the details of the 70 point proposal we have made, but let me summarize the more important changes. First, we think the unemployables who are in fact pensioners, the aged, the disabled and blind should be removed from the welfare structure. The state will assume all administrative and grant payments for these citizens numbering about 600,000. Their payments will be automated similar to the method used in paying Social Security. There is no need for a costly bureaucracy checking to see if the elderly are continuing to get older. With the administrative savings we should eventually be able to increase their pensions so as to give life a little more dignity, pleasure and meaning.

The state would be taking over about $92 million in present county expenses but in another area—"Aid to Families with Dependent Children"—the counties would assume an additional $84 million of cost. So the net effect of these statistics is $8 million in savings to the counties in 1971–72.

Let me say here and now to those who have charged we intend to balance state spending by dumping the load on the counties . . . they are, as usual, talking through their hats. One of the absolute musts in this reform program is that there be no net cost shift to the counties. As a matter of fact, let me repeat what I said earlier, if there is *no* reform, county costs will go up $100 million. With reform this will, of course, be eliminated. The $8 million projected savings next year will grow in future years and could be as much as $47 million in savings to the counties during 1972–73.

With the change of the elderly and disabled to a pension status, welfare will then be dealing with the potentially employable. As of now welfare is as I have described it "at sea without rudder or compass." Just putting ever increasing numbers of people on a dole and providing food and shelter is not a worthwhile goal. These people are not a faceless mass—they are individuals with individual and unique reasons why many have been unable to get into the competitive labor market. Finding and treating with that unique and personal reason will give welfare a purpose and a goal. The goal must be to eliminate, if possible, the need for itself. We must begin to measure our success by how many people we have removed from the rolls each year, not how many we have added. We intend to place the employable welfare recipient under the jurisdiction of the Department of Human Resources Development. This department's total effort is devoted to job hunting and job training. Social workers assigned to this new jurisdiction will be judged not on the basis of how many people they place on welfare, but how many they place in jobs. This entire concept was born of recommendations made by the County Supervisors Association.

California has not been hesitant about job training programs, quite the contrary. The only major government funded program now dealing with welfare job training is "WIN"—work incentive program. Almost a third of all those who have obtained jobs through "WIN" in the entire nation, have done so in California.

Now we propose going further. The able-bodied employables will be expected to work in a public work force if they are not engaged in a job training program. They will receive the same benefits they are getting now, but will in return work at public assistance jobs which will benefit the community and the state. These will not be boondoggles or meaningless tasks for some punitive reason of "work for the sake of working." Every department of the state has been told to list those things it would do if it had the manpower and the funds. In addition, local government will be asked to provide work which can range from supervising school playgrounds and helping in child care centers, to working in the field of environment. Los Angeles County has already proposed using recipients as school watchmen to prevent vandalism. The program will be permanent but the individuals will be as temporary as we can make them. Every effort will be made to move them from this public work force into jobs in the private sector.

If an individual refuses to take a job when it is available, participate in a job training program or in this interim public work force, he or she will be denied further welfare assistance.

This, very much briefed down, is the direction our welfare reform takes. There are, in addition, changes in eligibility standards, elimination of unnecessary red tape and paperwork, increased auditing of abuses, flat grant computations and prior month budgeting to determine the size of welfare grants.

The goals are simple and straight forward: to increase our assistance to the truly needy; to require those who are able to work to seek work, train for a job or serve their community if asked as a reasonable condition for receiving welfare; and to strengthen family responsibility as the basic element in our society.

Then we propose to reform our health care program, known as Medi-Cal. This program went into operation in the spring of 1966. By spring of 1967 it was in financial trouble and was bogged down administratively with providers of service waiting six months or more for payment. Some of the management snarls have been taken care of but not the problems created by its unlimited benefits plus the case load explosion in welfare.

The working men and women in California who pay for this program are providing a level of health care for the others, that they can't possibly afford for themselves. Most health care plans or industrial and union programs offer no more than eight services with the individual paying part of the cost for each of those. Medi-Cal offers 20 totally free services with no restriction whatsoever on utilization.

In 1967 there were 97 claims of Medi-Cal for every one hundred participants—today there are 141 claims per 100 enrollees. The per capita health care cost per year for the average citizen is $312. The average cost per Medi-Cal recipient was $517 last year. We are proposing legislation to bring Medi-Cal benefits in line with those which the taxpaying citizens can afford.

Instead of a no-limit credit card Medi-Cal will provide a card good for the same amount of health care services the average citizen uses each year. Provision will, of course, be made for the cases of catastrophic illness or accident or emergency. To control overutilization we propose a partial or token payment by every Medi-Cal patient for the services he receives—a dollar for each visit to the doctor or for each drug prescription, etc. The provider would collect this and bill Medi-Cal for the balance.

In North Carolina a test was run on drug prescriptions alone and utilization was reduced by 25 per cent. In England socialized medical program token payment resulted in almost 10 percent reduction when tried.

I know that many will see our proposed welfare reform only as a device to balance the budget and this will lead to charges that we are placing dollars above human beings. To do so is at best the cheapest kind of demagoguery and at worst selfish, irresponsible protection of self interest.

Of course, we seek to balance the budget; the Constitution and common sense require that we do so. What is the alternative? An increase in state taxes which must be accompanied by a corresponding increase in county taxes and further deficit spending at the federal level. And if all of that is done, it must be repeated again and again until the very system collapses.

In the meantime, welfare goes on failing those who need it most, destroying our most precious resource, our people. Finally faced with economic crisis, we will find ourselves no longer able to help those who turn to us because they have no other refuge. Our present fiscal plight is not the reason for welfare reform; it is the excuse. It prompts us to do at last that which has needed doing for a long, long time.

Thirty-six years ago, in the dark days of the Depression, a president of the United States who called on our people to be compassionate warned us at the same time to temper compassion with wisdom. Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The lessons of history show conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit." Was he right? Is there a sickness of spirit spreading over our land?

Last week in Washington, D.C., the "National Welfare Rights Organization," ostensibly formed to protect the interests of the needy, picketed the governor of Nevada for daring to expose those who fraudulently posed as needy in order to rob their fellow citizens. In one of our cities a man with no dependents and earning $800 a month sued to prevent a county from making him contribute $20 a month to the support of his aged mother. In St. Louis an industrial firm ran blockbuster ads in six papers offering the unskilled, jobs at $100 to $150 a week. One hundred forty-one applied, but most weren't seriously looking for work or they didn't like the money. Of the thirty-eight who finally went on the payroll, 27 didn't show up or if they did, quit in the first two days. The company is still advertising.

An unemployed young father in California, finally forced to accept welfare, is urged by the social worker to free himself of debts by declaring personal bankruptcy. His only assets, his household furnishings, are taken to pay his creditors a few cents on the dollar. But this, he is cheerfully told by the welfare worker, makes him eligible for a house full of brand new furniture courtesy of the taxpayers.

Perhaps you saw the Negro mother on the TV news telling of how she was forced into welfare. She had never been on welfare before. She worked from late afternoon until 11 or 12 at night to support her children. Each evening she left the children at home in charge of the oldest. She arrived home from work one night to find a social worker waiting for her. She was told her children were to be taken from her unless she stayed home to care for them. When she asked how she could support them if she didn't go to work, she was told to quit work and go on welfare. Wouldn't it make more sense to provide a baby sitter?

To those who say reform of welfare is impossible or unworkable, I can only say, "not to Californians." Last week we talked to Secretary Elliot Richardson of HEW and were assured of his very real interest and cooperation. We talked to the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate and obtained their enthusiastic pledge of support in our efforts to make California welfare a pilot program. They asked how many governors would favor what we were trying to do. It was the last day of the conference and we could only contact 27. Twenty-four of them, Democrats and Republicans, signed a letter supporting our major proposals, three took the letter to consult with their congressional delegations, all of them asked for our detailed reform proposals. We are writing the other 23 and have every reason to expect most or all will sign the letter based on their views as expressed at the conference.

I asked for the opportunity to address the joint session of our legislature precisely because of the news coverage that would follow. It is absolutely imperative that the people of California understand what we are trying to accomplish.

Right now the propaganda fires are being stoked by special interest groups determined to resist and kill any effort to change welfare. In the days ahead the legislative committee hearings will be the target for demonstrations and pressure of every kind.

We have had great cooperation from some in the social welfare field who are true professionals and who want order brought out of the present mess. But others, feeling their bureaucratic empires threatened, will challenge every proposal and predict dire results if any part of our plan is adopted. Others will urge total federal takeover as the only solution. This would mean surrendering to those who caused the problem in the first place, and few in federal government want this.

Today we stand at a crossroad. We can continue to talk about welfare, complain about it and watch it grow unchecked while we raise taxes this year and every year thereafter to feed its cancerous growth. Or we can take the steps necessary to control it and reform it so that it will at last have the proud purpose of maximizing human dignity and salvaging the destitute.

This is not a jerry-built, hasty answer to a crisis. It is the result of months of work and study. It is perhaps our last chance. Neither Democratic or Republican, it is humanitarian—and it is ready to be tried.

I have addressed this message to the people of California because we need you.

NATIONAL PARKINSON FOUNDATION

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 of this year, the National Parkinson Foundation held its 12th annual Bob Hope Dinner. Bob Hope is Honorary National Chairman of the National Parkinson Foundation. He for 12 years has attended this great fund-raising dinner for research in respect to Parkinson's disease and for rehabilitation programs for the victims of Parkinson's. Bob Hope provides a thrilling evening of entertainment by having many personalities of distinguished national reputation to perform and acting as master of ceremonies himself. In addition, Bob Hope makes annually a generous contribution to the fight against Parkinson's disease which has been carried on very magnifically by the National Parkinson Foundation and the National Parkinson Institute, under the dedicated direction of a great and wonderful lady, Mrs. Jeanne Levey, who with her husband, a victim of Parkinson's disease, founded the National Parkinson Foundation.

My wife was chairman of the dinner this year as she has been for many years previously and she is national chairman of the women's division of the National Parkinson Foundation in which I have also taken an active part.

The National Parkinson Foundation was very fortunate to have as the principal speaker at this year's dinner the Honorable Robert H. Finch, Counsellor to the President. Mr. Finch, out of his great knowledge of the subject from his experience as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his warmhearted compassion for the victims of this killing and crippling disease, delivered a magnificent address which gave new heart and encouragement to both the victims of Parkinson's disease and those who have struggled to conquer it with such dynamic leadership.

All honor to a great lady like Mrs. Jeanne Levey and my wife and others who worked devotedly with them and to such great men as Robert H. Finch and Bob Hope for what they have done and will do to find the cause and cure of Parkinson's disease and afford relief to the 1 million people in the United States who are Parkinson's victims.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the able address of Mr. Finch on this moving occasion in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. FINCH

Sitting next to me tonight is one of the most lively, most energetic, and most dedicated women I have ever had the pleasure of knowing . . . Mrs. Jeanne Levey. She is vital proof that charming ladies can indeed lead in the betterment of their community and Nation.

As the motivating force behind this tremendous endeavor, Mrs. Levey has built the Parkinson Foundation into a medical facility of the highest caliber.

Now I know that Mrs. Levey couldn't have accomplished all that she has without the generous support of all of you present. So my tribute to her is a tribute to you as well—for sharing her dream.

I couldn't begin to give the deserved recognition to all those who have given special help to Mrs. Levey over the years, but I would like to pay my compliments to Congressman and Mrs. Claude Pepper. Claude, your vice chairman, has long been recognized across the Nation for his valuable contributions to the betterment of health for all our citizens, and he has a long list of impressive awards and tributes which salute his valuable efforts.

But particularly I want to honor the man we all salute tonight, Bob Hope.

No one in this room would disagree with the statement that he is literally one of the great humanitarians of our time.

Nothing could be more appropriate than to have this new Parkinson's Research Institute named in his honor.

When you consider the millions he has raised for charitable causes—the worthwhile endeavors he has been identified with—I guess you'd have to say he's sort of a one-man ambulatory HEW.

Gosh, come to think of it, if you put Bob's generous impulses and fund raising prowess together with the assets of Howard Hughes you could probably do away with the Federal Government entirely.

I will have to talk to the President about that—now that would be *real* Government reorganization.

The last two years when he did his annual Christmas show for the troops abroad, I worked with Bob so the boys would be actually signing up and preparing to return to college. We called it Project "Hope." It was a great success. Over 50,000 men signed up in 1969 alone.

The President's Message to Congress three days ago is a landmark in our pursuit of health. Here is a national strategy which has been two years in the preparation, and which will marshal and coordinate a variety of health forces, both private and public, to meet the major needs of our people. The proposals cap a long self-examination.

In 1969 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare launched a program to determine how America's health capabilities could best be used to meet our health needs.

Early in the inventory, we saw the unevenness in the distribution of our health efforts. There was an overabundance of funding and manpower in one area—a shortage in another. Some needs were overstressed, and others disregarded. And through it all—the most advanced nation in the world, in health research, capabilities, and expenditures—the United States, continued to receive poor marks in health statistics. You know them well.

This shortcoming required immediate attention from the new Administration in 1969—and as Secretary of the Department, I was pleased to see the health services turn to, and verify the need for, a new strategy.

The efforts have continued under Secretary Richardson and in our Domestic Council. The result is the President's plan.

It is a new template for making certain that when we invest more of our Nation's resources in the health of our people, we will get a full return on our investment—and we will avoid and overcome the ills that have so long and so often befallen us.

President Nixon has asked Congress to build this new strategy on these basic principles. First we must build on the strengths we have established—one of those strengths is the diversity of our system. We must take advantage of the range of choices our health structure offers to doctors and patients alike, so that from this spectrum of services and achievements, we can select and maximize the care and the cure that will do best.

Second, we must increase our health capabilities by increasing our health manpower. There is need for more doctors and more paramedical personnel. By expanding our medical training facilities, and accelerating their programs, our private health personnel will be increased, and health care will be more widely available and accessible to all.

Third, we must organize for efficiency. So many of our philosophers say, "Money isn't everything." (Even Bob Hope says it, but not out loud.)

In health care this is clearly the problem of the day. But we have one immediate solution. Preventive medicine is a lot less expensive.

We can usually be sure that *an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure*. We can always be sure that it costs a lot less in money, time, and especially in pain.

Certainly curative medicine is the last resort in defense against disease. Preventive medicine is the first. And it is the only truly satisfactory way to insure personal health.

The best patient care, the most effective care, comes before any illness—not after.

Here is the thrust of our national health strategy. We seek improvements in quality—based on research and discovery. We seek improvements in availability—based on increased numbers of better trained physicians and health personnel. We seek improvements in efficiency—resulting from a broadened practice of preventive medicine.

THE FIGHT AGAINST PARKINSON'S DISEASE

The pitched battle which all of us here wage against Parkinson's disease is one whose success will be near and dear to me. It is near, because relatives, friends and clients of mine suffered it. And it is dear, because those I have seen in its throes suffered such untold anguish.

It is an unexpected invader, stealing in and striking almost without warning—taking its toll really before a defense can be made against its dread progress. Those who have watched know best.

But tonight, we can say that our concerted struggle has brought a promise of victory.

We could be on the verge of solving the riddle of Parkinson's disease—how it is caused, how it can be cured or arrested, and how it can be prevented. I can dare to make

this bold statement because of the vital work you are doing here in Miami, for example, and because that work is backed up by substantial efforts in research that will answer these questions.

These earnest efforts have brought us L-Dopa, and enabled us to wisely use this first really effective anti-Parkinson drug to arrest the effects of the disease. Now, however, neurologists predict even greater potential.

L-Dopa will be the new research tool whose usefulness in further discoveries about the disease will prove at least as important as its immediate effectiveness in counteracting Parkinsonism.

As Secretary of HEW I soon got excited about L-Dopa. Let me tell you why.

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke was a source of that excitement (Dr. MacNichol) because preliminary findings were being positively corroborated. Large-scale trials by other research projects confirmed earlier conclusions so that we could give the green light to widespread use of the drug. In June of 1970, while I was still Secretary of HEW, the Food and Drug Administration was able to license L-Dopa for prescription sale.

In the Domestic Council we have continued to receive favorable reports on research with the drug—in Brookhaven National Laboratory, where Dr. George Cotzias (COT'-SEE-US) continues his broadened work of discovery—and in Miami. Here, the National Parkinson Institute was one of the first organizations in the world to have the vision and courage to go ahead with L-Dopa while it was still considered highly experimental.

The hundreds of patients you have treated can testify to your strikingly successful results.

Some additional, advanced work you are doing is even more current.

An important question now is whether L-Dopa really changes the progress of Parkinson's disease. Does it actually arrest it? Or is it merely symptomatic treatment?

There is a cooperative project on this, which promises to give us an answer to the question.

Together with the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, the National Parkinson Foundation is collecting data on patients who were here—at the Institute—between 1962 and 1964. This information is being matched against identical information for post-L-Dopa patients. The results of the work are beginning to come in, and they will be examined carefully.

To put it all together, now—

Everyone I know, who is aware of the work of this organization, has been impressed and indeed inspired.

The dedication and the courage shown by Mrs. Levey—and by the other leaders in the organization.

The volunteers—the contributors—all of these are dedicated as well—and all have exceeded the call of duty and certainly of charity.

But the most impressive test of any institution of this kind is what you have done for the patients. There is the final proof of success. And now, there is a vision of even greater success.

Only a few years ago the only thought for Parkinson patients was that the disease process could be slowed so that they might enjoy a few more active years.

Today, there is a new expectation that in a short while the process can be completely controlled or arrested.

Then over a million Americans will be freed from the virtual slavery of this tortuous crippler.

And here—*your deeds are father to more than just a wish.*

So tonight we are one step closer to that day when we will be able to say with Bob Hope, *Thanks for Making Parkinson's a Memory.*

NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) and more than 100 other Members in both Houses of Congress in introducing this bill to establish a National Legal Services Corporation. Identical legislation is to be introduced in the other body when the Senate meets tomorrow. Its chief sponsors there are Senators MONDALE and TAFT.

The Legal Services program giving people who cannot afford a lawyer full access to the American system of law has proven itself a very effective tool in redressing the problems of poverty. It is developing in many parts of this Nation a confidence in the ability of the law to be a force for good among people who have always thought of the law as the loanshark, the Welfare Department, or an adversary. It is offering hope to people who heretofore have had to face the legal system without education or sophistication.

Despite the program's success, legal services attorneys regularly confront conflict-of-interest problems and political pressures because of its location in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

In the early days of Legal Services, the Office of Economic Opportunity provided a natural location for the initiation and maturing of the legal assistance program. Nevertheless, experience has taught us the difficulties that are inherent in this structure. Throughout the past 5 years—regardless of which administration governed—the integrity of legal help for the poor has been challenged by politics and conflicts. Under the present structure, special attorney-client problems necessarily arise when suits are brought against agencies of the Federal Government, or against State and municipal governments.

The National Legal Services Corporation will encompass the full range of legal assistance presently offered through OEO. The Corporation approach is designed simply to meet three serious needs of the legal services effort—independence, security, and viability to the poor.

The problems of the OEO legal services program have been the subject of considerable study this past year by the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization—known as the Ash Commission—and by the American Bar Association Committee on Right to Legal Services. Both the ABA Committee and the Ash Commission have reached the conclusion that the objective of legal services—assuring that the Nation's poor have full access to our legal system—will stand the greatest chance of success by making the program an independent corporation. By the legislation we introduce today, we hope to implement that recommendation.

The ABA consultant's report, written by Charles L. Edson, followed a review of all pertinent Federal statutes as well as more than 70 interviews with leaders in the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, and throughout the U.S. Government. The final report contains an appendix written by the Washington law firm of Covington and Burling asserting that the Corporation proposal has been found to be legal and constitutional in all respects.

The National Legal Services Corporation will be established as a separate title under the Economic Opportunity Act. It is patterned after the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Corporation will be funded by yearly appropriations from Congress. The first fiscal year authorization is $140 million, about twice the amount spent for the present program. OEO officials estimate that present funding provides legal assistance to less than 20 percent of eligible low-income Americans.

The Corporation will be administered by a 19-member Board of Directors. Five members of the Board will be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member will be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, upon the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Six members serve by virtue of their office, including the president and president-elect of the American Bar Association, president of the American Trial Lawyers Association, president of the National Bar Association, president of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, and the president of the American Association of Law Schools. Three Board members will be chosen by a Clients Advisory Council and three will be chosen by a Project Attorney's Advisory Council—each council to be established by the act. The Executive Director of the Corporation, selected by the Board, will also be a voting member of the Board of Directors.

Six months after the date of enactment of this legislation, the Corporation will become fully operative. During the transition period, the Board of Directors will be selected and the Corporation will take necessary organizational steps. OEO will continue to administer the legal services program throughout this transitional period.

I want to stress the fact this legislation has broad bipartisan support. The delivery of legal help to an individual who cannot afford it is critical to each of us, regardless of political or philosophical persuasion.

In drafting this legislation we have sought the advice of many persons in and out of Government, and over a period of many months. We believe it is the best possible way to assure equal justice for all Americans. We strongly urge our colleagues in both Houses of Congress to

act swiftly to establish the independence of legal services.

Mr. Speaker, as supplementary information for my colleagues, I want to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from two lengthy studies on the legal services program. The first excerpt comes from the Ash Council Memorandum to the President, released February 6, 1971; the second is from the consultant's report of the Committee on the Right to Legal Services of the American Bar Association. Following the excepts, I will include a section-by-section analysis of the National Legal Services Corporation Act.

EXCERPTED FROM: THE CORPORATION FOR LEGAL SERVICES, A CONSULTANT'S REPORT, APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RIGHT TO LEGAL SERVICES, SECTION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

SUMMARY

The five years of the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity have been marked by singular achievement. Legal Services lawyers now handle a million matters a year for those who otherwise would see justice denied. Some cases have resulted in landmark judicial decisions significantly altering the law as it affects the poor. Impulses generated by the program have affirmatively affected the law schools, the law firms and other legal institutions.

The program's success dictates that serious thought be given to its permanent structuring. * * * The Departments of Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development, and Justice each have some logical claim to the program, and long term security might be gained if legal services were submerged within a large department. However, legal services lawyers have brought numerous suits against both HEW and HUD funded agencies and those departments as well. Justice represents these departments when they face court challenges. Placing legal services within any of them would create serious conflicts. Further, legal services within either HEW or HUD could mean a replay of the destructive administrative conflicts that have plagued it at OEO. The possibility of placing the program within the Administrative Office of the Courts or the Judiciary itself was rejected on conceptual, administrative and financial grounds.

The study of independent entities focuses on one model of compelling attractiveness, the federally-funded private non-profit corporation as exemplified by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Congress established this corporation in 1967 as a vehicle to channel federal funds to the producers and distributors of educational television programming. The First Amendment concerns of communications freedom that impelled this entity have equal cogency with respect to Legal Services' need for independence. * * *

Legal Services could enjoy similar success if administered by such a private non-profit federally-funded corporation. It is recommended as the permanent funding vehicle for the program. * * *

Law Reform and the Legal Ethic

The OEO Legal Services Guidelines issued in early 1966 stressed the necessity for law reform—a position reemphasized not only by all Directors of the Legal Services program but by OEO Directors as well. President Nixon recognized the need for such activity when he stated in his Message of August 11, 1969:

"The sluggishness of many institutions—at all levels of society—in responding to the needs of individual citizens, is one of the central problems of our time. Disadvantaged persons in particular must be assisted so that they full understand the lawful means of making their needs known and having their needs met."

In addition, the ethics of the legal profession require a lawyer to serve his client by any permissible legal remedy to secure his object. Canon 7 of the Code of Professional Responsibility commands, "A lawyer should represent a client zealously within the bounds of the law." Ethical Consideration 7-1 elaborates:

"The duty of a lawyer, both to his client and to the legal system, is to represent his client zealously within the bounds of the law, which includes Disciplinary Rules and enforceable professional regulations. The professional responsibility of a lawyer derives from his membership in a profession which has the duty of assisting members of the public to secure and protect available legal rights and benefits. In our government of laws and not of men, each member of our society is entitled to have his conduct judged and regulated in accordance with the law; to seek any lawful objective through legally permissible means; and to present for adjudication any lawful claim, issue or defense."

This explicit command makes no exception to a lawyer who feels that his clients' rights can only be redressed by challenging a law or practice that impinges on those rights. In the final analysis, law reform is no more than a lawyer performing his ethical and professional duty for his client.

Basis of Judgment

Quickly summarized, to perform its mission, a permanent legal services structure must couple *independence* for the program with the *security* needed to assure its continuation.

Independence connotes: Freedom of a lawyer to represent his client to the limits of his ability within the bounds of professional discretion, including a challenge to established or favored institutions, laws or practices.

Freedom from any political intimidation or retaliation for such representation whatsoever, including efforts to bar action against public agencies.

Freedom for a legal services lawyer to represent his client pursuant to the Code of Professional Responsibility and the highest practices of the profession without interference by any outside source, lay or legal. As Disciplinary Rule 5-107(b) states:

"A lawyer shall not permit a person who recommends, employs or pays him to render legal services for another to direct his professional judgment in rendering such legal services."

As Ethical Consideration EC5-23 amplifies the issue:

"Since a lawyer must always be free to exercise his professional judgment without regard to the interest or motives of a third person, the lawyer who is employed by one to represent another must constantly guard against erosion of his professional freedom."

By security is meant the establishment of a permanent legal services structure with the capacity to achieve governmental, public, client and bar understanding of and support for the provocative and controversial role of legal services in a free society.

Private, nonprofit federally aided corporations

Perhaps the least known of all government-affiliated entities, the federally-supported non-profit corporation enjoys a long history. Since 1867, the federal government has been the principal source of funds for Howard University, a comprehensive university organization located in the District of Columbia. Howard is governed by its own trustees, selected independently from any federal government source. The federal government has a similar relationship with another private institution in the nation's capital—Gallaudet College, a higher institution for deaf persons. Since 1879, Congress has been making funds available to the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, a non-profit corporation, to assist in the education of the blind by distributing braille books and other equipment.

Two well-known variations of the federally-assisted non-profit corporation are the American Red Cross and the Smithsonian Institution. Congress chartered the Red Cross to fulfill United States obligations under the Geneva Convention and the President appoints the chairman and seven members of the board of governors; however, the Red Cross receives no direct federal funding for its activities and thus provides an undesirable model for the Legal Services program. The Smithsonian Institution, a charitable non-profit corporation, has a dual status—private and governmental. It administers a number of federally-funded programs and, in its private capacity, receives and administers contracts and grants and accepts gifts and bequests from non-federal sources. Its governing body, the Board of Regents, includes the Vice President, the Chief Justice, three members of the Senate, three members of the House, and six citizen members. All in all, the Smithsonian presents an interesting blending of both public and private funding to carry out activities in the public interest.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting

In January 1967, after a year of study, the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television concluded an exhaustive report on public interest broadcasting. Significantly, the Commission recommended extensive federal funding for television program production, although recognizing the free speech danger implicit in government participation in the communications media.

"Because we contemplate federal assistance to Public Television on a far larger scale than at present, the pressing need arises to identify the manner in which federal funds will flow to the system. There is at once involved in the relation between freedom of expression, intimately and necesarily a concern of Public Television, and federal support. (Carnegie Commission, *Public Television—A Program for Action*, at pp. 36-37.)"

The Commission proposed the establishment of a federally-chartered non-profit corporation which would neither be an agency nor an establishment of the United States Government. The considerations of broadcasting integrity that impelled the Carnegie Commission to suggest such an entity are equally relevant to the question of Legal Services freedom.

Legislation embodying the Commission's report was introduced shortly after its issuance. The following excerpts from the hearings show that Congress was appraised of and sensitive to the free speech problems involved.

Fred Friendly, a television consultant to the Ford Foundation posed the issue at the Senate hearings:

"Of one thing we can be certain: Public Television will rock the boat. There will be—there should be—times when every man in politics—including you—will wish that it had never been created. But Public Television should not have to stand the test of political popularity at any given point in time. *Its most precious right will be the right to rock the boat.* (Hearings before Communications Subcommittee of Commerce Committee, U.S.

Senate, April 11, 1967, 90th Congress, 1st Session, S. 1190, at p. 173.) (Emphasis added.)"

At the hearings Senator Hugh Scott (Pa.) recognized the necessity for

". . . total freedom, if that could be obtained, in programming and in the presentation of ideas and in the protection of thought we hate, protection of the unpleasant, the protection of the Lar Dailys of this country, for example, who like to get out in uniforms and run for office, the protection of the oddball, beatnik, crackpot, jackass, fool, *the protection of anybody*. (Hearings, at p. 151.) (Emphasis added.)"

Better credos could not be stated for the Legal Services program.

Both the House and Senate Committees recognized in their reports the compelling need for the government to keep its hands off the operations of the corporation. As stated in the House report:

"How can the Federal Government provide a source of funds to pay part of the cost of educational broadcasting and not control the final product? That question is answered in the bill by the creation of a non-profit educational broadcasting corporation.

"Every witness who discussed the operation of the Corporation agreed that funds for programs should not be provided directedly by the Federal Government. It was generally agreed that a non-profit Corporation, directed by a Board of Directors, none of whom will be Government employees, will provide the most effective insulation from Government control or influence over the expenditure of funds. (H.R. 90-794, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, August 21, 1967, 90th Congress, 1st Session, at p. 15.)"

CONCLUSION

Judge Learned Hand taught that unless the spirit of liberty dwells within the hearts and minds of men, no court can be its ultimate protector. Similarly, unless legal services has wide-spread public and official support and understanding, no entity will withstand adverse pressures. However, within the ambit of this overriding warning, the proposed Corporation for Legal Services affords the greatest promise of independence coupled with permanence. It presents an opportunity to the nation to make a lasting unequivocal commitment to the concept of justice for all. The capacity of this society to ventilate internal pressures through traditional modes rests in part on this choice.

ASH COUNCIL MEMO ON THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

The Legal Services Program is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity under the specific authority of the Economic Opportunity Act. Its purpose is ". . . to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty" by providing advice, representation, counseling, education and other appropriate legal services for the poor.

The program operates through grants to local, nonprofit legal services corporations which have on their boards of directors representatives of both the legal profession and the clientele served by the program. A recent report showed 268 neighborhood offices staffed by 2,000 lawyers. Appropriations for 1970 are $54 million.

The Legal Services Program is an attempt to extend the benefits of the traditional adversary process to those who otherwise would not have the ability to seek redress of their grievances within the framework of our legal system. As such, the program has strong and continuing support of its clients and of the American Bar Association which has frequently testified before Congress in behalf of the program.

Both the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence supported expansion of the program to help make the legal system a more effective avenue through which the poor might have their complaints adjudicated.

The President's message on the reorganization of the Office of Economic Opportunity of August 11, 1969, stated that:

The sluggishness of many institutions—at all levels of society—in responding to the needs of individual citizens is one of the central problems of our time. Disadvantaged persons in particular must be assisted so that they fully understand the lawful means of making their needs known and having those needs met. This goal will be better served by a separate Legal Services Program, one which can test new approaches to this important challenge.

* * * * *

The nature of some actions, particularly those which involve challenges to administrative procedures or statutes often involves a confrontation with established authority. Thus the program is not free of controversy.

With this in mind, it is our view that the continued development of the Legal Services Program will depend to a large degree on the organizational arrangement under which this activity will be conducted.

The Office of Economic Opportunity as an organizational location for legal services

The Office of Economic Opportunity provided an excellent location for the initiation and maturing of the Legal Services Program. As part of the Community Action Program, it was assured funding as it developed a broad base of support and experimented with a variety of operating techniques.

While the bulk of Legal Services cases concern domestic relations, garnishment and landlord-tenant relations, the important class action cases or actions in behalf of clients against Federal, State or local government agencies have aroused public attention. These cases have raised a difficult issue: should an agency whose program is sponsored and funded by the Federal Government be permitted to undertake suits against other units of government? Despite the program's success in forestalling Congressional attempts to limit its freedom of action, this issue will remain a subject of political controversy so long as the Legal Services Program remains in the Executive Branch.

A second problem concerns the retention of the Legal Services Program in the Executive Office of the President. In our Memorandum for the President of October 26, 1970, we recommended that operating programs of the Executive Office of the President be transferred to appropriate operating agencies of the Executive Branch. In this Memorandum, we recommend placing all other operating programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity within either the proposed Departments of Human Resources or Community Development. The proposed transfer of these programs breaks the organizational tie between the Legal Services Program and other programs offering specialized services to the poor.

Retention of this one operating program within the Executive Office of the President would be inconsistent with the concepts discussed in our Memorandum of October 26, 1970, on the Executive Office of the President. As important, it would leave in the President's hands the need to resolve those controversies which the Legal Services Program may generate and which, by the nature of how they arose, are better left to the courts.

Other organizational alternatives

In examining alternative organizational locations for the Legal Services Program, we considered how well each would meet the criteria that we believe are necessary for the continued success of the program. These criteria are:

Maintenance of high professional standards;

Broad participation and support of the legal profession;

Responsiveness to the client group;

Ability to attract competent lawyers;

Maintenance of high professional standards;

Avoidance of conflict of interest by separating the roles of the parties in the adversary process; and

Visibility, to assist in reducing levels of social tension in society.

One alternative considered was the transfer of the Legal Services Program to either the proposed Department of Human Resources or the Department of Community Development. Such a transfer would parallel our recommendations for transfer of other Office of Economic Opportunity operating programs.

We believe, however, that subordination of this program within a line department, would reduce its visibility and hence its symbolic importance. Furthermore, it would place within the Departments, a program funding lawyers whose caseload would at times involve suits against agencies within the same department. This we view as a conflict of interest that would inhibit the proper functioning of the program. Also, within either department, the objectives of the Legal Services Program could become subordinated to the mission of that department.

A second alternative considered was the transfer of the program to the Department of Justice. This location would place the program within a larger legal context and might encourage increased involvement of the legal profession in the program. However, the conflict of interest problems arising in cases between Federal agencies and clients of attorneys in the program would be substantial. The Department of Justice is Counsel to the Executive Branch and would in most instances represent the Federal agency in such cases. To have the attorneys for both sides funded by the same department and ultimately reporting to the same Cabinet member would create real or apparent conflicts of interest that could severely impair the effectiveness of the program and raise serious questions as to the fairness of the system.

Another alternative considered was the creation of an Office of Public Advocate within the Federal Judiciary. This alternative was rejected for two reasons. First, such an arrangement would create at least the appearance of a special relationship between the courts and a particular client group, thus giving rise to questions of partiality by the courts. Secondly, an important distinction should be made between a system which provides for representation of clients in cases before the courts such as the Public Defender system and the more active assistance provided by Legal Services attorneys on a broad range of social issues. This latter role, in our view, is incompatible with the passive responsibilities of the judiciary.

The council's view

We have concluded that achievement of the objectives of the Legal Services Program will be served best by granting the program independent status.

Accordingly:

We recommend the transfer of the Legal Services Program to a nonprofit corporation chartered by Congress.

. . . Granting corporate status to the Legal Services Program would remove it one

step from the political process, while at the same time, guaranteeing the necessary government support. Equally important, such a move would give the program greater visibility and in so doing, signal recognition of the importance of the concept that all citizens should have the ability to participate within our legal system.

We believe that this recommendation is consistent with the best interests of the program and its clients and with Administration policy.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Economic Opportunity Act provides that the authority for delegation does not extend to the Legal Services Program. Therefore, any transfer of the program would require legislation. The legislation to establish a public corporation could be modeled on the amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 which established the Public Broadcasting Corporation and should be considered in connection with the Administration's review of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1971.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

Section 1, Short Title: Legal Services Corporation Act: authorizing a National Legal Services Corporation by amending the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Section 2, Establishes Title IX to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 entitled "National Legal Services Corporation."

Section 901, Declaration of Policy:

(1) it is in the public interest to encourage and promote resort to attorneys and appropriate institutions for the orderly resolution of grievances and as a means of securing orderly change, responsiveness and reform;

(2) many low income Americans are unable to afford the cost of legal services or of access to appropriate institutions;

(3) access to legal services and appropriate institutions for all citizens of the United States not only is a matter of private and local concern, but also is of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

(4) the integrity of the attorney-client relationship and of the adversary system of justice in the United States require that the performance and provision of legal services be free from political interference;

(5) existing legal services programs have provided economical, effective, and comprehensive legal services to the client community so as to bring about a peaceful resolution of grievances through resort to orderly means of change;

(6) a private nonprofit corporation should be created to encourage the availability of legal services and appropriate institutions to all citizens of the United States, free from extraneous interference and control.

Section 902, Establishment of Corporation: Establishes a non-profit Corporation, under the laws of the District of Columbia, which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.

Section 903—Process of Incorporation: There is established an incorporating trusteeship made up of the President and President-Elect of the American Bar Association, and the Presidents of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, American Association of Law Schools, American Trial Lawyers Association, and National Bar Association. The incorporating trusteeship shall, within sixty days after enactment, establish an eleven member Clients Advisory Council from among persons recommended by the Boards of Directors of existing Legal Services programs and who are representative of the client community. Similarly, the trustees shall establish a Project Attorneys Advisory Council. Within ninety days of enactment the Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory Council will select three representatives to serve on the Corporation's Board of Directors.

Section 904—Directors and Officers: The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors made up of nineteen persons, one of whom shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Five members of the Board are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States. Six members serve by virtue of their office (Presidents of the ABA, NLADA, American Association of Law Schools, American Trial Lawyers Association, and National Bar Association) and the President-Elect of the American Bar Association. Six members are chosen by the Clients and Project Attorney's Advisory Councils (three members each). The Executive Director of the Corporation is a voting member of the Board of Directors. The term of office for a Director is three years. The initial Board will be so constituted that members will have staggered terms of one, two, and three years. The Executive Director, selected by the Board of Directors, shall be an attorney and no individual can serve in this position for a period which exceeds six years.

Section 905—Advisory Council; Executive Committee: Establishing Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory Councils selected in accordance with procedures promulgated by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall also establish an Executive Committee of five members.

Section 906—Activities and Powers of the Corporation:

(a) (1) Provide financial assistance to programs furnishing legal services to the client community.

(a) (2) Carry out programs, including research, training, technical assistance, and law school clinical assistance, to improve the provision of services to the client community.

(a) (3) Increase opportunity for legal education for individuals who are economically disadvantaged or members of minority groups.

(a) (4) Co-ordinate activities in various parts of the country through information collection and dissemination.

(a) (5) Assist and coordinate all Federal programs for the provision of legal services to the client community by reviewing and making recommendations upon (a) grants and contracts concerning legal services and (b) proposed legislative or executive action.

(a) (6) Assure that attorneys paid in whole or in part by funds from the Corporation owe the same duty to clients and enjoy the same protection from interference as if the attorney was directly employed by the client.

(a) (7) Establish policies which assure the professional quality of the attorneys and adherence to the Canons of Ethics.

(a) (8) Establish eligibility standards for clients with first priority on those who are destitute or extremely poor.

(b) The Corporation is further authorized to make grants, contracts, and enter into cooperative agreements. Promulgate regulations approving grants and contracts using criteria regarding (1) the most economical, effective, and comprehensive delivery of services (2) peaceful and orderly methods of seeking change and (3) maximum utilization of organizations presently delivering legal services. Insure that the Board of Directors of grantees are made of a majority of attorneys and at least one-third representatives of the client community.

Section 907—Non-Profit and Non-Political Nature of the Corporation: The Corporation may not contribute to or support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

Section 908—Access to Records and Documents Related to the Corporation: Full access to records is insured. The Corporation is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act as long as consistent with the Canons of Ethics and the ABA Code of Professional Responsibility.

Section 909, Financing: Authorizes funds to be appropriated for payment to the Corporation as may be necessary for any fiscal year, including funds to assist the Corporation in meeting its organizational expenses. The proposed Act also reserves and makes available not less than $140 million for the first fiscal year of operation and $170 million for fiscal year 1973. Funds made available to the Corporation under this Act shall remain available until expended.

Section 910, Records and Audits of the Corporation and the Recipients of Assistance: Authorizes annual audit by the GAO and requires Comptroller General to make an annual audit report to Congress.

Section 911, Reports to Congress: An annual report shall be prepared for the President and the Congress.

Section 912, Definitions: "Client Community" means that group of individuals not able to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate financial means; in establishing eligibility standards for clients, the Corporation must give first priority to those who are destitute or extremely poor.

"Legal Services" includes legal advice, legal representation, legal research, education concerning legal rights and responsibilities and similar legal activities.

Section 913, Federal Control: Prohibits Federal control over the Corporation or its employees.

Section 3—During the first year of operation the Director of OEO shall take such action as may be necessary to arrange for the orderly continuance by the Corporation of the Legal Services Program.

Section 4—See Financing section in this analysis.

BAN SPORTS ON CLOSED CIRCUIT TV

(Mr. ASPIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, March 24, I will be introducing a bill which would ban the production of major sports events on closed circuit television in order to keep professional sports on home TV and radio. This bill would prevent the future showing of chamiponship fights, superbowls, world's series games, and other major sports events on closed circuit TV. The purpose of the ban would be to force promoters to turn to public network television and radio for the broadcast of all major sports. In other words, this bill would keep professional sports in America open to all sports fans, not just a select few.

The exorbitant profits made by a handful of professional promoters from the recent Ali-Frazier fight were, I believe, totally unjustified and were responsible for numerous lawsuits and the illegal counterfeiting and scalping of tickets at incredible prices. I believe the way the Ali-Frazier fight was promoted seriously injured the public's image of professional boxing and of professional sports in general. I believe that the $20 million or more expected profits from the Ali-Frazier fight will represent an enormous temptation for other sports to follow suit and produce their events on closed circuit TV.

After all, if a championship fight can reap such amazing profits, so could a superbowl, a world's series games, or an NBA championship game. When we reach that point, however, spectator sports would become the province of the rich and the boon of the professional promoter. The only losers would be the vast majority of American sports fans.

I believe my bill would prevent such an absurd situation from arising. It would place closed circuit TV in the same category as pay TV, which is handled by the Broadcast Bureau within the Federal Communications Commission. At present, closed circuit TV comes under the jurisdiction of the FCC's Common Carrier Bureau, which regulates such nonpublic areas of communications as the telephone industry. Under my bill, promoters of major sports events would be required to accept the highest bid from a television network for the broadcast of a sports event. The only exception to the closed circuit TV ban would apply if the Broadcast Bureau determined that the anticipated profits from a live network broadcast—along with other expected receipts, such as gate receipts) would not be sufficient to justify the holding of the sports event. In that case, which would be extremely rare, I think, the FCC would allow for the production of that event on closed circuit TV.

There is no question that under my bill the profits of, say, future championship fights would be significantly reduced. But the fact that the boxers themselves might only make a half million dollars apiece from a network TV contract, instead of $2.5 million from a closed circuit production, would hardly be a deterrent to the holding of their matches.

There is a critical need for the passage of this preventive legislation before the lure of these unprecedented profits extends to other major spectator sports. If that occurs, remedial legislation would be terribly difficult to pass in the face of intense opposition from the powerful vested interests who would favor the continuance of closed circuit productions.

This is one instance where the threat to the public good is clear and immediate, and where preventive legislation—taken now by Congress—would be both politically feasible and effective in keeping spectator sports open to the general public. It would be the height of irony if sports fans were further excluded from viewing their teams while, at the same time, their tax money was going for the construction and maintenance of bigger and more modern stadiums for their teams to play in.

Mr. Speaker, I will be working hard in the near future for the passage of this important legislation. I believe that the chances for its passage this session could be surprisingly decent if public support of this bill is as strong as I hope it will be and if we in Congress are sensitive to the people's best interests.

WHITHER INDIA AND INDIRA

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, India has voted socialist straight down the line, giving Prime Minister Indira Gandhi complete control of that country's government. Her electoral success is being hailed by the press as one of the extraordinary political achievements of post-independence India. Mrs. Gandhi has outstanding ability, and she is endowed with great appeal to the people of India from the fact that her father was Nehru and because of the name which she bears. What is not being said about her victory is that Mrs. Gandhi won through an emotional appeal to the country's poor. They think she is going to take from the "haves" and give to the "have-nots." Ninety percent of the people of India are extremely poor, and it follows that they would vote for the person who promised them most, particularly if they trust that person. They would also have voted for her as a conservative or a middle-of-the-road candidate, and in fact they did so for years.

America, as a capitalist country, can have some earnest reservations about the course which the Government of India is now expected to follow. Nationalization of more of the country's principal industries is now in prospect. The distressing part of it is that there just are not enough assests in India for universal sharing. When this fact finally dawns on the people, there could be resentment, even violence, and the next step could be communism for that country.

NATIONAL WILDFIRE DISASTER FUND

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is an area in forest fire control programs which should have more emphasis and adequate funding. I refer to the fire protection problems known as wildfires.

These are fires of catastrophic proportions which can occur whenever there are adverse combinations of high temperature, low humidity, protracted drought, and gale force winds. At such times any open flame may be fanned into a fire that destroys millions of dollars worth of property and endangers the lives of many people.

Examples of such disasters are the Peshtigo fire of 1871 which burned over more than 1 million acres and killed 1,500 people. A decade later a similar conflagration burned a million acres in Michigan and killed 119 people. The Hinckley fire of 1884 claimed 418 lives in Minnesota. The great Idaho fire of 1910 blackened 3 million acres.

In more recent years, the Bar Harbor fire of 1947 destroyed over 200,000 acres in Maine and killed 16 persons. South Carolina had an emergency situation in 1966. The Idaho fires of 1967 reached disaster proportions because of frequent lightning strikes during extreme burning conditions. Last year severe fires ravaged eastern Washington and southern California.

No part of this country is immune to fires of disaster proportions. By the same token no single fire control agency, Federal, State, or private, can afford the cost of maintaining sufficient reserve equipment and manpower to combat a fire of disaster proportions.

Needed is a national program for wildfire control. Such a program should establish national guidelines for organizing all firefighting agencies into a disaster fire network. Every State should have a plan for forecasting, mobilizing, and organizing for emergency fire situations. Funds for emergency use should be available for instant use.

I offer such a program for your consideration. I am introducing a bill which I feel would provide important steps toward the control of disaster from wildfires. I include a copy of the measure in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 6399

A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wildfire disaster control fund

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $10,000,000 to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, until expended, for the purposes described below to supplement the efforts of State and local governments in the prevention, control, and suppression of forest and grass fires on private and public property when, in the discretion of the Secretary, such additional assistance is deemed necessary.

(1) Fire emergency preparation including planning, administrative, supply and other activities designed to increase capabilities for quick and effective action in the event of a fire emergency.

(2) Control and suppression of disaster or potentially disastrous fires on forests, ranges, and intermingled agricultural lands upon request of State or local government officials when regular and emergency fire control resources are considered potentially or actually inadequate or have been exhausted.

SEC. 2. The appropriation of such moneys for the initial establishment of the fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided,* That pending such appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of Agriculture may allot, from existing appropriations, such funds as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of work herein authorized, such appropriation to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred by this Act, and any funds provided hereunder, shall be supplementary to, and not in substitution for, nor in limitation of, any other authority conferred or funds provided under any other law.

THE PLEDGE TO SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to an informed and enlightened article on South-West Africa which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. The author, Mr. Ernest A. Gross, has impressive credentials to comment on this subject by virtue of his previous service as Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Delegate to the United Nations. Mr. Gross

presents a logical and cogent argument that South Africa has violated the terms of its mandate over South-West Africa by extending apartheid to the territory and by refusing to account to the United Nations as required by a 1950 opinion of the International Court of Justice. I trust that these points will be given careful consideration by the Court in its current consideration of the Security Council's request for an advisory opinion on the legal consequences for states of South Africa's continued presence in the territory. The text of the article follows:

THE PLEDGE TO SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

(By Ernest A. Gross)

United States policy in regard to South West Africa (Namibia) has been assailed by Mr. Dean Acheson on the ground that "if the United States does intend eventually to try to coerce South Africa out of South West Africa, it is following a path to huge and gratuitous folly" (Washington Post, Jan. 2). Mr. Acheson's strictures, harsh and marred by factual error, omit any reference whatever to the central moral and legal issue: South Africa's persistent violation of its Mandate—a trust assumed on behalf of the international community—to "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants" of the Territory of South West Africa.

Mr. Acheson, when Secretary of State, characterized the problem as "perplexing," and the dilemma posed for the United States (and the United Nations) has not abated in the two decades since he left office. The source of perplexity is easy to define. The United States, together with all other U.N. members, is pledged to protect the rights of the peoples of an international trust territory, in the face of South Africa's obdurate refusal either to honor those rights or to respect the authority of the Organization upon which the trust is laid.

The *apartheid* policy, which South Africa applies as rigorously in this international territory as in South Africa itself, excludes "non-whites" (the large majority of the population) from any effective participation in political life. It imposes limits upon their economic and social progress and forbids them under criminal sanction, to form of join labor organizations to seek improvement of their condition. It denies educational opportunities essential to qualify for scientific or technical skills and denies them entry into a large number of professions. It prohibits their emigration, while limiting at home their freedom of movement and of residence, by means of an onerous and degrading "pass system."

Needless to say, such a policy has been condemned, officially and universally, as a grave breach of the Mandate.

Moreover, South Africa has refused to account to the United Nations in respect of its administration of the territory, despite a 1950 Opinion of the International Court of Justice that it was under an obligation to do so. The court's decision fully sustained the views of the United States in this regard, submitted to the court in a statement cleared by then Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

At last, on October 28, 1966, the U.N. General Assembly acknowledged the obvious futility of further efforts to persuade South Africa to fulfill its obligations under the Mandate. The Assembly decided that, by reason of its material breach and, indeed, by its own disavowal of the Mandate, South Africa had forfeited all right to continue to administer the Territory. The Assembly decreed that, with the termination of the Mandate, the Territory was to come "under the direct responsibility of the United Nations." An *Ad Hoc* Committee was established to recommend "practical means" for the administration of the Territory, until the inhabitants could exercise their right of self-determination and achieve independence.

The territory thus becomes the only area on the surface of the earth over which the United Nations has asserted a direct responsibility of government. The decision, taken with near unanimity and with the full concurrence of the United States, is to be seen as the product of a long-smouldering sense of frustration and moral outrage. There was no illusion concerning the nature of the obstacles for the enforcement of this "sacred trust of civilization," so long betrayed by the power in control and in possession.

The United States representative on the ad hoc committee for South West Africa, in 1967, was William Rogers, the present Secretary of State. In his opening statement to the committee, Mr. Rogers declared that it was the responsibility of the United Nations to provide the people of South West Africa "with the best practical means—and the emphasis must be on the word 'practical'—of exercising their right to self-determination and independence."

To be sure, standards of practicality in matters of essentially moral and human concern are to be measured against a flexible yardstick. Few, if any, responsible persons would advocate the use of outside military force to "coerce South Africa out of South West Africa," in Mr. Acheson's phrase. But how many would counsel supine acquiescence in South Africa's defiance of the confirmed authority of the United Nations to bring relief to the oppressed inhabitants of a territory impressed with an international trust?

As is true of all struggles for human rights and freedoms, regeneration must take place from within the social order, which is the primary architect of its own change. Nevertheless, the international society—rudimentary as it is—cannot passively accept an evil anachronism, without impairing its own integrity and stunting its own growth. It must bring to bear all practicable pressures, short of force, with the hope of inducing, even if it cannot compel, necessary change.

Many such political, economic and moral pressures are available to the United States, as well as to other of South Africa's major trading partners.

The United States government has announced that export-import guarantees would not be available for trade with the territory and that American investments made after the termination of the Mandate would not be protected against claims of a "future lawful government." Tax and trade treaties with South Africa should be regarded as inoperative insofar as they purport to extend to the territory.

The U.N. Council for Namibia, which has superseded the earlier committee, should be strengthened by added personnel and resources. It should assist and train Namibian leaders, both at home and in exile, to shape economic and political institutions requisite for an independent state. The council will gain in stature and effectiveness if the United States agrees to become a member, as it thus far has declined to do. A Namibian government-in-exile should be fostered. All U.N. members should honor Namibian passports, validated by the United Nations.

These measures are merely illustrative of the many open to the international community, if it is determined—as the United States promised at the time of the General Assembly decision in 1966—"to bring practical relief to the people of South West Africa in their time of need."

When the United States sought to conserve foreign exchange it did not hestiate to prohibit all new direct investment in South Africa. Can it be said that measures adopted in order to correct the balance of payment are a "gratuitous folly" if designed to redress the balance of justice?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VANDER JAGT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARSHA, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RUPPE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of Illinois) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEGGETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND to revise and extend remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HORTON to revise and extend remarks during debate today right after Mr. CONTE and to include extraneous material.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. DUPONT.

Mr. HOGAN in five instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. KEITH in six instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. WARE.

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. MIZELL in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of Illinois), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in six instances.

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. SISK in two instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. ROUSH in two instances.
Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.
Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL in four instances.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. CORMAN in two instances.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. GAYDOS in five instances.
Mrs. ABZUG.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. BENNETT in two instances.
Mr. PURCELL in two instances.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. JARMAN in two instances.
Mr. HAGAN in two instances.
Mr. DENHOLM in three instances.
Mr. FOLEY.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 22, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

438. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for U.S. property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

439. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of various facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

440. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

441. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to motor vehicle insurance and an accident compensation system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

442. A letter from the Chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

443. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to extend the authorizations for titles I through V through fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Public Works.

444. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the provision in the Social Security Act for providing assistance for U.S. citizens returned from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

445. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the acquisition of major weapons systems by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 6357. A bill to support the price of milk at 90 percent of the parity price for the period beginning April 1, 1971, and ending March 31, 1972; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6358. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. HOSMER) (by request):

H.R. 6359. A bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 6360. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 6361. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 6362. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. Charles H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. ROBINSON of New York):

H.R. 6363. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal service program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 6364. A bill to provide a maximum age for persons to be seated as a Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6365. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6366. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 6367. A bill to amend the Department of Transportation Act in order to modify the national policy with respect to the protection of lands traversed in developing transportation plans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 6368. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured by executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 6369. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Bureau of Consumer Protection in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 6370. A bill to amend titles X, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act so as to limit, for purposes of determining need of an individual for aid under any State program established pursuant to any of such titles, to specified relatives of such individual the persons whose financial responsibility for such individual may be taken into account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 6371. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BYRON, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DORN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 6372. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6373. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6374. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6375. A bill to provide for the establishment of a system of overtime pay for the U.S. Capitol Police; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6376. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for more equitable retired pay for members of the military services; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the present limitations on eligibility for, and the amount of, the child-care expense deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6378. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6379. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of obscene materials to persons under the age of 18 years, to restrict the exhibition of movies or other obscene matter to such persons, to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate by mail obscene materials to such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation and fishery programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6381. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 6382. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6383. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 6384. A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles; preconstruction certification of stationary sources; more stringent State standards covering vehicular emissions, fuel additives and aircraft fuels; emergency injunctive powers; and public disclosure of pollutants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mrs. ABZUG):

H.R. 6386. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. BELL):

H.R. 6387. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 6388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINK:

H.R. 6389. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation of the Dickinson reclamation project in North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 6390. A bill to protect the public from exposure to excessive noise from civil supersonic aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6391. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6392. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6393. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 6394. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 6395. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension of $125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 per centum where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 6396. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national catastrophic illness insurance program under which the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with State insurance authorities and the private insurance industry, will reinsure and otherwise encourage the issuance of private health insurance policies which make adequate health protection available to all Americans at a reasonable cost; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work by automobile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 6398. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6399. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wildfire disaster control fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6400. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and subdivisions thereof in the enforcement of State and local laws, rules, and regulations within the national forest system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6401. A bill to provide for the arrest and punishment of violators of certain laws and regulations relating to the public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 6402. A bill to provide for the equalization of the retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6403. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6404. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6405. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax interest on certain deposits in thrift institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual an income tax deduction for the expenses of traveling to and from work by means of mass transportation facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an employer a deduction for the cost of making changes in his place of business to make it possible to hire or retain handicapped individuals as employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 6412. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971–72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 6413. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act), to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the protection of U.S. vessels on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6415. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 6416. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 6417. A bill to reduce the number of class A retailers' licenses issued and outstanding under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, to establish the number of such licenses that may be issued and outstanding under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. POFF, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARING, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 6418. A bill to consent to the interstate environment compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 6419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 6420. A bill to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 6421. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus supplies and equipment to political subdivisions within redevelopment areas for public purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6422. A bill to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6423. A bill to provide for the payment of medical or surgical services or hospital treatment for certain disabled former members of the Metropolitan Police Department, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the Executive Protection Service, and the U.S. Secret Service Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 6424. A bill to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 6425. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971–72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6426. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6427. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6428. A bill to require that impact-resistant eyeglasses be issued under the medical program for members of the uniformed services on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6429. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuczko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6430. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Securtiy Act to provide payment for for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 6431. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code to increase the jurisdictional amount for the administration of small estates, to increase the family allowance, to provide simplified procedures for the settlement of estates, and to eliminate provisions which discriminate against women in administering estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 6432. A bill to provide minimum standards in connection with certain Federal financial assistance with respect to correctional institutions and facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 6433. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of $125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6434. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of $125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6435. A bill to restore the investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6436. A bill making appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year 1972 to carry out the provisions of the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6437. A bill to increase annuities payable under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6438. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of nonmarriage of certain annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6439. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 6440. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6441. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6442. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1965, relating to the establishment of Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. WATTS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 6443. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971–72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6444. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10-percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 6445. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to persons in the aerospace industry for the purpose of enabling such persons to transfer the application of aerospace technology to the problems of ground transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 6446. A bill to provide for addition of the Minam River Canyon and other areas to the Eagle Cap Wilderness, Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, to modify the boundaries of the Wallowa National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate by proclamation the third week of May of each year, beginning May 16 through 22, 1971, as "The Week of the Young Child"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 480. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.J. Res. 481. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning on the last Monday in October of each year as "National Magic Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of June 8 through 14, 1971, as "National Fraternal Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 483. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the 28th day of September of each year as "Teacher's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SISK, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. STRATTON):

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution that the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "proportionate repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a study team to observe the election in Vietnam in October 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution urging the withdrawal now of U.S. forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to paid advertisements broadcast for the Federal or State or local governments or departments or agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution to establish minimum standards on pollution in international waters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 325. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 326. Resolution that the U.S. Department of Transportation give every consideration, without further delay, to the proposed route of Interstate Highway 75 across Lake Allatoona; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MILLS, Mr. WATTS, Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SISK, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. LANDRUM, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. BAKER):

H. Res. 327. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COTTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DORN, and Mr. DRINAN):

H. Res. 328. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KASTENMEIR, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEDS, and Mr. MELCHER):

H. Res. 329. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 330. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 331. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H. Res. 332. Resolution protesting the showing of X-rated motion picture previews at G and GP rated motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. O'HARA):

H. Res. 333. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H. Res. 334. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. McKINNEY):

H. Res. 335. A resolution: Mass transportation—A national priority; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Dionisio Pajimola Almirol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6448. A bill for the relief of Madonna Cudjoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Rios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Constantin Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 6452. A bill for the relief of Desanka (nee Rogic) Haen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Giuseppa Daniele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6454. A bill for the relief of Luis Elkin Echavarria-Quintero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 6455. A bill for the relief of William M. Starrs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6456. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng Tsuau Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6457. A bill for the relief of ToppSav, Inc., formerly known as the Topp-Cola Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6458. A bill for the relief of Bak Hon Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6459. A bill for the relief of Rosario Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6460. A bill for the relief of Angelo Carusotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6461. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gugliotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6462. A bill for the relief of Vitantonio Presidio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caterina Scafuro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 6464. A bill for the relief of Edith C. H. Yang and three children, Julia Chen, Dorothy Chen, and Samuel Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6465. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Engracia Davila-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6466. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pilar Sartiaguda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 6467. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Seaborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 6468. A bill for the relief of Angela Buono Gallidoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6469. A bill for the relief of Pietro Gallidoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6470. A bill for the relief of Sullivan I. Kite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Res. 336. Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Elmhurst College of Elmhurst, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW SBA ADMINISTRATOR KLEPPE EMPHASIZES IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the magazine, Government Executive, in its current issue has an excellent article featuring our former colleague and the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Thomas S. Kleppe.

Administrator Kleppe, in this article, emphasizes the importance of small business and our competitive free enterprise system to our Nation.

In this connection I place the article from Government Executive in the RECORD herewith, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject.

The article follows:

SBA'S NEW ADMINISTRATOR KLEPPE: "PRIVATE ENTERPRISE BUILT THIS COUNTRY"

The Small Business Administration was created by Congress in 1953. The average tenure of its administrators over its 18-year history has been 14 months. Reasons for this impermanency? Politics, allegations of graft, too much heat in the kitchen (Truman's famous line), etc.

Now sitting in the hot seat, since January 18, is Thomas S. Kleppe, 51, of Bismarck, North Dakota. He has several distinctions. He is a college dropout. He has made a hole-in-one. He has bowled a perfect (300) game. He picked up money as a rodeo rider. He turned down an offer by the St. Louis baseball Cardinals. He is a self-made millionaire.

Kleppe was a two-term Congressman, assured of a third term, when President Nixon asked him to run for the Senate last year.

He lost. People say Nixon rewarded him with the SBA job. Reward?

A LOOK AT THE OBJECTIVE

Kleppe's views on his job as told to *Government Executive:* "There isn't much question about the fact that small business and our private enterprise system is what built this country. This is what sustains this country and this is the real hope of this country."

"The small business community is vast and far-reaching," Kleppe continued. "Probably the reason there has been such a primary interest on Capitol Hill is that every single man that's up there has SBA activity in his district. He hears about it and he feels it. So he has to be close to it. This is one of the motivations I had in coming here. It is a little disturbing for me to know that there is ever said anything negative about SBA. The reason I say this is that everything we have to offer is for good.

"We have nothing but good for people. I am not concerned when somebody complains because they have been turned down on a loan application. That's not what I'm talking about. I am talking about an overall negative image that someone or some group of people might have because of something SBA should have done or didn't do, when really everything we represent is for good.

"So I look at our objective and our problems as those that must be corrected to fulfill the commitment of Congress when they founded SBA—to do good for this great small business community.

"I want to make one point clear. One of the first things that seems to be on the minds of the public and the press is that my primary responsibility is to find a way to pressure Congress into larger appropriations, that if another billion dollars were appropriated for SBA, all our problems would be over in the small business community.

THE MORATORIUM PROBLEM

"Very clearly this is not the case, I think it is my objective, as far as my working relations with Congress and the Office of Management and Budget are concerned, that we lay before them the facts—the facts as to what we have done with the resources they have provided for us. What can we do with additional resources if they provide them for us?

"I have confidence in my former colleagues on the Hill to accept what we give them as being truthful and honest, based on the predictions that are always hard to make.

"It's unfortunate that last year SBA had to declare a moratorium because it ran out of loan funds. We have problems along this line right now. It is one of the areas that I am getting into now very thoroughly, so that this doesn't happen in the future because, not only do you lose momentum from the standpoint of people knowing the SBA is here and does provide a service, but it creates a stigma in the public sector that is negative.

"So we have responsibilities to communicate with the Administration through OMB and Congress so that they know what our purposes are and I have great confidence that they will be met. Then the ball will be in our court, to execute as efficiently as we can, to use those resources and provide these services, in the form of loans and other services to our small businesses."

Kleppe continued: "We have a very candid feeling that Congress never, through the use of taxpayers' funds, will provide the dollars necessary to take care of the total small business community.

THE CALIFORNIA QUAKE

"Small businesses are normally nonbankable candidates for loans," Kleppe said, "that's where we fit in. We come in with a guarantee; even though the bank furnishes the funds, we are creating leverage that is tremendous. We guarantee the loans or, in many instances, we participate with the banks. They put up part of the money and we put up part."

Kleppe then discussed SBA's disaster loan program. SBA has $100 million in the Fiscal Year 1972 budget estimate. "This," said Kleppe, "is going to be tested by the California earthquake. It takes a lot of money and it's going to take a lot of manpower but it's done on a business basis. We have no grants for disaster, other than the forgiveness features of a loan. But there is a great deal of incentive in this for people who want to help themselves."

In FY 70 SBA provided record assistance to small businesses. It made 32,000 loans—93 percent more than in FY 69. Total dollars loaned were $885 million.

SBA's budget for Fiscal Year 1972, beginning July 1, calls out $1,249 billion, exclusive of $100 million in disaster loans. The agency spends only $65 million to $70 million to run itself—in salaries, overhead and other costs.

Kleppe served four years in the Army Air Corps in World War II but never got overseas. War over, he spurned the Cardinals' offer and joined the Gold Seal Co. in Bismarck where he says quietly, "I made an awful lot of money." He sold his interest in Gold Seal when he ran unsuccessfully for the Senate in 1964. When he won a House seat two years later, he decided to "release any skeleton anybody might have thought could have been in my closet." His declaration of holdings showed a worth of $3.5 million, excluding a trust fund for his children.

"I am," he says, "the opposite of a mercenary. I've never used money for strength and power and I never will. It isn't to feather Tom Kleppe's pocket. When I was in Congress I voted against my own best interests. If money is used wrong, it's sin of the worst kind."

LENT APPLAUDS SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the passage yesterday of the social security benefit increase has provided our Nation's much-deserving senior citizens a 10-percent benefit increase retroactive to January 1, 1971. The enactment of this measure is long overdue, and it is heartening to me that this Congress has chosen to make the benefit increase one of the first and most important orders of business.

My only regret is the fact that this increase bill did not in any way increase the archaic $1,680 earnings ceiling. The Congress will not have demonstrated its sincere care for our elderly until those persons who have initiative enough to work past their normal retirement are permitted to earn a reasonable sum without being penalized for it. I urge the Congress to attend to this matter without delay.

While property taxes in our States and localities have soared, pricing many senior citizens out of their own homes, Congress has, up until now, demonstrated little sympathy for those who spent a lifetime of diligent work. While housing, food, health care and other living costs have skyrocketed, the Congress has left the elderly to fend for themselves on outmoded pensions which do not approach an adequate retirement income.

We now have pasesd a sizable increase in benefits. I hope that the Congress will use the passage of this initial bill as a springboard for the passage of future legislation that will provide automatic increases geared to the cost-of-living index. When the senior citizen knows that his benefits will be increased in this manner, only then will he be able to plan for his everyday needs.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we have made some headway in granting our senior citizens what they rightfully deserve, but there is yet much to be done to insure that those over 65 maintain a life of dignity and not one of constant humility, dependent on the whim of the Congress for periodic handouts.

MENTIONING THE UNMENTIONABLE OPTION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, President Richard Nixon said in his state of the world message, February 1971:

> Some urged that we escalate in an attempt to impose a military solution on the battlefield. We ruled out this approach because of the nature of the conflict and of the enemy, the costs of such a policy, the risks of a wider war, and the deeply held convictions of many of our people.

The President has at long last set forth the reasons for the policy of not seeking a military victory over the North Vietnamese Communists. The four reasons for not seeking to defeat the enemy through the application of armed force are: First, the enemy we face cannot be defeated by military means; second, it would cost much more in terms of both lives and money to defeat the enemy; third, attempting to defeat the enemy might lead to Soviet or Chinese intervention; and fourth, certain sectors of our own people would object to victory. Let us analyze these arguments.

The enemy is defeated militarily when military action reduces his material capability or his will to the point where he no longer is able, or wishes, to carry on the war. Without necessary weapons and supplies the enemy cannot continue to fight no matter what his desires. Unequivocally and beyond a shadow of a doubt, the United States possesses the military means to shut off the flow of supplies to the enemy, and decisively disrupt his rear areas. Over 80 percent of the war material used by the enemy now comes into North Vietnam through the port of Haiphong Harbor. The United States has never attempted to close this harbor even though it is easily possible to do so through naval blockade, aerial bombing, or mining.

The greatly reduced level of enemy activity in the southern portions of South Vietnam is due in large part to the fact that the Communists can no longer use the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville—Kompong Som—for resupplying their southern forces. Closing Haiphong Harbor would have even greater results since it is the last major point of input remaining to the enemy. Whatever the nature of the enemy may be, he simply cannot fight without equipment.

It is very difficult to see how taking the war determinedly to the enemy in his rear areas could cost more, either by way of lives or money, than refusing to do so. Had we utilized our military forces effectively in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, or 1970 to destroy the capability of the enemy base areas from which the invasion of Southeast Asia is being mounted, the war would have been over in any one of those years. The efficacy of denying inviolable base areas to the enemy was conclusively proved by the military operation last spring into enemy held areas of Cambodia. Serious efforts to disorganize the sanctuary of North Vietnam would have even greater effects.

We have already dealt in past newsletters—70-12, 71-1, 71-6—with the possibility of direct Soviet military intervention on behalf of the North Vietnamese politboro. It was pointed out that the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs, Dr. Henry Kissinger—one of the major architects of this state of the world message—finds it very hard to see what we could do in Southeast Asia that would lead to a general war with the Soviet Union. The only thing I see that we could do in Southeast Asia that would result in a nuclear war with the Soviets is to deplete the defense funds going to maintain our strategic forces to the point that the Soviets gain a position of such superiority that an attack on the continental United States becomes feasible. This is an argument for quick victory, not surrender. The unlikely possibility of Red Chinese intervention will be covered in a later newsletter.

Our society has already suffered real damage because we have so far refused to win the war in Indochina. Watching 6 years of war on the television set with no hope of victory because a military solution had been ruled out has seriously undermined the morale of our citizens. Although some of our own people may now be deeply committed to enemy success, it is intolerable that the views of these people should be allowed to counterbalance the fact that tens of thousands of loyal young Americans have been deeply committed to our success, to the point of having given their lives for their country in Vietnam, or suffering for years in Communist prison camps.

Evidently the President sees risks in the option of victory—the specter of a Soviet attack on the United States, or of the march to victory floundering in some hidden morass, some trap which may have been overlooked. But our cause in Southeast Asia is just. Victory is needed to turn the international tide running against our Nation now as never before. Every individual dies only once. I am sure that a great many people would not ask others to risk their lives for them without understanding that they bear the ultimate responsibility and must consider themselves as possibly subject to the same fate as the young soldier torn to bits on a battlefield far away.

Our people will not be united through surrender or further hesitation. It is time to end the conflict in Southeast Asia in the only honorable manner—through defeating the aggressor on those Asian shores to which we committed ourselves so long ago.

AUSTIN CARR OF NOTRE DAME: COLLEGE BASKETBALL'S PLAYER OF THE YEAR

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the sports legacy of the University of Notre Dame is a great one. The Four Horsemen, Knute Rockne, Frank Leahy, The Gipper, Johnny Lujak, Tom Hawkins, Paul Hornung are names which have become legends at Notre Dame and across the country.

The newest name in that galaxy is Austin Carr, the dazzling star of the Notre Dame basketball squad.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to note on St. Patrick's Day that this Fighting Irish standout has been named the player of the year in college basketball by United Press International.

Austin Carr's basketball prowess is well known. A national television audience saw his great 46-point performance earlier this year as Notre Dame defeated the No. 1 team in the country, UCLA. This past Saturday he scored 52 points as the Irish won their first NCAA tournament test against TCU. And he complements his scoring ability with quick offensive assists to his teammates and determined defensive play.

Mr. Speaker, Austin Carr's coach, Johnny Dee—who has already guided the Irish to 20 victories in a most successful season—had some very appropriate words for this fine young man. Coach Dee said:

> Austin Carr is a very special young man. He has great poise and great temperament. Not only is he an outstanding player on the court, but he is an unbelievable guy, period.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Austin Carr, and I wish Coach Dee and the Notre Dame team the best of Irish luck in the NCAA playoffs.

THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was 110 years ago today that the unification of Italy was proclaimed by its first parliament. The transformation of Italy from a miscellaneous conglomeration of petty states into one nation was completed on March 17, 1861. This auspicious date in European and world history was the culmination of a series of political, diplomatic, and military triumphs in which three figures stood out—Vittorio Emanuele II, Cavour, and Garibaldi.

Vittorio Emanuele, who had become King of Sardinia, which included Piedmont on the mainland as well as the island, in 1849, was the first monarch of modern Italy. Count Camillo Benso di Cavour, his prime minister, lived less than 3 months after his dream of a united country had been realized, as he died on June 6. The military hero during the campaign for unification was Giuseppe Garibaldi, one of the most outstanding figures of Italian history.

Lombardy had been annexed to the Kingdom of Sardinia in 1859. Parma, Modena, Romagna, and Tuscany were added in March 1860, Naples and Sicily—the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies—in October, and the Marches and Umbria in November. France ceded Venetia to

Italy in 1866, but it was not until October 2, 1870, that Rome was annexed to the new kingdom and made its capital.

During the century and more that has elapsed since its unification, Italy has been a good friend of the United States, except for World War II, when it threw in its lot with National Socialist Germany. Following its defeat in that conflict, which resulted in the collapse of Fascism as well as Naziism, the Italian people changed their form of government from a monarchy to a republic. During the quarter of a century of turmoil that followed World War II, Italy has been an ally of America and the many other nations that make up the free world.

Present day Italo-American friendship is a renewal of the amicable ties that were established when America, itself a union of many States, was engaged in a struggle to preserve that union from disruption. Abraham Lincoln, who had become President of the United States but 13 days before the unification of Italy became an accomplished fact, referred to that friendship on July 30, 1864, when he addressed these words to Joseph Bertinatti, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary:

> I am free to confess that the United States have in the course of the last three years encountered vicissitudes and been involved in controversies which have tried the friendship, and even the forbearance of other nations, but at no stage of this unhappy fraternal war, in which we are only endeavoring to save and strengthen the foundations of our national unity, has the King or the people of Italy faltered in addressing to us the language of respect, confidence, and friendship. . . .
>
> I pray God to have your country in his holy keeping, and to vouchsafe to crown with success her noble aspirations to renew, under the auspices of her present enlightened Government, her ancient career, so wonderfully illustrated by the achievements of art, science, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope, as I am sure it is that of my colleagues also, that the friendship between the United States and Italy, which inspired such eloquent words from Abraham Lincoln, will continue to grow through the years.

NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL APPROVES SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1971

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, in response to the growing problem of criminal activity in the schools of New York and other cities against students, teachers, and administrators, I introduced in the House the Safe Schools Act of 1971. This legislation would provide Federal assistance to school districts to deal with this problem. No such Federal assistance is available under existing educational assistance programs.

A great many local and national organizations, representing parents and educators, have endorsed this legislation.

I am now delighted to report that a resolution endorsing my bill was introduced in the New York City Council by Councilman-at-Large Aileen B. Ryan, and was unanimously adopted on February 19. The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION No. 407

Resolution calling upon Congress to pass the "Safe Schools Act" which would combat Crime in the elementary and secondary schools

Whereas, The incidence of crime in schools has reached astronomical proportions; and

Whereas, A congressional study of 110 school districts across the country has revealed that since 1968 school robberies have increased by 306%; aggravated assaults by 43%; burglaries and larcenies by 86%; assaults on teachers by 7,100%; narcotics abuse 1,069%; weapons offenses 136%; assaults on students 167% and drunkenness 179%; and

Whereas, In the year 1970, in New York City, 289 assaults were made upon teachers and vandalism alone amounted to a loss of over 5 million dollars; and

Whereas, Problem children, delinquents and student gangs are ravaging the schools and public transit facilities enroute to school, using them as their hunting grounds and threatening and intimidating students; and

Whereas, A bill, sponsored by Representative Jonathan B. Bingham, of The Bronx proposes that federal funds be channeled directly to school districts where they would be used for expansion and training of security guards, parent patrols, the installation of surveillance and alarm systems, student identification badges and to improve community liaisons; and

Whereas, The present atmosphere of anxiety and fear on the part of students interferes with learning while the cost of educational staffs is steadily increasing; and

Whereas, School children, who will be the parents, professionals, and leaders of the future should be insulated from interference with their learning progress; and

Whereas, School authorities are unable to deal with the present situation due to lack of funds and planned security and crime control programs to counter the present menace; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of The City of New York calls upon Congress to pass the "Safe Schools Act" which would combat crime in the elementary and secondary schools.

Adopted, February 19, 1971.

HOUSE TRAMPLES INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of all of the Members of the House of Representatives a perceptive article written in the Boston Sunday Globe of March 14, 1967, by S. J. Micciche, one of the able writers of the Globe Washington bureau.

The title of the article is "The House Tramples Individual Rights" and the subtitle of this piece is "Senate Voices Unheard in House Chamber."

Mr. Micciche recalls the debate on the floor of the House on March 2, 1971, with regard to a resolution of the House Internal Security Committee. Mr. Micciche reports that that resolution "balked at the request for clippings and transcripts—of the House Internal Security Committee—as being inconvenient and burdensome" for the staff of that committee to compile.

Mr. Micciche concludes that by the action of the House on March 2:

> The plaintiffs in the constitutional test of the Committee's powers will get less than the full discovery ordered by the Federal Court.

In my judgment the denial by the House of Representatives of the basic evidence required by three witnesses subpenaed by the former House Un-American Activities Committee in Chicago is another self-inflicted wound on the part of the Members of the House.

Mr. Micciche's article follows:

SENATE VOICES UNHEARD IN HOUSE CHAMBER: HOUSE TRAMPLES INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

(By S. J. Micciche)

WASHINGTON.—Being the political institution that it is, the Congress can be a source of immense contradiction at times.

Take this recent example:

There was the Senate, fearful of a debilitation of Constitutional rights from the ominous spectre of government snooping, particularly by the military, of American citizens engaged in non-violent social and political activities.

And across Capitol Hill, the House was denying basic judicial rights for the sake of convenience to the staff of the House Internal Security Committee.

The Senate subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, deeply concerned as it is over unwarranted intrusions by Federal agencies into the private lives of Americans need look no further than to the Senate and House Internal Security committees for shuddering examples.

With privileged immunity cloaking their actions, these committees practice the star chamber art of villification without trial, all perpetrated in the haloed defense of the Constitution.

The practice of these committees is to take raw testimony in secret, often hearsay, speculative and opinionated, and later publish it without affected individuals having been heard. The result is too often a composite by inference and innuendo of allegations unsupported by evidence.

A Constitutional test of the existence of the House Internal Security Committee has been before the courts since 1966, when it was then the House Unamerican Activities Committee.

The case has been up and down the judicial ladder to the US Supreme Court twice and is back before a US District Court in Illinois.

The test of the existence and powers of the House Committee is being raised by three Illinois residents who had been subpoenaed to testify before the old HUAC in May 1965 during its investigation of the Communist party in that state.

The day before the committee's hearing in Chicago, the trio filed suit asking the Federal courts to declare unconstitutional the reaction of the HUAC in 1945 and to enjoin its successor from holding hearings.

The Illinois residents appeared before the committee but walked out after answering preliminary questions. They were cited by the House for contempt of Congress.

In the latest action on their suit against the House committee, a three judge Federal court ordered last Dec. 7 that the three plaintiffs were entitled to the discovery of information essential to their case and held by the committee.

To support their case that the conduct of the House committee consists of "exposure of witnesses . . . to public scorn, obloquy and harassment and intimidation of witnesses without any legislative purpose," they

asked the committee for its files of newspaper clippings and unedited transcripts, among other items.

Since the House is the exclusive keeper of its own records, a vote of the branch was necessary.

But US Rep. Richard H. Ichord (D-Mo.), Internal Security chairman, balked at the request for clippings and transcripts as being inconvenient and burdensome for his staff to compile, going back to 1945. He sought permission of the House to refuse.

US Rep. Robert F. Drinan (D-Mass.), a holding that "it is not for the members of committee member, opposed his chairman. the House . . . to decide upon the relevancy or materiality of evidence decreed by a Federal court to be the inherent right of plaintiffs in litigation."

Drinan, who would like to see the internal security committee abolished, said the denial of all documents sought by the plaintiff would be a "deprivation of basic justice to these individuals . . . who have been told they have a basic right" to it by a Federal court.

But at the finish, Ichord got his way on a 291–63 vote. The plaintiffs in the constitutional test of the committee's powers will get less than the full discovery ordered by the Federal court.

And meanwhile, the Senate subcommittee on Constitutional Rights continued to amass voluminous evidence of Federal agencies trampling upon basic individual rights, though obviously not within earshot of the House chamber.

BROUGHT TO YOU BY THE CIA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, seemingly the American taxpayers, already overburdened, continue to pay the bill for many useless and costly pet projects of the far right and the far left, both in this country and abroad.

There are many who feel that the time has come to tighten the belt on many of these costly fringe programs. It has developed, for example, that two broadcasting stations in Europe which many Americans thought were being operated by private contributions are in reality costly extensions of the CIA. This disclosure in itself negates the effectiveness of these propaganda outlets. Earlier reports indicate that the CIA has been making monetary grants to various foundations—which in turn have been giving these funds away to extremist groups both of the far left and far right. These costly giveaways should be discontinued.

In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith a recent editorial from the Nashville Tennessean, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject.

The editorial follows:

BROUGHT TO YOU BY CIA

It has long been a fiction that the U.S. broadcasting stations in Europe, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were privately supported by citizens anxious to send the messages of freedom into East Europe.

There have been private contributions of course, but Sen. Clifford Case, Republican of New Jersey, finally blew away the fiction by his public disclosure that the stations have been secretly financed by the Central Intelligence Agency at a cost of about $30 million annually.

But the fiction of non-governmental operation permitted the stations to broadcast from West Germany while Bonn shrugged aside East German protests of the stations being operated by the U.S. government. Lately, with Bonn making overtures toward East Europe, the nettlesome question of the clandestine stations came up and forced West Germany to consider their future operation.

Now that Senator Case has made it clear the stations are being operated by the CIA, Bonn has a more sticky problem, and so does the U.S.

Reportedly, President Nixon has ordered a study of alternate ways of financing the operation of the stations. One method which seems to appeal to Congress would be the formation of an independent agency, which would function through congressional appropriations.

But it is not helpful to the credibility of either to have it known they are secretly financed by CIA.

DESTROYING THE ENEMY'S SUPPLIES IS THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY TO BRING THE WAR TO AN END

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article on the relation between military supplies and military operations appeared in the Manchester Union Leader of February 29, 1971. The author of this column, Mr. John P. Gardiner, makes the point that destroying the enemy's capability to continue waging war is one of the most efficacious methods for bringing a war to an end.

No matter what the enemy's will, no matter how great his hostility, no matter what objectives he may hold in his mind, without the implements necessary to carry out his design he will be unable to achieve his goals. The first and overriding principle of war is to destroy the enemy's powers of resistance, material, and morale, to the point where he is no longer capable of carrying on active armed struggle. The North Vietnamese Communists have shown by word and deed that they seek to extend their domination over the whole of Southeast Asia. As their hostility and objectives remain constant they leave us no choice but to reduce their material capability to the point where their desires become mere fantasy.

The article follows:

EYES ON SUPPLIES—No. 1

(By John P. Gardiner)

This is the first of two articles on supplies and their relationship to current hostilities in Southeast Asia.

"For want of a nail, the shoe is lost. For want of a shoe the horse is lost. For want of the horse, the rider (Messenger) is lost. For want of the rider, the battle is lost. For loss of the battle the kingdom is lost and all because of a horseshoe nail."

—"Jacula Predentum," George Herbert, 1651

One cannot scan the pages of history without becoming impressed by the pivotal role often played by events considered at the time to be peripheral. Standing by themselves, even if noticed, and apparently having little connection with the chain of events which ultimately lead to Victory or Defeat, history now permits us to view them within the context of reality and to realize that such a simple little thing as a lost "horseshoe nail" at the critical time and place can be held accountable for the rise and fall of nations, yes, even of whole civilizations. Here are a couple of examples:

Napoleon is said to have lost the Battle of Waterloo because he had a head cold on that fateful day for Europe in 1815. And in our Civil War in September 1862, if a still-unknown Confederate cavalry officer hadn't decided to wrap his four carefully-hoarded cigars in a copy of General Robert E. Lee's field orders. If the package hadn't dropped out of his pocket while the Confederate army was passing through Frederick, Maryland, during Lee's first invasion of the North. And if the cigars with their wrapper hadn't been casually picked up by an officer of the trailing Union army. And if the importance of the wrapper hadn't been instantly realized by that officer and passed up the chain of command to General George Brinton McClellan known as "The Little Napoleon" who, once he knew the location of the various segments of the Confederate army, immediately put his forces in motion, there wouldn't have been any Battle of Antietam (or Sharpsburg) with the result that Lee's Army of Eastern Virginia might have triumphed. As a result there might have been no more United States. North or South maybe, but the United States as we know it today, almost certainly not. Consider the ultimate result of a soldier's desire to protect his perhaps last four precious cigars, if you follow our line of thought.

It would be ridiculous, of course, to attempt to assess the ultimate importance of a single bag of rice, or one medicine chest in the course of the current lunge of the South Vietnamese army into the Laos panhandle across the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Perhaps someday, someone will in the sense of the four cigars and their wrapper as described above but hardly now. To the unmilitary eye these don't seem to be in the same class with artillery, tanks and rockets. But mutliply the former several thousand times, cutting them out of the supply line on which the North Vietnamese armies operating further South in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam depend, and the destruction of these highly-unspectacular objects can become a matter of critical importance. Even if you can't see it that way, the Communists sure do! Witness the anguished howls emitted from every Red and Leftward inclined throat everywhere in the world not excluding the august Senate of the United States at our 21.7-mile, time-locked sweep in Cambodia of last May and the current slash of the South Vietnamese armed forces into Laos with the intent of disrupting traffic on the Ho Chi Minh Trail and destroying all supplies of any nature uncovered in their operational area.

With Cambodia's only port of Sihanoukville sealed off last year and the supply caches of the North Vietnamese forces located in Cambodia within striking distance of Saigon destroyed, the Communist threat to the Southern segment of Vietnam, if not entirely eliminated for at least a year was, without a shadow of a doubt, seriously crippled. And now, with the main remaining Communist supply jugular imperiled ———. Well, when Hanoi starts making noises about the possibility of the Red Chinese coming in in force, knowing how much the Vietnamese hate the Chinese, you can be sure that they're hurting.

History has proven time and time again that if you can sit across your enemy's supply lines and maintain your position he's finished. You may have to repel attacks but you don't need to expend a single bullet to completely destroy the armed forces dependent on it.

Remember how in World War II, General of the Armies, Douglas MacArthur, completely annihilated the Japanese armies in his operational area simply by cutting their supply lines and leaving them to "wither on the vine"? His brilliant strategic maneuver of unexpectedly landing in Inchon during the early days of the Korean War of the early 1950s and thereby effectively getting astride of the supply lines of the North Korean army, until then, operating most effectively against our tenuously-held beachhead far to the South in the Pusan area, followed the same basic pattern of his operations against the Japanese in New Guinea and Rabaul in World War II.

So if you "Keep Your Eyes On Supplies" in Southeast Asia as we have been doing ever since the first column we ever had published in the Union Leader more than four years ago, we don't think you can go far wrong. We'll pick up the ball again next week giving special attention to the supply jugular even further North.

BUDGET BUREAU CHALLENGED ON FREEZING AND IMPOUNDING OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY THE CONGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget, formerly the Bureau of the Budget, continues to defy the Congress by ignoring authorization and appropriation by arbitrarily freezing, withholding, and impounding funds appropriated by the Congress.

In this connection, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place in the RECORD herewith my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS)

BUDGET BUREAU CHALLENGED ON FREEZING AND IMPOUNDING OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY THE CONGRESS

This week, under the bright lights of television, the full Committee on Appropriations held its annual full-scale review of Administration budgetary and economic policies—and the first open hearings in the Committee's 105-year history, a historic occasion.

Administration officials at the witness table were Secretary of the Treasury John Connally; Director George P. Shultz of the Office of Management and Budget (formerly the Bureau of the Budget); and Dr. Paul McCracken, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Many searching questions were raised concerning the Administration's deficit-financing budget and its projections of Federal revenues which are based on many contingencies and assumptions.

Your Representative in his questions challenged the authority of the Office of Management and Budget to arbitrarily impound, freeze and withhold funds for projects which have been approved and funded by the Congress. For example, even though the Congress cut and reduced appropriations for public works by some $26 million last year, the Office of Management and Budget has impounded funds in this bill for 145 projects totaling $90 million 662 thousand throughout the country.

In other words, non-elective officials of the Office of Budget have in effect substituted their won priorities for the priorities set by the Congress after exhaustive hearings on the merit and need for various projects and programs in water resource development, power generation, navigation, flood control, water supplies, and other essential public purposes.

In our District, for example, the Office of Budget has withheld substantial funds for import programs of the Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge, including $17 million to improve and expand production of enriched uranium to fuel nuclear power plants in the face of brownouts, blackouts, and electric power shortages. Certainly this is a matter of high national priority and need.

When questioned about this, Director Shultz said that until the controversy is resolved between those interested in preserving the environment and the necessity for locating nuclear power plants to provide electric power, he is opposed to moving forward with this project at this time.

Certainly it is my feeling that nothing is more important than assuring people in our area and throughout the United States of an adequate power supply.

The Office of Management and Budget also has withheld appropriations totaling some $4.3 million for the Normandy and Columbia Dams on the Upper Duck River.

Your Representative pointed out that the Office of Management and Budget in addition has withheld and impounded some $1 billion 325 million for various programs for our cities, large and small—including appropriations for water and sewer grants, urban renewal, various housing programs, the Model Cities program, and others.

"What authority does the Office of Budget have to withhold funds in this magnitude which have been appropriated by Congress?" your Representative asked.

Director Shultz said he would have to consult an attorney and would supply a legal response for the Record.

"The Office of Management and Budget is going too far," your Representative asserted. "It is my feeling that you are substituting your judgment for the judgment of the Congress. Mr. Director, when you substitute your judgment for a Congressional mandate by singling out specific projects for impoundment, are you not in effect resorting through subterfuge to an item veto which is unconstitutional?"

Shultz insisted that this was not the case and argued that the Office of Management and Budget is attempting to carry out "the complex and related purposes which Congress puts before us."

It is my feeling that the Office of Management and Budget is attempting to usurp the appropriations powers of the Congress to the point that if this practice continues, the appropriations power of the Congress could become meaningless.

Testimony showed that as of last January a total of $8 billion 923 million has been impounded by the Office of Budget from funds appropriated by Congress for the current fiscal year budget.

The Congress must not be a rubber-stamp for the policies of the bureaucrats. Congress must re-assert its constitutional responsibilities and obligations and certainly it is my intention to endeavor to maintain the integrity of separate and equal branches of government as established by our forefathers in the Constitution.

ELIMINATION OF JOB CEILINGS—AN EXPERIMENT IN ECONOMY

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated an end to mandatory manpower ceilings for the purposes of economy. It has been proven time and again that arbitrary ceilings on the number of civilian employees that Federal departments and agencies can have, particularly in the Department of Defense, is a false economy. Missions must be performed, missions that are approved and funded by the Congress. When the number of civilian employees to perform these missions is arbitrarily limited, the military services are left with the more costly alternatives of using combat-trained military personnel, contractor-furnished personnel, or paying overtime to incumbent civilian employees.

The Department of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, has made the first great stride. The Secretary of Defense is in the process of removing manpower ceilings—on an experimental basis for 1 year. Fiscal controls will be used instead. This procedure will give our military managers the flexibility they need to accomplish their respective missions. Decisions can be made on the type of manpower to be used for the performance of a particular function—civilian employees, military personnel, or contractor personnel—based entirely on economy and experience.

Joe Young, staff writer of the Washton Star, aptly covered this subject in his Federal Spotlight column of February 5, 1971.

I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

PENTAGON TESTING PLAN TO SAVE CIVILIAN JOBS

(By Joseph Young)

An experiment has begun that could save tens of thousands of Defense Department civilian jobs.

Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard has ordered that fiscal controls be used to determine the number of civilian jobs instead of civilian personnel ceilings.

Packard ordered the personnel ceilings removed.

Packard noted that the Defense units have been getting around the restrictions by using contractor-furnished personnel or military personnel. Civilian career employes were then laid off in order that Defense could remain within the ceilings.

This proved more costly to Defense than if the jobs had remained filled by civilian employes.

Defense's experiment in removing the ceilings to see how the new system will work has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

It has been endorsed by Rep. David Henderson, D-N.C., chairman of the House Civil Service and Manpower subcommittee, who long has advocated abolishing civilian personnel ceilings.

PRYOR SUPPORTS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, few congressional events testify more eloquently to the sweep of American history than votes to amend the Constitution of the United States. Next week's vote on the amendment to extend the franchise to 18-year-old citizens presents one of those rare instances in which the future is given the opportunity to do justice to its past. For we would not be standing here today debating the question of young people's role in 20th century America were it not for the role played by them in 18th century America.

I am going to support this constitutional amendment not because it is pragmatic, or because it will save a great deal of money, but because it is right. It is right not only for the 11 million citizens who will achieve meaningful participation in State and local elections, but more important, it is right for America.

The very document we seek to amend today was largely the work of young men, young by the standards of their day and young by our standards. As Samuel Eliot Morison, the eminent historian, observed:

> The most surprising thing about the delegates (to the Constitutional Convention) was their youth.

Five of them, in fact, were under 30 when they wrote the document which has survived longer than any constitution in the history of man.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Senate has already passed this constitutional amendment unanimously. Now the eyes of this Nation's young will turn to the House of Representatives to see if it will open the door to the most precious right a free people possess, the right to vote.

The constitutional amendment is made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Oregon against Mitchell. In that case, the Court ruled upon the constitutionality of legislation passed by the 91st Congress which sought by statute to extend the right to vote to 18-year-olds. Its decision upheld the authority of Congress to establish voting guidelines for the conduct of Federal elections, but ruled out the possibility of altering voting age requirements for State and local elections in the absence of a constitutional amendment.

Now that a constitutional amendment has been passed by the Senate, we in the House must act switftly to insure that State legislatures will have sufficient time to ratify it before the 1972 elections.

There are many compelling reasons for passing this constitutional amendment. Not the least of them is the money it will cost to hold a dual election; one ballot for citizens over 21 and another for those only eligible to vote in Federal elections. The results of a State-by-State survey provide graphic evidence of the cost of holding an election under current law. In New York City alone, it is estimated that the cost of a dual election will exceed $1.5 million. There is no excuse for burdening the taxpayers of this Nation with the staggering cost of holding two elections at the same time when it is clear that in the near future we will have a constitutional remedy for the current dissimilarity in Federal and State election laws. There is a simple and expeditious way to eliminate that dissimilarity and it is presently before the House of Representatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, arguments about cost provide neither the only nor the best reason for passing the proposed constitutional amendment. This amendment should be passed for the simple reason that it is right. As Senator BIRCH BAYH pointed out the other day, the age of 21 is of no magical significance. Its designation as the age of majority stems from the 11th century, from a time in which 21 years was the age at which most males reached the physical capability of carrying armor.

Now we have a chance to right the wrong which has been perpetrated on this segment of our society, a segment which has had to assume the burdens of democracy without participating in it. And the reasons why we should are impressive:

About one-half of the 11 million 18- to 21-year-olds are married.

Some 1.4 million are serving the Nation in the Armed Forces.

More than 3 million are full-time employees and taxpayers.

They can make wills in over one-half of the United States.

In all but one State, they are treated as adults in criminal courts.

Tens of thousands have died in the Indochina war without ever having any chance to play a role in determining whether they should be there.

Mr. Speaker, these are times when each of us is questioning the role America should be playing in the world. Each of us, I am sure, believes that democracy's role should loom large. Failure to enfranchise this creative and productive segment of this Nation would be a large blot on our Nation's record. I urge the passage of this amendment.

CATASTROPHIC HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, medical costs, doctor bills, and hospital expenses have risen phenomenally over the past decade. Each citizen is now spending twice what he paid for his health care in 1960, at a time when dollars are dearer and all basic family needs have suffered a price rise.

At the same time, health care, through scientific and medical advances, has improved, and patients with formerly fatal or totally debilitating illnesses can expect to survive, even recover, with extended hospital and medical care.

There are presently before this body a number of proposals regarding comprehensive health insurance plans. Today, I am introducing a bill that is aimed specifically at those persons, those families who suffer and must finance catastrophic illnesses; illnesses, as I mentioned before, which advances in scientific knowledge and technology now rendered curable or at least manageable.

I am not talking about any special kind of illness, other than that which requires long-term and extraordinarily expensive treatment, treatment which goes beyond the financial capacity of most American families and beyond medical insurance coverage.

It seems to me that, regardless of what overall health insurance program this Congress endorses, we must immediately attend to this special problem. It is the problem of those who must rely on kidney machines, or must undergo numerous and protracted transplant operations, those with strokes and the accompanying paralysis, those required to take extensive and continued radiation therapy in association with surgery.

No one can deny a member of the family the benefits of such treatment, yet many times families do not have the money to buy these wonders of science. This is a choice no family should have to make.

The bill I am introducing would reinsure private insurors, provide a Federal backup against loss, thus stimulating the insurance industry to provide coverage that would allow families to protect themselves against the costs of catastrophic illnesses. The legislation would encourage the creation of insurance pools similar to those available for flood insurance, but this time for catastrophic illnesses requiring extended care.

This legislation sets up a deductible formula which would be used to encourage each family to provide basic health-care protection. Only when this level was exceeded would the catastrophic insurance protection plan be utilized. A family with an adjusted gross income of $10,000 would have to either pay the first $8,500 of medical expense or have provided themselves with $8,500 worth of basic insurance protection to offset the deductible requirement. Existing basic health and major medical plans coverage would generally be sufficient for this deductible amount.

If that same family incurred expenses during the period of a year that exceeded $8,500, the catastrophic program would be available.

If American citizens cannot reap the rewards to be garnered from the advancement of scientific knowledge and technology, then the funds we are spend-

ing from the taxpayer's pocketbook had better be allocated elsewhere.

MORE CRIES FOR REVENUE SHARING

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, cities, States, and counties throughout the country continue to cry out in need of revenue sharing to help them meet their serious financial crises. The legislature of Rockland County, N.Y., made another such plea on March 10 when they unanimously passed the following resolution, which I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION NO. 169—MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT THE SHARING OF FEDERAL REVENUES WITH THE SEVERAL STATES

Mr. Lovett offered the following resolution which was seconded by Mr. Balsamo:

Whereas, President Richard M. Nixon announced in his State of the Union Address a Five-billion Dollar Revenue Sharing Plan to be used by the several states and the localities therein to provide essential services and to relieve the financial burdens being imposed upon the states and localities, and

Whereas, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller has not only urged the support of this measure but further has suggested that the amount be increased to Ten-billion Dollars for such purposes, and

Whereas, The Chairman of the Legislature of Rockland County proclaimed February 22, 1971 as Federal Revenue Sharing Day in the County of Rockland, and

Whereas, an informal estimate by the New York State Division of the Budget has indicated that if the President's request is honored the County of Rockland would receive an additional $508,000.00 and twice that amount if Governor Rockefeller's suggestions are enacted, and

Whereas, it is to the interest and benefit of the taxpayers of the County of Rockland that every effort should be made to secure this additional revenue to relieve the burdens of taxation on our local citizenry, now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Legislature of Rockland County hereby expresses its approval of the proposals of the President of the United States and the Governor of the State of New York and urges the Congress of the United States to adopt either of these proposals, and be it further

Resolved, that the Clerk to the Legislature of Rockland County be and he is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the President and Vice-President of the United States; the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of the State of New York; the United States Senators representing the State of New York; the United States Representatives representing the County of Rockland in the Congress of the United States; and the Legislators representing the County of Rockland in the New York State Legislature.

The question was taken upon the adoption of the foregoing resolution which was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: 15.

Nays: Messrs. Connor and Goodfriend.

Absent: Mr. Miller.

EDINA HIGH SCHOOL CAPTURES MINNESOTA STATE HIGH SCHOOL HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the community of Edina, Minn. Edina High School sports teams have consistently been in the forefront of the State scholastic athletic programs.

Last weekend the Edina High School hockey team brought further honors to the community when it captured the Minnesota State high school hockey championship. In these days of maligned youth it is tremendous to see the sportsmanship, fair play, and competitive determination of a group of young men such as these.

State Representative Otto Bang, who represents Edina in the Minnesota State Legislature, has introduced a resolution, passed by the Minnesota House, congratulating the team, the coaches, and all other participants in the tournament. It is a pleasure for me to insert this excellent and well-deserved resolution in the RECORD at this point:

A HOUSE RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING THE EDINA HORNETS, THE 1971 MINNESOTA STATE HIGH SCHOOL HOCKEY CHAMPIONS

Whereas, competitive sports in our high schools are helpful in teaching the principles of sportsmanship and fair play to our high school students, thereby contributing to better citizenship; and

Whereas, high school hockey teaches not only principles of sportsmanship and fair play, but promotes vigorous good health of the participants; and

Whereas, the Edina Hornets, the high school state champion hockey team, exemplify the ideals of sportsmanship and fair play; and

Whereas, the Edina Hornets won the state high school hockey championship by a series of hard fought and challenging competitions; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, by the House of Representatives that an expression of its respect and admiration be extended to this outstanding team, and that Head Coach Willard Ikola, Assistant Coaches Bartley Larson and Bill Beste, and the following team members be congratulated for their outstanding accomplishment in winning the State High School Hockey Championship.

1971 CHAMPIONSHIP TEAM

Dave Bremer, Dave Geving, Todd Nieland, Scott Nieland, Bill Broback, Steve Eichhorn, Rick Wineberg, John McMorrow, Ron Sorem, Dave Otness.

Tim Carlson, Rick Cabalka, Charlie Kelly, Jeff Baker, John Engquist, Dan Finke, Jeff Tscherne.

Mike Schmunk, Student Manager.

Stu Schmerler, Student Manager.

Be it further resolved, by the House of Representatives that an expression of its admiration and respect be extended to the other teams that were participants in the 1971 state high school hockey tournament: Hastings, Alexander Ramsey, East Grand Forks, St. Paul Johnson, Minneapolis Southwest, International Falls and Roseau.

Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be instructed to prepare formal copies of this resolution for presentation to the coach, assistant coaches, and team members of the Edina hockey team, and to the Hastings, Alexander Ramsey, East Grand Forks, St. Paul Johnson, Minneapolis Southwest, International Falls and Roseau high school hockey teams.

R. REID VANCE

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, a resident of my district, the 15th Congressional District in Ohio, will be honored by his friends and associates on the 25th of March for a long and excellent career devoted to the improvement of the graphic arts industry in Columbus and the State of Ohio.

Mr. R. Reid Vance has served for over 50 years as an effective, imaginative and versatile official of Printing Industry of Central Ohio, the trade association of the printing and allied industries in Columbus and the mid-Ohio area. Almost singlehandedly, Mr. Vance has provided a large variety of services to his members, such as accounting, credit information, employment, and recruitment services, labor negotiation, government agency liaison, and many others. In so doing, he has aided immeasurably in the growth and improvement of the industry's services to the community.

In addition, he has served as spokesman for the printing industry in the Columbus area. As the executive secretary of Printing Industry of Ohio, Mr. Vance has attended to the concerns of the printers of all Ohio in the Ohio Legislature. His comprehension of the relationship of the printing industry to the community and the State have established respect for his wisdom and reason.

Reid Vance is widely known and respected throughout the entire State of Ohio. Union leaders, employees, plant owners, printing customers, government officials—all have come to know and respect him as a devoted servant of his industry as well as its leader and spokesman.

In his private life as well as his professional capacities, he has demonstrated a love for his hometown by serving unselfishly and enthusiastically in such activities as the Columbus Community Fund and the Ohio State University Alumni Association and many other local service organizations.

Mr. Speaker, of such men as Reid Vance is the fabric of our society constructed. That our country continues to produce such conscientious men, such steadfast, and unselfish leaders is the factor that insures our preservation. It is therefore with pride that I insert this tribute to my longtime friend Mr. Vance in the RECORD today.

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS USEFUL FOR THOSE WHO WANT ECOLOGICAL FACTS ON CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, before the decision by the administration to terminate the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, it was generally conceded that the January 1970, U.S. Geological Survey publication entitled "Geohydrology of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal Area With Special Reference to the Ocala Vicinity," gave a clean bill of health ecologically and otherwise to the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. I know of no one who then gave it a different interpretation.

Now, after the President's edict to stop or halt the canal, opponents of the canal assert that the Council on Environmental Quality received on February 24, 1971, an assembly of excerpts subtracted from the survey and introduced with a statement that this survey "provides evidence that there is a significant potential for ground water contamination in the Summit Pool, Eureka Pool, and Inglis Lock areas of the canal system."

Mr. Speaker, I have read this entire 216 pages of the survey and I think that any objective analysis of it would be that the survey does not give encouragement to anyone who would oppose the canal for any reason whatsoever. The following excerpt speaks of the purpose of the survey:

> The design for the canal calls for an accommodation to the local ground-water regime to the extent that the new waterway will alter natural conditions as little as possible, and, in any case, for the canal to have no significant adverse effect on the ground-water system. In a further effort to see that this aim be accomplished, plans were made in 1965 for the U.S. Geological Survey to monitor the ground-water in the area of the Barge Canal before, during and after canal construction.

The resulting 1970 survey revealed that the canal would not necessarily do any damage at all if proper and simple precautions are taken. It is probable that this fact is the reason why the President's edict halting the canal made no reference to water pollution or contamination as a reason for his edict.

The conclusions of the survey are summarized at the beginning of it as follows:

> The geohydrologic investigation of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal area reveals that the design of the canal and the plan of operation are consonant with the hydrologic regime. Thus canal operations should not seriously affect the regimen of the economically and ecologically important large springs—the water level, rate of flow, and the quality of water at Rainbow Springs, for example. Further, if Summit Pool lockage losses are essentially replaced and operating precautions are taken against pollution of Summit Pool waters, there should be no noticeable adverse effects on the water level, rate of flow, and quality of water of Silver Springs.

The excerpts relied upon in the February 24, 1971, memorandum make reference to insoluble contaminants but the survey makes no assertion that anything that is expected ever to happen in the use of the canal will ever bring such contaminants to the canal's waters. Nor does the survey assert that any such contaminants that might enter the canal or its associated water systems could not be easily prevented from doing any damage by inexpensive and easily taken precautions.

It is apparent from the survey that the area of possible entry of waters into the aquifer is quite small and could be easily cemented in, or otherwise closed off. It is also clear that there are adequate sources of clean water available for replenishing the Summit Pool so there is no need for impure waters ever to be there. The slight possibility of an occasional oil spill could hardly be cause for alarm because the narrow containment area could be quickly and easily closed off and cleaned. The survey did not consider these as significant threats to water purity if proper precautions were taken.

The survey did mention, however, a much more serious, already existing, oil pollution of the underground waters of the area, which arises not from the canal but from the draining of city streets, with their oil residues, into drainage wells. Under a discussion of the "Ocala Drainage Well System" the report at page 212 said of two public wells and one industrial well in Ocala:

> The three wells were found to have a 30 to 35 foot column of pump lubricating oil floating on the water.

Speaking of these drainage wells, the survey further observed at page 38:

> A system of drainage wells drilled into the limestone of the Floridan aquifer has been developed in the city of Ocala in the bottoms of partly plugged sinkholes and excavated retention ponds. The drainage wells were drilled to augment the natural internal drainage system as storm runoff increased with urban expansion. However, present State regulations against the drilling of additional drainage wells, because of the risk of pollution of ground-water supplies, precludes further expansion of the drainage well system. A few other drainage wells are no doubt located within the study area, but Ocala is the only place where there is a sizable concentration.

Further discussion of these drainage wells is found at page 127 of this survey. And at page 81 of the survey the following statement is made:

> Numerous large depressions, some whose lowest points are at altitudes below 100 feet, have developed as a result of the collapse of limestone caverns at depth, thus producing a hilly, subdued karst topography. Many depressions, large and small, have clay bottoms and thus pond runoff. Drainage of the outliers is for the most part into the depressions. Some sinks are connected directly with the limestone aquifer, and many partially plugged depressions allow seepage into the aquifer. Drainage from the edges of the outliers infiltrates rapidly into the surrounding near surface limestones.

Speaking of pollution control in the Summit Pool, the report said, at page 205:

> Any normal use of the canal by barges and boats will tend to cause at least minor dirtying of the water, but the natural filtering capacity of the aquifer immediately adjacent to the canal can minimize movement of particulate contaminants into the aquifer, provided large caverns do not open into the canal channel at the zone of outflow. Dissolved contaminants will remain in the water as it enters and moves through the aquifer, so enforcement of sanitation and pollution control regulations will be important in order that chances for contamination of the pool waters be minimized. However, the risk of accidental spills remains and should be anticipated with plans made for handling such emergencies before polluted water may enter the aquifer.

Concerning the Eureka Pool, the survey said at page 158:

> Where leakage into the aquifers is expected from the Eureka Pool, the sands and clayey sands through which the pool water will seep will tend to filter out any particulate materials which might contaminate the pool water, although the natural filter will not preclude movement into the aquifer of dissolved contaminants if present in the pool waters.
>
> The controlled water level in Eureka Pool will have an important stabilizing effect on the water level at the head of Silver Springs, and will in turn limit the range in stage of the Summit Pool, although there is no direct hydraulic connection through the aquifer between Eureka Pool and Silver Springs or between Eureka Pool and Summit Pool.

Concerning the Inglis Pool, the report said at page 163:

> The Inglis Pool will consist essentially of what presently is called the Withlacoochee backwater or Lake Rousseau, the impoundment on the Withlacoochee River maintained by the old Inglis Dam for approximately 45 years, with no known adverse effects on the ground-water system. The canal pool will be operated within about the same stage range as the present impoundment, so there is no reason to expect canal operations to cause significant changes in the ground-water levels.

And further with regard to the Inglis Pool, the report said at page 166:

> The difference in stage of the Gulf reach of the canal and the Inglis Pool will be about 25 feet. This considerable difference in elevation is expected to aid in minimizing the lockage of Gulf salt water into the upper pools of the canal. Over the long term of canal operation, possibility exists for the "locking up" of significant amounts of salt water into the Inglis Pool as a result of salt water and fresh water intermingling during lock filling operations. Although the high stage differential at the lock reduces the probability of high volume movement of salt water into the upper pool, remedies for control of migration should be developed.

And the Rodman, Eureka, and Summit Pools were discussed in their relationship to eliminating contaminants at page 206 as follows:

> Studies indicate that the chance of contaminated water entering the aquifer directly from the lower pools, especially Eureka and Rodman Pools, is much less than in the Summit Pool. Therefore, if contaminants, especially highly water soluble ones, could not be removed by the means just mentioned, the Summit Pool might be drained rapidly through the locks. Thus the contaminants could be removed through the lower pools and out to sea with less risk to ground-water supplies. The stage of the Summit Pool would be lowered temporarily, and flow would be reversed in the zones of outflow so that water could not enter the aquifer from the pool. In fact, if some contaminants had already entered the aquifer, they might be flushed back out.

As to salt water entry and precautions to prevent it, the report said as follows at page VIII:

Minimal locking up of Gulf of Mexico water into Inglis Pool is indicated by past experience at the old Inglis Lock and Dam on the Withlacoochee River, and by the fact that considerable flushing action should result from Withlacoochee River flows augmented by possible increases in fresh water flow to the Gulf from some additional ground-water inflow to the Inglis Pool reach and from lockage releases at Dunnellon Lock. However, if significant lockage of Gulf water is found to occur, special operational procedures may need to be effected to minimize such lockage into the canal pools.

Speaking of existing salt water in the Florida underground, the report said at page 51:

The underlying Oldsmar Limestone contains salt water in many parts of Florida, but this is probably not the case in much of the canal area. Based on the height of the potentiometric surface, the fresh-water-salt-water interface is estimated to occur in the Cedar Keys Limestone in the Ocala vicinity.

And at page 101 it was said:

Beneath the northern part of the Ocala National Forest near the Oklawaha River, the Floridan aquifer contains salty water.

There are well-known salt springs in the area.

When the entire survey is read carefully, it makes no assertion that insoluble contaminants mentioned in the summary are expected to be present in any substantial or significant amounts; and to the extent that they might be present at all, ever, it is suggested that there are inexpensive and easily achievable methods of prevention available. It is therefore obvious that this survey is no basis for closing down construction of this canal—now over one-third complete. As a credit to the President, he did not assert anything to the contrary.

PRESIDENT NIXON RUNS AHEAD OF EVERY MAJOR DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL HOPEFUL

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was bad news this week for those who seek to replace President Nixon.

Despite the fact that the President faces a constant barrage of criticism from politically motivated sources, the American people are not being fooled.

Opinion Research, a highly respected survey film, disclosed that the President continues to run ahead of every major Democratic presidential hopeful, including Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, and MUSKIE.

As President Nixon continues to set a record of winding down the war, of keeping peace in the Middle East of stabilizing our economy and pacifying our country, I expect his margins will widen.

I include in the RECORD a UPI wire story which disclosed the results of the Opinion Research poll:

OPINION RESEARCH POLL

WASHINGTON.—The Opinion Research Corporation said Monday its latest poll shows that President Nixon is running at least 4 percentage points ahead of three possible Democratic presidential contenders.

Nixon ran ahead of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts 42 per cent to 38 per cent. He topped Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine 40 to 34, and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, his 1968 opponent, 44 to 35.

The corporation said it based the results on telephone interviews with a nationwide sample of 1,018 persons age 18 and above March 1-3.

Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace got between 12 and 16 per cent in the three trial heats and 7 to 10 per cent were undecided.

The corporation asked these questions: "In 1972 there will be another presidential election. If this election were being held today and the candidates were Richard Nixon, (Kennedy) (Humphrey) (Muskie), and George Wallace as a third party candidate, which one would you vote for?"

FASCELL NOTES FLORIDA CONSERVATION WEEK

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will be interested to learn that this week of March 14-20 is Florida Conservation Week.

The activities of this special week include exhibits, field trips, and numerous panel discussions sponsored by the State of Florida Department of Natural Resources and citizens groups. The emphasis will be on the important goal of conserving the precious natural resources of our State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to the text of an article which appeared in the Florida Conservation News concerning Florida Conservation Week.

The article follows:

FLORIDA CONSERVATION WEEK, MARCH 14-20

The largest Conservation Week in Florida's history will be held in the Winter Park Mall, Winter Park, Florida, during the week of March 14.

Exhibits that will be open to the public include those from the National Wildlife Federation, Florida Department of Natural Resources, Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District, Florida Game & Fresh Water Fish Commission, Sierra Club, American Forestry Association, National Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, Winter Park Chamber of Commerce, Tri-County Water Pollution Control, Shikar-Safari Club, Conservation International, Incorporated, and the Florida Audubon Society.

The formal opening of the exhibits is to be at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 16 in the Mall. This will be followed by the Annual Conservation dinner at the Langford Hotel at 7:30 that evening.

Wednesday and Thursday will be devoted to field trips under the direction of the Florida Audubon Society. On Thursday there will also be a boat trip of the Winter Park Lakes.

Friday and Saturday will feature outstanding panel discussions. All of the panels will be open to the public and held at Security Federal Savings and Loan Association on the Winter Park Mall property.

At 9:00 a.m., Friday, March 19, Robert Ingle of the Florida Department of Natural Resources and Phil Edwards of the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission will discuss what is being done in both freshwater fisheries and saltwater marine research.

At 10:30 a.m. there will be a discussion on aquatic weed control. This panel will consist of Dr. Alva P. Burkhalter, Florida Department of Natural Resources; Representative William Fulford; and Robert D. Blackburn, Botanist, United States Department of Agriculture.

At 2:00 p.m., E. T. Heinen of the Federal Water Quality Administration and George Gardner of the Florida Department of Air and Water Pollution Control will talk about pollution problems.

Saturday, March 20 at 9:00 a.m., Steve Fickett, Florida Game and Fresh Water Commission; Chuck Salter, Division of Forestry, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; and Eldon Lucas of the U.S. Forest Service will hold forth on the forests and wildlife.

At 10:30 a.m., a panel revealing the problems of beach erosion will be held. It will consist of Dr. William Tanner, Florida State University, Department of Geology, William Carlton, Florida Department of Natural Resources, and Lt. General William Cassidy, Erosion Control District Advisory Committee.

At 2:00 p.m. in the Mall there will be a film festival showing a number of prizewinning outdoor and conservation films.

SECRETARY HENKIN ON THE REBROADCAST OF "THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Z. Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, issued the following release upon learning that CBS is going to rebroadcast "The Selling of the Pentagon."

The message speaks for itself and I want to include it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DAN HENKIN

I note that CBS News has decided to rebroadcast the show which it calls "The Selling of the Pentagon."

I would hope that the numerous factual errors, the unprofessional distortions and the misquotations in the show, as it was originally aired, will be corrected so that the American public will not be misinformed and misled once again.

I also hope that CBS News has now complied fully with certain legal requirements concerning the use of some of the material provided at their request by the Department of Defense. I am informed this compliance was not previously accomplished.

If these corrective actions are not taken, I would only add: let the viewer beware.

THE RAILROAD SITUATION—A STATEMENT OF THE STATUS

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the United Transportation Union for the fact that we are not presently wrestling with the nearly insoluble problems that confront the Congress when a national railroad strike occurs. I hope that other House Members will join with me in expressing similar gratitude.

The United Transportation Union has, since it was formed by a merger in 1969, given every evidence that it does not want to plunge the Nation into a crisis that grows out of a national railroad strike. At the same time, it is determined to bargain vigorously and effectively for better wages and working conditions. Thus, we have the example of an aggressive but responsible labor organization.

Look for a moment at the UTU's handling of its long-existing problem of rules pertaining to the use of locomotive firemen on diesel engines. The union's dispute in this area reached a stage where it was free to strike in the latter part of 1969. But it did not strike. It continued to search for a negotiated solution until the middle of 1970. When the situation appeared hopeless, UTU did not strike nationally. It struck only four railroads. However, the railroads rushed to court and got a restraining order, and the President intervened by appointing an emergency board.

There we have the crux of the problem involving labor-management relations on the railroads. The railroads, with the help of some tortured court logic, have established a situation which holds that unions cannot legally strike a few railroads but must strike all railroads. Then, when a national strike is threatened, the Government moves in to avoid a national emergency. I ask: How can any union function in such a no man's land?

The railroads' legalistic maneuvering prevailed in the above-mentioned firemen's dispute in mid-1970 and earlier in the year in a dispute involving railroad shopcraft unions. Carriers have refused to subject these decisions to appellate court review, pleading each time that the matter has become moot before it reaches a higher court. In the firemen's case, UTU had to bring a declaratory judgment action of its own to counter these tactics. It finally got a decision in the district court last week holding that selective strikes are legal on that issue.

Now let us turn to the UTU's wage-rules dispute that dominates the news these days. It goes back to October 1969, when the union served notices on most of the Nation's railroads for wage increases needed to meet skyrocketing living costs. At an earlier and later period in 1969, the Maintenance of Way Employees, Railway Clerks, and Dining Car employees also served notice for wage increases. The unions' notices were countered by carrier proposals for rules changes. It was not until mid-1970 that the railroads offered any pay increase at all.

After the unions had exhausted the Railway Labor Act's extensive procedures for bargaining, and mediation, the disputes reached an impasse stage in September 1970. Again the effort was made to strike selectively so as not to precipitate a national crisis—this time only two railroads were struck. Again the unions were stopped by a temporary restraining order and the President appointed an emergency board to prevent any strikes or lockouts for 60 days.

The unions went back to the court that had imposed the restraining order to get a prompt trial so that the issue of the legality of selective strikes might be resolved. The railroads opposed this motion and the court denied it.

So it came about last December, when the emergency board report had been made and the negotiating period after that had expired without culminating in an agreement, that the unions were forced into setting a national strike, and Congress responded by enacting Public Law 91-541.

The law imposed a moratorium on any strikes or lockouts until March 1 of this year. It also granted the first year of the board's recommended wage proposals. During the moratorium period, the unions involved in disputes other than UTU managed to make settlements of their disputes—though not without great difficulty.

I do not set myself up as a judge of the merits involved in this rather complex UTU dispute. But I am informed, and it has been frequently reported in the press, that the difficulty in getting a settlement lies in the fact that rules are involved. Rules were not significant issues in the other disputes.

The rules sought by the carriers would have an adverse effect on its members, UTU contends. The union's president, Charles Luna, says:

> If we were to accept them as the carrier insists, it would amount to our members suffering severe layoffs and pay cuts. We would, in effect, be paying for our wage increase and the increases won by the other unions, too.

A key rule change sought by the carriers is the unilateral right to extend road crews' runs without negotiations. In other words, UTU's members would not have the right to negotiate on the length of runs, hours on duty, meal periods or protection to adversely affected employees. Carriers have offered some protective conditions in recent negotiations but they "are entirely inadequate," the union points out.

The UTU has proposed that the questions of interdivisional runs be referred to a standing committee called for in the board's recommendations. The carriers seem to be in favor of the standing committee idea but will not put the interdivisional run issue before it.

One of the most interesting and revealing changes being sought by UTU is a modification of the present away-from-home expense rule. The present rule provides only one meal allowance—and get this—of $1.50 during an entire period an employee may be required to be away from home. It staggers reality to think of workers trying to buy meals away-from-home for 1 day, or several days, as often is the case, on $1.50. Furthermore, the allowance covers only about 45 percent of the employees represented by UTU. Would you not think it justified that the union get the allowance extended and increased?

I find it unbelievable, and I am sustained by many experts on the law, that the Railway Labor Act makes it illegal for unions to strike a few railroads—even one—but must instead strike nationally if they are to strike at all, and thus create an emergency that throws a particular dispute into the laps of Congress.

Yet that is exactly what one judge of the district court for the District of Columbia reasoned to be law last week in blocking a scheduled UTU strike against two railroads—despite the fact that the declaratory judgment of another judge in the same court—in the firemen's case—found selective strikes to be legal.

Two things involving the behavior of the railroads in this situation are most startling: First, they have made the most spectacular efforts imaginable to avoid any appellate court resolution of what the present law means, obviously in the hope that they can continuously stop any selective strikes through temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions; second, their ultimate objective in continually enjoining selective strikes, and thus forcing national strikes, must be to pressure Congress into permanently denying transportation workers the right to strike. Let us make no mistake about it, the railroads cannot possibly believe that a shutdown of the entire industry is better for them and better for the country than a selective strike of a few railroads would be. Their objective has to be abdication of their responsibility for collective bargaining and the substitution of compulsory arbitration.

Incidentally, there is another aspect of the railroads' behavior that interests me. Last Wednesday the Wall Street Journal—March 10, page 12—in reporting the current battles in the courts, indicated that a mutual strike insurance plan among the railroads, that I had heard about some 10 years ago but assumed had lapsed, was still operative. I understand that when the railroads' counsel was asked about this scheme by the court of appeals last Friday, March 12, he admitted that it was still in operation. I suggest that we Members of Congress would be well advised to inform ourselves most thoroughly concerning this scheme and to make our own determinations as to whether its existence does not result in a complete perversion of labor relations in the railroad industry.

EL DIARIO SUPPORTS BADILLO URBAN AID PLAN

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 weeks since I made my first speech in this House detailing my proposal for meeting the immediate, urgent financial needs of our cities and States, there has been increasing support from concerned individuals and groups and from the news media.

This week, the distinguished newspaper, El Diario-La Prensa endorsed my plan editorially, noting that:

Our cities cannot wait two years for the debate over revenue sharing and its alternatives to be resolved. Congress should approach the problem right now and Mr. Badillo's proposal is the best solution advanced up to this date.

I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD the March 15 El Diario-La Prensa editorial:

BADILLO'S PLAN

A stopgap measure to save our cities from its present financial crisis was presented last week by Congressman Herman Badillo, (D-N.Y.)

Mr. Badillo proposed that the federal government lend states and cities $20-billion over the next two years to meet what he called "a physical crisis that has brought many local governments to the brink of collapse."

"Our cities", he said, "are strangling in traffic congesion, noise and poisonous air. The slums are spreading like a cancer feeding the insidious growth of racial strife, violence and crime. We hear demands for law and order, but our cities can barely meet police payrolls. The welfare rolls continue to grow but the cities are unable to find sources of revenue to keep pace. Our slumping economy and the flight of the white middle class to the suburbs, exacerbate the crisis still further".

We cannot but agree with Mr. Badillo's picture of our cities. In fact, this is exactly what is happening in New York. His plan does not intend to be a cure-all, but a temporary measure tending to give Congress time to come out with a more permanent solution.

He proposed that the $20-billion loan should be financed by a 50 year U.S. bond issue on which the federal government would pay the interest charges.

The money should be apportioned to states and cities according to the formula contained in the Nixon Administration's general revenue sharing plan. Under the Badillo proposal New York state would receive $2.1-billion over the next two years, of which about $760-million would go to New York City.

The money would be a loan which the states and localities would be required to repay in 50 years. "Because this money is in the form of a loan, rather than a grant, I believe that we can avoid a long, drawn out debate over restrictions, the earmarking of funds and so forth", said Mr. Badillo.

We do believe that Congress should give serious consideration to Mr. Badillo's plan. It should be passed without delay. If we are going to save our cities, we must do it now with a massive infusion of money. Otherwise, many of our cities will sink irretrievably into filth, decay and crime.

If Badillo's bill is passed, Congress would be able to develop a long-range solution on the basis of the Administration's revenue sharing plan, a Federal takeover of welfare, tax-credits or other measures, enabling the states and cities to provide the essential services their citizens need and deserve.

Mr. Badillo is confident that a sound approach will be worked out and enacted by this 92nd Congress. It seems clear, however, from the discussion and debate which has already taken place, that a long range solution is not likely to be found this year and it may well come too late to be effective before 1973.

Our cities cannot wait two years. Congress should approach the problem right now and Mr. Badillo's proposal is the best solution advanced up to this date.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION PROGRAMS OUTLINED

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—ARBC—the organization established by Congress to plan the celebration of our Nation's 200th anniversary in 1976, I am pleased to report the commission is acting to discharge its responsibilities.

Previously the commission has always met in Washington, but it recently concluded its first full meeting outside the District in open hearings at San Francisco, Calif. The public hearings were an effort to meet State ARBC organizations on a face-to-face basis, and they were successful. Six Western States and several cities made presentations to the commission. Both sides learned much, and another meeting has been planned for a different region of the Nation in the near future. An expanded program is contemplated for the meeting, helping both ARBC members and State and local organizations in planning and establishing goals for the celebration. ARBC Chairman, Mr. David Mahoney, and his outstanding staff deserve congratulations for the fine contribution they have made.

The activities of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission have been performed in the face of severe financial limits imposed by Congress. However, an organizational framework has been established and programs outlined. The time has now come for expanded action to carry out the responsibilities Congress has given the commission.

The commission has been going about its job rather quietly, shunning headlines and controversy, so I doubt many of you have much of an understanding of the ARBC programs or goals. Let me briefly outline them for you.

The ARBC believes the U.S. 200th anniversary celebration should be nationwide. It is to be developed during what the commission has designated the bicentennial era, a period extending to 1983. This 13-year span will recognize the 200th anniversary of many major events that formed this Nation.

The ARBC believes this period is the best time for: First, intensive review and reaffirmation of the basic principles on which the United States was founded; second, how these principles affect and influence our lives today; and third, whether they should be enhanced or changed in guiding our people in the future.

To accomplish this tricornered look at ourselves and our country the Commission has established three programs through which all Americans can participate. They are: Heritage '76, Open House USA, and Horizons '76.

Heritage '76 will review our past. It will be a nationwide summons to recall our heritage and reexamine our origins, our values and the meaning of America. It will be a summons to take pride in our accomplishments and to dramatize our developments. The Heritage '76 program asks that all groups and individuals in our society reexamine themselves in the national context and take pride in their contribution in making the United States the leader of nations.

Open House USA will provide a nationwide opportunity for cities and States to program activities and events to stimulate travel, encourage citizens to expand their knowledge of the Nation, and to extend a particular welcome to visitors. Open House USA is a concept for managing a national voluntary effort to invite citizens of other countries and assist them in attending our national celebration. This program will be the coordinating framework to inspire individuals and private groups to a great outpouring of hospitality. American clubs and organizations will be encouraged to invite their counterparts from abroad.

Horizons '76 is a nationwide challenge to every American, acting individually or with others, to undertake at least one principal project which manifests the pride, the priorities, and the hopes of his community. Every group is encouraged to pool its resources and talents in a constructive way to demonstrate concern for human welfare, happiness, and freedom. Projects of a lasting nature, of long-term benefit to an area, are especially encouraged.

This is a brief outline of the programs. Greater detail can be obtained in the Commission's July 4, 1970, report to the President. Obviously the programs will need top organizational and managerial talent on both the national and local level. You will notice that there is a great deal of cooperation needed between individuals and groups in all three programs. The economic benefits, combined with an uplift of spirit when Americans are given the opportunity to work together for a common peaceful cause, will benefit the Nation now through 1976 and beyond.

The ARBC is providing the opportunity for Americans to plan and work together for their own betterment and enjoyment. Out of that cooperation will come an understanding and appreciation of the worth of the individual and the other person's point of view. A better America will result.

Cooperating with the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission will be State bicentennial commissions, and hopefully each city and town in the country will establish their own Commission to provide this opportunity and challenge.

The opportunities these programs provide are boundless. The ideas have been outlined, put down on paper. Now comes the time for action. This is where the project now stands. At this critical juncture Congress will decide whether the celebration will go forward and fulfill its promising future.

Legislation will soon be presented to Congress that will enlarge the Commission and provide for the necessary funding of its operations.

The commission has been struggling manfully to accomplish its goals with a totally inadequate budget. Presently it does not even have funds to support an open public hearing outside of Washington. An opportunity for the public to contribute its ideas, and the Commission to establish grassroots contact, is being threatened because of inadequate funding. That is a deplorable situation for a prestigious Commission of the Federal Government headed and staffed by talented, dedicated citizens to find itself forced into. The new legislation will provide for adequate funding of the Commission and its programs.

When the new legislation is presented to Congress, I ask for immediate consideration by the referred committee and quick approval by all Members. Time is getting short and so much work remains to be done.

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission is a child of Congress. It has performed its homework admirably. Soon the time will be upon us to give it the spiritual and financial support it needs to develop. Congress must then face up to its own responsibility.

EARTH STEWARDSHIP DAY

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I proudly call to the attention of my colleagues a project of 150 to 200 teenage youngsters from the Episcopal churches in the greater Oklahoma City area which has resulted in our mayor proclaiming March 27 as "Earth Stewardship Day." On this day Episcopal youth from Oklahoma City and the neighboring towns of Moore, Edmond, and Norman will forgo their usual quarterly social event and invade Stars and Stripes Park with their mowers, hoes, rakes, and spades. They will devote a full day's work to improving the undeveloped section of Oklahoma City's newest public park. This beautification project will be a commemorative occasion for our city, and the young participants and sponsors of the project are to be commended for this worthwhile and constructive venture.

A BILLION BUSHELS OF GRAIN DUMPED

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of that committee many of my constituents have written to me concerning the Commodity Credit Corporation sales of grain and decision of the Department of Agriculture not to extend reseal privileges on vast amounts of grain in storage.

Recently, the National Farmers Union had its annual meeting in Washington, D.C. One of the speakers at that event was Hon. ROBERT J. DOLE, U.S. Senator from Kansas.

While I did not have the privilege of hearing Senator DOLE on that occasion, I was provided with a copy of his remarks.

I should like to insert a portion of his comments in the RECORD at this point:

I recall the millions of bushels of grain dumped into the market to hold down prices during the Freeman years. I recall a former Secretary of Agriculture expressing pleasure when farm prices fell, and a Chairman of Economic Advisers under President Johnson stating on television that dumping Corn and other grains on the market was good because it would result in lower hog prices.

I recall an effort made in the House Agriculture Committee to raise the minimum resale price above the 105 percent of loan level and the pressure that came from the Great Society to maintain that low resale price—an effort which was successful by the narrow margin of one Democrat.

I recall the outcries from the farmers union GTA against this market-destroying activity.

However, my recall mechanism does not include any statements of criticism of these policies by the present chairman of the Democratic National Committee in regard to the interests of our farm families on this real dollar and cents issue.

I can recall in the mid-sixties farmers would dread the day Commodity Credit Corporation was to announce the sale of some surplus grain. It was a pretty sure bet grain markets would drop 3¢ to 10¢. I am pleased to say that the minimum legal resale for grains is now 115 percent of loan. CCC is getting that much and more. There is no "dumping" philosophy or practice in this administration.

The statement of Senator DOLE concerning "dumping" of grains under this administration as compared to the previous administration and the information which was being supplied to me by farmers from South Dakota prompted me to check into the statistics concerning this matter.

The Department of Agriculture has provided me, through Legislative Research Service, the information on the CCC activities in grain markets for the years 1967 through 1970. That information is contained in the table below:

[Million bushels]

	1967	1968	1969	1970
Wheat sales:				
Domestic use	7.8	1.6	4.0	41.9
Export	42.4	19.0	14.3	35.2
Corn sales:				
Domestic use	15.2	14.0	24.5	195.3
Export	6.8	5.7	4.3	3.2
Grain sorghum:				
Domestic use	6.8	1.6	12.9	23.3
Export	40.2	0.6	17.7	39.3

Further, the Department of Agriculture advised me that—

In January 1968, the Department of Agriculture announced that reseal privileges would be extended on all loans maturing in 1968 and in October 1968 it announced that reseal privileges would be extended on all loans maturing in 1969.

In December 1969 and February 1970 it announced that reseal privileges would not be extended in 1970 for grains in storage from specified crop years. In December 1970 and February 1971, it also announced that reseal privileges would not be extended in 1971 for grains in storage from specified crop years. The amount of specific grains under government loans at the time of the announcements, not eligible for reseal in 1970 and 1971 were:

[In millions of bushels]

December 1969:	
Wheat	54.8
Corn	147.5
Grain sorghum	44.5
February 1970:	
Corn	8.3
December 1970:	
Wheat	247
Corn	100
Grain sorghum	21
Barley	28
Oats	36
February 1971:	
Corn	87

Thus, in 1969 and in 1970 the Department of Agriculture releases of grain to markets, by CCC sales and by terminating resealed grain loans, totaled more than 1 billion bushels—1,103,000,000. That compares with about 16 percent of that amount for the previous 2 years—161,700,000 bushels.

It is obvious to me that the purpose of these sales by CCC and the decisions concerning reseal privileges have been made by the administration for only one purpose—to hold down the price of these farm products.

The magnitude of the Government grain dumping policy revealed by that tabulation is alarming and unbelievable—especially when the agriculture industry is suffering the consequences of a price depression.

The market price of spring wheat in South Dakota has dropped as much as 24 cents per bushel during the last 60 days.

This grain-dumping policy is another demonstration of the doubletalk philosophy in how to emphasize rural development and economic stability.

It is the same pattern that was followed last week when the Secretary of Agriculture refused to increase the price support of manufactured milk and ig-

nored completely the rising costs of feed, labor, and other costs of production imposed on farm families by continued policies of national inflation.

It is the same pattern followed when the Secretary of Agriculture set support levels for corn and wheat at the lowest possible levels allowable under the law.

Congress must act quickly to reverse present USDA policies that are not in the best interest of farm families and insist that the Secretary of Agriculture take positive action to stop the farm depression.

One such effort is a bill which I am cosponsoring with Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa, to continue the producers' price of milk at 85 percent of parity.

I will seek other legislation that provides fair, equitable, and reasonable income for farm families.

DO NOT MARCH BACKWARD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious to us that many issues by their very complexity deserve thorough and objective study and are subject to well-intended but highly emotional pressures.

This is, as I interpret it, the practical point made in an editorial Saturday, March 6, in the Polish American of Chicago, Ill. The editorial follows:

DO NOT MARCH BACKWARD

A curious transition has been taking place in both public and private attitudes toward our way of life in the United States. Under the guise of improving physical health, quality of life and the environment in which we live, a drive is on to reduce the availability or utilization of the very things that for centuries were considered the ultimate goals of a better life. Even the abundance of good food is now considered a hazard to health in some quarters.

This drive toward regression is bound, sooner or later, either through regulation or other forms of coercion, to cause a sort of "hardening of the arteries" of the production and marketing system that heretofore has operated on the traditional premise that people will demand more and better things in the future. Normal, healthy people are told, for example, that they should eliminate certain items from their diet in anticipation of heart attacks or some other disability—although there is abundant scientific evidence that such sacrifice is neither necessary nor likely healthful. In an effort to help counteract rising confusion over food—what to eat—the food industry is launching a long-range program to encourage people to eat normally of the four basic food groups—meat, fish and poultry; fruit and vegetables; dairy products; and breads and cereals. The National Dairy Council is one of the research and educational organizations charged with the task of helping to present the nutrition story in which dairy products have an important place. Normally healthy people need milk and milk products just as they need the other foods that make up a balanced diet.

It is hard to see how the quality of life or the health of the individual can be improved by turning away from the bounty that has been given to us by the most efficient food production and marketing system ever known. In food, as in everything else, a healthy and wholesome future lies in the wise use of that which science and technology have given to us.

NADER, THE OBSESSION MAN

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I noticed an interesting column last Sunday by the distinguished writer, Donald Walsh, in the Cape Code Standard-Times that quotes some statements made by our colleague, Representative BOB WILSON of California on the subject of Ralph Nader.

I include it as a portion of my remarks:

NADER, THE OBSESSION MAN

(By Donald Walsh)

Ralph Nader is a busybody by profession. Also he has an obsession.

Ralph's particular hangup is a conviction that Big Business has only one aim—to send each and every one of its customers to an early grave.

If a company happens to be in the food processing-business nobody can tell the sultan of snoopers that they do not work with might and main, around the clock, yet, to poison people. Baby food manufacturers have achieved high skills in this direction, the Nader theory has it.

Automobile manufacturers, and especially General Motors, have been pulling the wool over our eyes for years and years and have pretty well convinced the public that their aim is to provide reliable transportation and price it within reach of most wage-earners.

Poppy-cock, balderdash and sheer, utter nonsense are Nader's terms for this fabrication because he knows the motor trust is intent on killing us, one and all, by turning out cars with brakes that don't brake, steering wheels that don't steer, trap doors that dump passengers to the pavement when speeds exceed 35 miles-an-hour and various other pieces of equipment designed with evil in mind.

Oil companies, instead of striving to improve and purify their products, lavish princely sums on laboratories and scientists to man them for the sole purpose of discovering molecular tinker-toys guaranteed to make car exhaust systems as lethal as San Quentin's gas chamber, thus placing every living thing on Death Row.

Giant soft-drink companies are in cahoots with the American Dental Association by means of an underground cartel known as Cavities Unlimited, but everybody knows that.

In the Nader scheme of things airplanes are made for the express purpose of escalating the eradication of the ecology and the nation's cigaret rollers, all along the busy production lines, are dedicated to the proposition that all lungs are susceptible to carcinoma and what's wrong with spreading it around.

I confess to being a rapt Nader-watcher so when I tell you he has yet to sound any warnings about the possible harmful effects of puffing marijuana or hashish you'd better believe it. This proves conclusively, I would guess, that he is not a 100 per cent, absolute killjoy and has due appreciation for the finer things in life. Nevertheless, if pot falls into the hands of corporate curs, watch out!

It will go on the Nader blacklist quicker than you can say G.M., rest assured.

Another thing to be noted about Ralphieboy is that his every word, every syllable, is treated as if it were the Sermon on the Mount by scribblers and talk-merchants of liberal persuasion. His bitterest accusation gets immediate endorsement from these people who, I am overjoyed to remind you, are the very ones who swallowed with gusto and A-1 sauce the Big Lie about 28 blacks having been murdered in cold blood by policemen at the opposite end of the color spectrum and spread the falsehood the length and breadth of the land without making even a cursory investigation of the facts.

A careful analysis by a responsible reporter reduced the number to two and even this total is questionable because some evidence points to the fact that these victims were engaged in a shoot-out with police when they fell. A regrettable incident, of course, but hardly cold-blooded murder if shots actually were being exchanged.

It is a strange fact of life among the liberals that Nader's knocks against anything and anybody constitute legitimate stories, hard news as a matter of fact, whereas anyone who dares criticize the arch-critic gets about as much attention as a cap pistol on an artillery range.

To cite as an example, how many gentle readers are familiar with a speech delivered in Washington only last month by California's Congressman Bob Wilson of the San Diego Wilsons? The speech took Nader to task for complaining bitterly to the House judiciary committee and the Senate antitrust and monopoly committee that his, Nader's, demand that General Motors and Ford be broken up had been ignored by Congress.

In his letter, Nader professed to see, in Wilson's words, "all sorts of diabolical and political reasons why such action had not been taken."

The Californian continued, "It is not just a case of trying to breakup GM that bothers me, though. It is this whole trend toward making business the goat for all our problems. Of late it almost seems to be a sport to shout that business, and particularly Big Business, is bad. I will readily admit that Big Business is one of the establishments in American life.

"But let us not forget for a minute that it gained that position by 'establishing' itself over the years as a solid economic base for the growth of our country. Large corporations did not just spring up in this country overnight, despite the fact that some crusaders feel they should be dismantled in that time span.

"They were built slowly and arduously. And only in response to the demands for more of the things that make ours the highest standard of living in the world. This may sound like a lot of flag-waving but it's not. It is the story of American business and all of us should be quick to defend it against blithe attacks by so-called crusaders.

"We should be quick to speak out against such assaults no matter where they arise and, to my dismay, they are beginning to come from some pretty high places."

There was a lot more, in the same general vein, to the speech but what I want to ask is this—

Why, if Ralph Nader is so all-fired newsworthy whenever he, himself, opens his trap, isn't it also worth a headline or two when someone puts the blast on him as Bob Wilson did in his February speech that was carried in the Congressional Record?

Just asking, that's all.

HORRIBLE CONDITIONS IN MANY OF CHICAGO'S NURSING HOMES

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the second in a series of articles which appeared recently in the Chicago Tribune. These articles, which exposed the horrible conditions in many of Chicago's nursing homes, were the result of the work of a task force of Tribune writers who spent 6 weeks working in nursing homes and reporting on their findings.

The Tribune writers involved in the project were: William Jones, Philip Caputo, William Currie, and Pamela Zekman. While there will be those who will criticize these articles as being sensational, I believe, as one who has shared their experience of working in nursing homes, that these men and women have performed a valuable service not only to Chicago and Illinois, but to the Nation as well. My only hope is that the day will soon come when reporters can go into nursing homes and find no story to write.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 2, 1971]

HALT NURSING HOME FUNDS—STATE WELFARE IS WITHHELD; PROBE BEGINS

(By Philip Caputo and William Currie)

The State Public Aid Department announced yesterday it is withholding thousands of dollars in public aid payments to Chicago area nursing homes named in a Tribune series exposing mistreatment and neglect of the elderly poor.

George Dunne, County Board president, disclosed plans to remove hundreds of public aid patients from substandard nursing homes in an attempt to force them to close.

Dunne and Harold Boysaw, deputy director of the county public aid department, said 30 investigators have been assigned to a full-scale nursing home investigation. Boysaw said he expects a preliminary report by late tomorrow or Thursday.

The Tribune began a series of articles Sunday disclosing patient abuse and wretched living conditions in area nursing homes. The probe was conducted in cooperation with the Better Government Association.

REACTION OF OFFICIALS

In other related developments:

Ald. Claude W. B. Holman [4th], chairman of the City Council health committee, and Ald. Wilson Frost [34th] said they will submit a resolution March 10, seeking public hearings on nursing homes.

"It will be a sweeping investigation with the view of passing new laws, if necessary, to remedy the evils you have exposed," Holman said.

An aide to Gov. Ogilvie said the governor's office has directed state officials dealing with welfare payments and nursing home inspections to increase inspections from once a year to once every 30 days.

The aide also said his office has uncovered evidence that state employees may be selling information to some nursing home operators, telling them when surprise inspections are planned.

HANRAHAN COMMENTS

State's Atty. Edward V. Hanrahan said his office will "enthusiastically prosecute" all cases where there is evidence of patient brutality.

A Chicago health official admitted that one of the nearly 20 homes where a task force reporter worked as a maintenance man is not licensed by the city. A public health nurse attempted to inspect the Golden Age Home, 4542 N. Malden St. was turned away at the door by an employee of the home.

Dr. Murray Brown, commissioner of the Chicago Board of Health, which controls nursing home licenses in the city, said his agency plans to seek no special action as a result of the disclosures.

"If you're looking for some reaction, you're not going to get it," Brown said. "We're reacting to it all year long. We do have limitations. What you as reporters can see in 24 hours we can't see in our inspection visits.

WANTS COURT'S SUPPORT

"There are people that shouldn't be in this business but they are there and it is difficult to keep them out. If you close them down, where are you going to put the people. It's not our purpose to close homes down. It's our purpose to care for the people."

Brown also called for more support in the courts when action is taken against poor conditions in nursing homes.

"We would like to have support from the courts," Brown said. "We aren't attacking the courts but we would like their full, wholehearted support such as an increase in the amount of fines. A $5 to $1,500 fine is peanuts compared to the effect of cutting off payments."

Robert Wessel, chief of the medical administration section of the state Public Aid Department announced the cutoff of funds to nursing homes named in the series. He said his investigators are on the street to determine if the homes threaten the health and safety of patients.

"The reports in the Tribune show we are apparently not getting what we are paying for," Wessel said. Wessel said the ban on public aid payments now covers these homes:

Melbourne Nursing Center, 4621 N. Racine Av.; The Park Home, 2320 S. Lawndale Av.; Monterey-Drexel Home, 4616 S. Drexel Blvd.; La Grange Convalescent Center, 40 S. Ashland Av., La Grange; Austin-Congress Nursing Home, 901 S. Austin Blvd.; and Whitehaven Acres Nursing Home, 1505 Greenwood Rd., Glenview.

Dr. Robert Glass, director of the Illinois Mental Health Department, said he will lead a series of inspections into homes where former mental patients now live.

RECALL 1969 SCANDAL

Thousands of mental patients have been transferred into private nursing homes in recent years as a result of a 1969 scandal in mental institutions that resulted from overcrowding and brutality.

Glass said if he finds the same conditions outlined in the Tribune series he will ban the transfer of former mental patients to the nursing homes and transfer those already there.

Another source in the Mental Health Department complained that inspectors have apparently not been doing an adequate job in inspecting the homes. He complained that Board of Health inspectors have failed to notify mental health officials of conditions in some of the homes until nursing home operators are taken to court.

REPLIES TO DISCLOSURES

Hillel Yampol, executive director of the Metropolitan Chicago Nursing Home Association, described the disclosures as "superficial" and said his organization will hold a press conference at 9:30 a.m. today in their offices at 43 E. Ohio St.

The Illinois Nursing Home Association released a statement late yesterday criticizing what the organization described as very poor enforcement of standards, rules and regulations of the nursing home industry by the Chicago Board of Health and the County Health Department.

"The Illinois Nursing Home Association supports the nursing home investigation and proposed crackdown on standards enforcement in Chicago," said Ross A. Reardon, executive director of the group.

NURSING HOME'S SHAVING TIME BECOMES TORTURE FOR PATIENT

The young man had just begun to mop the filthy floor of the South Side nursing home when he was summoned by a nurse's aide.

"Hold this guy's head or I'll never get him shaved," the aide ordered.

The old man, his body crippled by a nervous disorder that caused his arms and head to jerk uncontrollably, hadn't been shaved in a week. It was a difficult task at best and today it would quickly become an ordeal.

Using only a pan of cold water and a sliver of soap, the aide began hacking away at the whisker growth. She had gathered several old safety razors for the job and as the blood trickled down the patient's face she would discard one and try another.

SEEKS NEW BLADE

Finally, unable to watch it any longer, the mopboy told the aide to wait while he ran thru the home searching for a razor blade that hadn't been used before. When the ordeal was finally over, the aide added a final touch to the patient's discomfort. She splashed rubbing alcohol over his face in an effort to stop the bleeding.

This is the Monterey-Drexel Home, 4616 S. Drexel Blvd., one of a chain of nursing homes owned by the N-H Managment Corp., 105 W. Adams St.

The shaving incident is one of many examples of the kind of care received by thousands of elderly citizens living in warehouses for the dying in the Chicago area.

EXPOSED 8 YEARS AGO

Tribune Task Force reporters worked as orderlies, janitors, nurses' aides, and mopboys to document the abuses.

This is the second time in the last eight years that the Monterey-Drexel Home has been exposed for filthy conditions and wretched patient care. The N-H Corp. is headed by Joseph Bonnan, a former aide to Mayor Daley and the man who wrote the city's nursing home code while serving as the Mayor's assistant.

The same day that the old man submitted to the shaving ordeal, another aide was discussing the plight of an emaciated man too weak to move from his bed.

"He's supposed to be on a special high protein diet," the aide explained to a reporter employed as a mopboy. "But he gets the same thing everyone else gets."

PATIENT GIVES VIEWS

Another patient, one of hundreds dumped into private homes in an effort to reduce the patient load at state mental hospitals, discussed his problem this way:

"I wish I was back there [Kankakee State Hospital]. They don't care here. You come here all messed up, you're gonna stay messed up. They don't pay no attention to you."

His conclusions tragically parallel the attitude of the administrator of Monterey-Drexel.

"We're not going to help them [the patients]," she said. "I don't worry about them. I just want to keep myself out of here."

HOME IN PALATINE

At the Bee Dozier Home in Palatine, an old farmhouse that houses up to 40 patients, a reporter working as a nurse's aide made the mistake of attempting to change the bath water after every patient.

"Don't do that," a male orderly cautioned. "I just let a little bit out and add a little clean hot water to warm it up a bit. This ain't the Savoy dear. It's the Workingman's Palace and we don't do that." The Workingman's Palace is one of Skid Row's largest flophouses.

The orderly then poured a single pitcher of clean water into the tub and used the dirty water to give two more patients their weekly bath.

MANY ALCOHOLICS USED

The male orderly was one of dozens of Skid Row alcoholics who make up the major labor force at the Dozier home.

Recruited from a West Madison Street flophouse by a maid who receives a kickback for every derelict, the men are sent to the Northwest suburb by train and then ride a cab to the nursing home. They must stay at least 30 days and work as orderlies, nurse's aides and cooks. During two of the three shifts in the home they are the only employes in charge of patients.

The only nurse at the home explained that before she was hired a year ago one of the derelicts was performing all the nursing duties. She said the same employe who gave the baths had been banished to the laundry shack recently after he was caught stealing drugs prescribed for the patients.

SCRIMPING ON FOOD

The home also features one of the most unusual diet items uncovered during the investigation. In order to scrimp on the food budget, the head nurse explained, the management purchases such items as canned pineapple cores instead of the more expensive pineapple slices. The cost cutting scheme apparently backfired, however, when the employes couldn't eat the so-called fruit and a blender failed to pulverize it.

At the Park House, 2320 S. Lawndale Av., which describes itself in a brochure as "Chicago's newest, most modern convalescent, retirement and nursing home," the weekly bath became a horrifying experience for a 91-year-old patient.

Two nurse's aides were attempting to make the patient sit down in the bath tub despite his pleas to "slow down, I can't bend my legs this fast."

AIDE SLAPS PATIENT

One of the aides responded with a sharp slap across the face and the old man cried out in pain.

Another aide slapped a patient who objected to the way he was being shaved.

The home is infested with cockroaches and puddles of urine are allowed to dry on the floor. No effort is made to provide special care for patients unable to control their body functions.

One aide, who has worked in a number of other nursing homes, said it was the first home she had seen where such patients did not receive extra care. Instead, she noted, "they have the patients' bare buttocks against the chairs. These people are usually kept in some kind of diapers, but they don't do that here."

One subzero morning at Park House, a senile woman managed to make her way into an outer hallway where the temperature hovered around freezing. She was shaking uncontrollably from the cold. When the maintenance man called her plight to the attention of an aide he was told:

"She'll come in when she gets cold enough."

CLEAN FRONT HALLWAY

The home's claim to being the city's most modern is apparently based on the care given to the front hallway and several selected rooms. George Smith, the administrator, insisted that particular attention be paid to areas of the home that might be seen by visitors.

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

The Beacon Hill Nursing Home, 4530 N. Beacon St., also restricts its sanitation demands to the front hallways. While the first floor glistens from repeated mopping and waxing, the second floor is constantly filthy and includes chipped and cracked toilets and toilet seats, plumbing pulled loose from the walls, and in one bathroom a toilet jarred loose from the floor that floods the entire room every time it is flushed.

OWNER EXPLAINS PROCEDURE

The most helpless of the patients are kept on the second floor, the owner pointed out, "so they don't smell up the first floor."

In a day room a very old woman is ignored completely and spends hours each day slumped forward in a chair with her head against her food tray. She had been in this position so long that a large circular sore has opened on the tip of her nose.

Patients, including an elderly diabetic, frequently complain that they don't receive their medication. The nurse's aide assigned to the floor occupied by the diabetic said she refuses to give him his insulin because "it scares me to stick needles in people."

TRIES TO GET MEDICINE

In another case, a woman cried out for hours in an effort to tell someone she hadn't received her medication the night before or that morning. She was told to shut up by several aides, but persisted until the chief nurse told her:

"You got along without your medicine last night, you can get along without it today."

PILLS FOUND ON FLOORS

The nurse then noted that the woman had not received her medication the previous night because someone had gone home with the keys to the medicine cabinet. Sometime later the nurse told an aide to give the still complaining patient her medication.

"What's she get?" the aide asked.

"Oh, a white one, a yellow one, and a black one and green one," the nurse answered.

Several days earlier, while mopping the floors at Beacon Hill, a reporter hired as a maintenance man discovered a pill on the floor where it had been tossed or dropped into a puddle of urine. He picked up the pill and complained to an aide that he was finding pills on the floors thruout the home.

The aide took the pill, walked over to the medicine cabinet, and dropped it inside a pill bottle to be used again.

At the Whitehaven Acres Nursing Home, 1505 Greenwood Rd., Glenview, and the Kenmore Nursing Home, 5517 N. Kenmore Av., investigators noted pill swapping by aides at medication time. One patient runs out of medication, the medicine prescribed for another is used. At Whitehaven the cook dispensed medicine.

THROWS PILLS AWAY

At the Melbourne Nursing Center, 4621 N. Racine Av., the aides throw away pills if a patient has a reputation for balking at taking his medication.

Neither is any effort made at Melbourne to maintain accurate records of day-to-day progress or problems of the patients.

The licensed practical nurse in charge of the shift was aware of the practice and cautioned the employes to also enter a time for their observations, pointing out that "these are legal documents. If anything should happen and you get pulled into court on them, they are the only way you can prove it didn't happen on your shift."

"NOBODY WORKS TOO HARD HERE"

(By William Jones)

It is called the Kenmore House Nursing Home and it is a reminder that for many of our elderly poor the golden years are a cruel trick filled with dreary, smelly rooms, incompetent staff and meals consisting of table scraps.

I worked at Kenmore House and the filth is everywhere.

The stench first hits an outsider at the basement level entrance and gets worse as you ride a rickety elevator to the upper floors of the converted transient hotel. One of the most foul-smelling rooms on the fourth floor, occupied by three elderly men, is directly across the hall from the dining area. The stench from the room is so strong that it carries into the dining area.

BEGINS WORK AS MOPBOY

The floors in some of the rooms are so filthy that the day I began work as a mopboy my efforts to mop the floors created muddy swaths across the cracked tile floors. In another room, where the bathroom window was broken and replaced with clear glass, the patients have taped an old bath towel across the window to afford a degree of privacy.

The home has been the target of numerous city health department complaints in the last year, yet continues to receive more than $250,000 a year from public aid for patient care.

I obtained the job after an interview with the administrator, Rabbi Benjamin Cohen, who made no secret of the fact that he was not happy with my out-of-town work experience.

QUESTIONS CREDENTIALS

"You have no roots, you just wander around," Cohen said. "How can I check you out? I can't hire you without any references. I'm in trouble now with the Board of Health now because I hired a guy without checking him out and he started roughing up the patients."

I insisted I was willing to work for less than $2 an hour, however, and a week later Cohen decided to take a chance.

"This guy says he wants to works as a maintenance man," Cohen told his head houseman. "You talk to him. He seems a little eager to me."

William Recktenwald, a Better Government Association investigator, also applied for work as a janitor and apparently made a better impression, despite similar phony references.

"This is a nice young fellow," Cohen told his director of nursing. "Let's make him a nurse."

"We can't make him a nurse," the nursing director responded. "He has no training. He couldn't dispense medication without training."

"He's a nice personable young man," Cohen said. "Make him a nurse and he can dispense medication. I'm sure he can catch on quickly."

The next day Recktenwald was given a set of keys to the narcotics and medicine cabinets and worked the next two days as a nurse.

My own introduction to work as a mopboy was handled in a slightly different manner. On the day I reported for work, another houseman who was washing his underwear in the basement was told to show me the ropes. It was his day off and he was still drunk from the previous night.

As we moved from floor to floor I found my fellow worker walking into walls and cursing his bad fortune at having to spend even a minute of his day off showing a new man around.

"If you see something laying around sweep it up," I was told. "You know, just look busy. Nobody breaks their——around here. Do you drink?" When I responded that I did on occasion he said: "Well, I've got a bottle down in my locker and I better get to it."

With that he disappeared and I was left to clean the fourth floor. No disinfectants are used in cleaning the floors or toilets and

the head houseman related that such chemicals only streak the floors.

My pail of mop water had turned black by the time I had completed the first room. Linen and blankets are grimy and the wastebaskets in each room are so dirty they resemble garbage cans.

PILLS FALL ON FLOOR

During my chores on the fourth floor I also observed a nurse's aide preparing the mid-morning medication. She stood in front of a medicine closet with a variety of pills scattered at her feet where they had been dropped and never retrieved.

As she prepared each dosage I noticed a unique cost-cutting device. She was reusing several crumpled wax paper pill cups stashed in the bottom of the medicine cart with no apparent knowledge of who had previously used the cups.

It was not the first cost-cutting scheme uncovered at Kenmore. While Recktenwald worked as a nurse, he also helped feed the patients. One night, when the evening meal had been sent to the 37 patients living on the second floor, it quickly became apparent that there would not be enough to go around.

SOLVES MEAL PROBLEM

A licensed practical nurse working with Recktenwald said this happened frequently. Then she and Recktenwald began gathering the trays of those who had finished eating and set about solving the problem.

All of the leftover steamed cabbage and noodles on each tray were scraped onto new trays and fed to other patients. What they didn't eat was again scraped onto fresh trays until the evening meal was completed.

When Recktenwald returned to the home a few days later a nurse was complaining about large quantities of narcotics missing from the drug cabinet. This was her solution to the problem:

"The drug and narcotic records are all messed up. We have big shortages on some of the narcotics. He [the administrator] had better get that pharmacist over here to phony up the records. I'm not going to get in trouble for this."

PACOIMA MEMORIAL LUTHERAN HOSPITAL

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1957, two airplanes crashed at Pacoima Junior High School, killing two boys, five men, and injuring scores of others. There was no local hospital available and victims were transferred long distances for treatment. This meant unnecessary pain and misery.

Because of this tragedy, Rev. John Simmons decided to build a hospital—Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital. Last October the hospital celebrated its 10th anniversary, and Reverend Simmons declared:

God through us has made a triumph out of tragedy.

On February 9, 1971, the hospital became a victim of the California earthquake. More than 100 patients were evacuated from the hospital without injury, and 200 emergency cases were brought in and treated at no charge. The same morning, the hospital was condemned.

Less than a week later the hospital opened operations in a new wing that had been undamaged by the disaster—the Golden State Community Center. This was not an easy task, and credit for completing the task must be given to Reverend Simmons, the medical staff, hospital employees, hospital volunteers, and many other volunteers including those from police and fire departments.

Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital experienced death, resurrection, and rebirth all in 1 week. It was first born out of tragedy, and it must again rise from tragedy. Hence, we honor the hospital, its devoted members, and its dedicated founder, Rev. John Simmons, March 28 with the theme, "Triumph Out of Tragedy—An Instant Replay."

The hospital now faces the future with greater determination to serve those in need. It is a lesson for us all.

THE LATE THOMAS E. DEWEY

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of Thomas E. Dewey brings to a close the life of one of the leading public figures in our Nation's recent past.

It is not generally known, I believe, that the three-time Governor of New York was originally from Michigan, having been born some 68 years ago in Owosso, which is located in the Sixth Congressional District.

It is, therefore, the special combined sense of loss and pride that I wish to express at this solemn time which I know is shared by many in that Shiawassee County community.

Governor Dewey served his country and his party with uncommon distinction. His counsel will be missed. The Washington Evening Star and the Washington Post have both published commemorative editorials which I believe give some indication of the measure and appreciation of the man and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 17, 1971]

THOMAS EDMUND DEWEY

The death yesterday at the age of 68 of Thomas E. Dewey deprives New York, the Republican party and the nation of one of its most distinguished sons. As a racket-busting federal prosecutor, as district attorney for New York County and as a three-time Republican governor of the Empire State, Dewey served with both moral integrity and intellectual distinction.

Twice he was the G.O.P. standardbearer for the presidency, losing in 1944 to Franklin D. Roosevelt and in 1948 to Harry S. Truman. In the latter instance, his victory had been so unanimously predicted by the pundits that several newspapers' (notably the Chicago Tribune's) early editorials hailed it. But when the votes were counted, the man from Independence was the victor by 2 million popular votes and a margin of 303–189 in the electoral college. On both occasions Dewey was a good loser, concealing any personal disappointment he may have felt in the interest of national unity.

If his record as governor was any indication, Dewey would have made a good President. In addition to shaking the power of organized crime, he reduced New York's bonded debt, prohibited racial and religious discrimination in employment and education and banned strikes by public employes. The Michigan-born statesman, who always regarded himself as a "true liberal," advised those who opposed the G.O.P.'s "progressive" policies to leave the party.

There were those who said that if Dewey had shaved the mustache he grew the summer after his graduation from Columbia University, he would have been President. It was typical of Dewey that, after two presidential defeats, he kept the mustache and disavowed further political aspirations.

His decision, as he put it, was "as certain and final as death and the staggering New Deal taxes." And as usual, Dewey had said what he meant and meant what he said. He'll be missed.

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

THOMAS EDMUND DEWEY

It is in New York that Thomas E. Dewey will be best remembered—as an able, progressive governor of the state for three terms, as a dogged, even dynamic district attorney, as a distinguished lawyer in the years after his retirement from public office and public politics at the early age of 52. As a national politician, he will be worst remembered for the two losing candidacies for the presidency, and especially the last catastrophic campaign against President Truman in 1948. Yet neither remembrance will do justice to the enormous influence he exerted on the history of his times by the manner in which he did—or did not—exercise political power. On no less than three occasions he had as much to say as any man—indirectly, in two instances and inadvertently in another—about who would become President of the United States.

It is probably safe to say, for instance, that Richard Nixon would not be President today had it not been for the role played by Mr. Dewey, both in the choice of Mr. Nixon for the second spot on the Eisenhower ticket in 1952, and in the retention of Mr. Nixon on the ticket after the uproar over the famous "secret" political fund which had been collected on his behalf. It was Mr. Dewey who guided the young Senator Nixon through that particular political crisis in his life. And it was Mr. Dewey who stuck by him when most of the Eisenhower high command was ready to let him withdraw as the vice presidential candidate, which would almost certainly have put a stop to his political career.

A case can similarly be made that had it not been for the slickly professional support of Governor Dewey and his forces for General Eisenhower, the GOP Convention of 1952 might well have turned to the old warhorse, Robert Taft, who had stood up for the party and fought its battles during its long hard 20 years of opposition to Democratic presidencies. It was the Dewey crowd that engineered the so-called Fair Play maneuver that turned the tide against Taft; even so, the Eisenhower edge was a narrow one.

And finally, of course, there is no getting around the hard fact that Governor Dewey had as much as anybody to do with the triumph of Harry Truman in 1948. It was easy enough to say after the fact that the silky smooth, super-confident, noncombative Dewey campaign was a mistake. It was, of course, a mistake founded on a miscalculation which pretty nearly everybody but Mr. Truman shared; there was a contagion about the way in which wrong assumptions reinforced themselves until nobody in the Dewey entourage bothered to examine what the reality might be because the polls and the press had already agreed on it. Still, it was his show and it will always be said that he misplayed it in part because it was in his

nature to be arrogant, and cold and therefore out of touch. He was too glib, too efficient, too programmed, the argument ran.

Yet he was extraordinarily competent; you could not dismiss or discount his qualifications for the presidency. He did his party no disgrace in 1948, and he rendered it long service, with modesty and good humor, after departing from the public stage. To remember him most vividly in defeat is to overlook the fact that he was a valuable public servant in New York for many years and, nationally, a man who made a considerable difference in the political history of his times.

THE BROWNSVILLE RAID—A STUDY OF MILITARY INJUSTICE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago a most significant study of military injustice was published. Entitled "The Brownsville Raid," it is a thoroughly documented chronicle by John D. Weaver of an almost forgotten bit of history involving a cast of characters that included Presidents of the United States, Senators, the Military Establishment, white townspeople of Brownsville, Tex., and 170 black soldiers.

The incident in Brownsville, which often has been called America's "black Dreyfus affair," occurred on August 13, 1906, when shots were fired in the vicinity of the army barracks, killing one civilian and wounding another, and culminated in the discharge without honor of 167 black infantrymen of the U.S. Army.

His curiosity, aroused by a casual reference to Brownsville of his mother, Mr. Weaver commenced a research project that involved 2 years and much travel to develop and correlate the facts. He has written a remarkable and provocative account of the incident.

Following are several reviews of "The Brownsville Raid," which I hope will ignite an interest in my colleagues to delve further into this little known incident in our Nation's history and join with me in seeking to right a grievous wrong:

BLACK EPISODE AT BROWNSVILLE

(By John D. Weaver)

I grew up with anecdotes my mother liked to tell of a trip she took from her native Washington, D.C., to Brownsville, Texas, in the early years of her marriage. My father was a court reporter in those days and I had always assumed that litigation of some sort had taken him down to the Mexican border. Not until three or four years ago, when mother made a casual reference to Brownsville, did I get around to asking why she and my father had gone there.

"Some Negro soldiers shot up the town," she said, "and Teddy Roosevelt kicked them out of Army."

"Did Dad report their trial?" I asked.

"They didn't have any trial. He just kicked them out."

"But not even the President can go around kicking people out of the Army without a trial," I said.

"Teddy Roosevelt did," mother insisted, and when I dug into the official records of the case in the library at the University of California at Los Angeles, I discovered she was right.

DISMISSED WITHOUT HONOR

Three companies of black soldiers had been dismissed without honor by a stroke of the presidential pen in 1906. Roosevelt's order had been carried out by his Secretary of War and hand-picked successor, William Howard Taft.

Three years later, I found, my father had reported the proceedings of a court of inquiry composed of five retired generals who were less interested in righting the wrong than in making the wrong appear right.

Although two Presidents of the United States had first committed and then tried to justify this massive assault on the civil rights of 170 black soldiers (many of whom had fought at Roosevelt's side in Cuba), it has been swept under history's rug. I could find few standard reference works that even mentioned the raid and none that gave a full, fair and accurate account.

This was all the more astonishing because the story turned out to be a fascinating whodone-it. Sometime around midnight August 13, 1906, when shots rang out in the dark corridor between Brownsville and Fort Brown, the newly arrived black troops assumed they were being attacked by a local mob because, just the night before, a white woman had fought off an assailant she'd described as a Negro soldier. The townspeople, on the other hand, assumed that the black soldiers were firing on the town because of the ill treatment they'd received.

From the outset the War Department took the soldiers' guilt for granted, but time and again in the evidence it dug up to establish the men's guilt proved, on further investigation, to be compelling evidence of their innocence. To this day not a single soldier has ever been proved guilty of the offense for which all of them were punished.

Aside from its interest as a mystery story, the episode also had far-reaching political significance. Because of their resentment of the harsh, unjust treatment of the Brownsville soldiers by a Republican Administration, more blacks voted against Taft in 1908 than had ever voted against any other Republican presidential candidate.

Thus, Brownsville marks a watershed in the development of Black Power, but for more than 60 years the official records had rested on library shelves virtually ignored.

No full-length examination of this Black Dreyfus Affair was available to students swarming into classrooms set aside for new programs in the field of Black Studies. The long neglect of the Brownsville Raid constitutes a most persuasive argument for the initiation of such programs.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Sentinel, Dec. 24, 1970]

"BROWNSVILLE RAID"

(By Frank W. Terry)

A massive assault by two U.S. Presidents on the civil rights of 167 black soldiers has been swept so far under history's rug that few Americans—black, brown or white—have ever heard of the episode, John D. Weaver reveals in "The Brownsville Raid: The Story of America's Black Dreyfus Affair," which has just been published by W. W. Norton & Co., New York.

"Aside from its fascination as an exciting mystery story," Weaver says, "the story of the Brownsville soldiers is of great historical importance. Its political repercussions mark a watershed in the development of black power, but two generations of historians, biographers and encyclopedists have virtually ignored the affair. It's an excellent example of the need for black studies departments."

The incident took place in Brownsville, Tex., on a hot summer night in 1906 when three companies of black soldiers were stationed at the old Mexican War fort on the edge of town. Around midnight, just two weeks after the arrival of the black battalion, shots rang out in the dark corridor separating the town and the fort.

WHITE WOMAN ACCUSES NEGRO

The soldiers assumed they were being attacked by a local mob inflamed by talk of the attempted rape of a white woman who had identified her assailant as a black man in an Army uniform. At the same time, the townspeople jumped to the conclusion that black soldiers were attacking the town because some of them had been assaulted by white men.

At the end of the 10-minute shooting spree, a young white man lay dead, a police official had been wounded and an angry mob had formed in the center of the town demanding punishment of the black soldiers. All of the soldiers signed sworn statements proclaiming their innocence, but from the outset the War Department took their guilt for granted.

The men were confronted with an ultimatum from President Theodore Roosevelt: They must either tell what they knew about the raid or they would be summarily dismissed from the Army. The men insisted they had nothing to tell. The President made good on his threat. By a stroke of his pen, he discharged the men of all three companies.

The executive order dismissing the black soldiers without honor—and without any sort of public hearing—was carried out by Secretary of War William Howard Taft, who was Roosevelt's hand-picked successor. Outraged blacks were urged to take their vengeance at the polls, and they did. More blacks voted against Taft in 1908 than had ever voted against any Republican Presidential candidate. The bitter campaign pitted the loyalist forces of Booker T. Washington against those of W. E. B. DuBois who voted for Bryan and predicted the eventual shift of the black vote to the Democratic column.

IN BLACK MAN'S LIMBO

"They lived and died in the black man's limbo," Weaver writes of the Brownsville soldiers. "Alive, they were denied the equity of the white man's justice and, dead, the vindication of his Jim Crow history."

One of the first readers of "The Brownsville Raid" (he read the book in manuscript) was Ronnie Dugger, publisher and editor of "The Texas Observer."

"In our moral intelligence we know that American history is, as John Weaver says, the white man's 'Jim Crow history,'" Dugger has written. "There is a large, hard work to be done, righting this. In 'The Brownsville Raid,' Weaver has done more of it than most historians ever will. His book teaches those of us who didn't know it—which includes me, and I dare say includes most of us—that Teddy Roosevelt committed one of the most blatant racist injustices in the history of our all-white Presidency. . . .

BOOK REDRESSES WRONGS

"Weaver's book redresses, if a book can, a grievous wrong (among the uncountable grievous wrongs) against the blacks in our received history. It is a text for the new Black Studies programs and an example for every historian, white or black, of diligent seeking after the moral realities of history."

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Star, Nov. 21, 1970]

THE RAID WAS REAL; SO, TOO, THE INJUSTICE

(By Calder M. Picket)

Because I had never heard of the Brownsville raid, and because the historical implications suggested by John Weaver's book intrigued me, I looked up the "raid" in the "Concise Dictionary of American History"

and "The Chronological History of the Negro in America." Both did, unblushingly, what Weaver says most histories do: They gloss over the legal and racial implications of the affair, and they state as bald fact what must come through to any fair-minded reader of "The Brownsville Raid" as something quite unproved.

The "something quite unproved" is that it was black soldiers who made an attack on Brownsville, Tex., on August 13, 1906, shooting up the town, killing one person and wounding another. What seems quite proved by Weaver's fine book, is that two presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft, and a good many other civilian and military figures completely ignored the civil liberties of these black soldiers, not according them even what seems a basic right today, a trial and an opportunity to answer charges against them.

"The Brownsville Raid" is by an associate editor of Holiday magazine and one-time member of The Star's staff. In this newspaper Weaver told (October 18) about the background of the book, about how the story of the raid went back to his boyhood, when his father was a court reporter. Weaver sees the case as a "black Dreyfus affair" and as "a watershed in the development of black power."

The incident occurred in a time when a few black leaders were vying for strength both nationally and among their people. The central figures in this power struggle were W. E. B. DuBois, the most militant black figure of his time, and Booker T. Washington, the most revered of American Negroes then and the man who shook up much of the white gentry of the land when Roosevelt invited him to the White House for lunch. The Brownsville raid became a cause in the militant black movement of the time.

A knowledge of history will tell one that an incident of this kind could happen much more easily in the America of early 20th century than in the America of today. There were few black leaders of national importance then, and there were few whites ready to take up the battle for the Negro.

The liberal statesmen of the time (Woodrow Wilson comes rapidly to mind) were scarcely liberal in the matter of civil rights.

There was powerful antiblack feeling in the town of Brownsville, and much of it came, by the way, from the sizable Mexican-American population of the city. There also were those who thought it insane for the Army to station black soldiers near such a town.

Weaver tells the story in dramatic narrative style, moving along with the sweep of a novel. It is a detective story, in a sense, but a detective story with no solution, for the reader never learns who it was who shot up part of the town of Brownsville. The accused soldiers were dismissed from the Army "without honor." A court of inquiry did take place later, but Weaver shows it to have been a stacked court.

Histories, Weaver says, have stated conventionally the kind of thing one finds in "The Chronological History of the Negro in America":

"In August, in Brownsville, Texas, a Negro soldier of the 1st Battalion of the 25th Infantry, USCT, had an altercation with a white Brownsville merchant. For this Brownsville was put off limits for the Battalion. In protest, a dozen or more Negro soldiers entered the town, shooting wildly in the streets, killing one white man, wounding two others, including the chief of police. . . ."

That is it, baldly stated, in a new book (1969) whose very purpose is to restore—or create—a balance in the history of the black man in America. How much of our history, it becomes necessary to ask, is based on data so slight, and so biased? John Weaver, it seems to me, has provided a real service in research and in engrossing retelling the circumstances of "The Brownsville Raid."

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Dec. 27, 1970]

AUTHOR EXAMINES BROWNSVILLE RAID AND ITS LEGENDS

(By Ron Tyler)

On the evening of Aug. 13, 1906, a fusillade of shots cracked through the air in the hot, humid Texas border town of Brownsville. This was the long expected confrontation between angry whites and the battalion of Negro soldiers stationed at Fort Brown. "The Brownsville Affray," as it is generally called in historical accounts, seems to get confusing from that point.

The white citizens of Brownsville hastily gathered information to "prove" that the Negro soldiers had attacked the town, while the white officers at Fort Brown seemed to have irrefutable evidence that all their troops had been within the confines of the fort, armed only with guns that had not been recently fired. After several inconclusive investigations (including the famous one by Texas Ranger Captain Bill McDonald), President Theodore Hoosevelt accepted the findings in what author John D. Weaver conisders "a triumph of military and legal cant over logic and justice."

That might have been the end of the case had not Ohio Sen. Joseph B. Foraker conducted a personal study. He decided that the President had rendered, strictly speaking, a legal verdict, but one that was at odds with the actual facts of the incident. Essentially Foraker discovered that no evidence had been uncovered to prove anyone guilty of firing on the citizens of Brownsville. Proceeding on the premise that some of the Negro troops had attacked the whites and that the other Negroes refused to denounce the guilty ones, Roosevelt had discharged all the soldiers "without honor" (as opposed to a dishonorable discharge). All had been punished for the assumed—but unproved—guilt of a few.

This Weaver finds incredible. The author of "Warren: the Man, the Court, the Era," and a student of our judicial system, he carefully points out that, even according to military law, the soldiers were denied their rights. They were never given a hearing to determine their guilt or innocence. The only time they were heard, the court accepted testimony relating only to which of the men committed the crime, with their guilt already assumed. Although Roosevelt insisted that he had not punished the soldiers, Weaver declares that they were deprived of their right to serve in the army and of their pensions.

The only man with the courage to challenge the President was Senator Foraker. Weaver presents his campaign for a fair hearing—"They ask no favors because they are Negroes, but only for justice because they are men"—with the enthusiasm and fervor that could earn the Senator a place in "Profiles in Courage." Foraker is pictured as a heroic, tragic figure who risked his office on winning justice for the defenseless soldiers and lost. Roosevelt, Weaver believes was a man who had made a mistake and refused to admit it—a character trait that several of the President's biographers have had difficulty explaining.

Acording to Weaver, whose father was the official reporter for the 1909 inquiry, the matter had its roots in the race prejudice in Brownsville. Weaver documents the prejudices of both Anglos and Mexicans in Brownsville, rendering his version of the confrontation entirely believable. The citizens of Brownsville, in an effort to rid their community of several companies of Negro soldiers, staged the incident and laid the blame on the troops.

The Brownsville Affray has inspired several famous legends of Texas history, particularly the story of Captain Bill McDonald walking into the guns of a score of hardened, angry Negro soldiers. ("He would charge hell with a bucket of water.") But the incident was more than local in impact. It soon was well-known across the country, and may yet come to to be considered one of the more significant mistakes that Roosevelt made.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 21, 1970]

STUDY OF MILITARY INJUSTICE

(By Robert R. Kirsch)

The scene in which Capt. Alfred Dreyfus was stripped of his rank and disgraced in a monstrous act of injustice in France has been told and retold. An equally dramatic scene in which 167 black infantrymen of the U. S. Army, most of whom had served their country gallantly in the Indian Wars and in Cuba, were stripped of their arms, treated as guilty men and humiliated, has gone largely unreported and unrecorded.

The 1st Battalion of the 25th Infantry (colored) were the victims, in a case which has some astonishing parallels with the Dreyfus affair, complete with an American Zola, Republican Sen. Joseph Benson Foraker of Ohio, who put his political career and his reputation on the line in defending a group of innocent soldiers against two Presidents, a stacked Army court of inquiry, a biased town and the efforts of some disreputable investigators to manufacture a case.

DOCUMENTED RECOUNT

John D. Weaver has written a thoroughly documented account of the matter in THE BROWNSVILLE RAID (Norton: $7.95; illustrated). In this work, he corrects the distortions of several generations of historians, white and black.

It is too late to do justice to those men who, after serving their country with distinction and loyalty, were discharged without honor from the military service because they were members of three companies who were present when the incident occurred even though their most bitter accusers had to concede that the vast majority of them could not have participated in the alleged shoot-up of the town of Brownsville, Tex., on the night of Aug. 13, 1906.

After reading this account, it becomes obvious that this was a reversal of American tradition in justice (that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty) and that the perpetrators of the shooting spree were not soldiers at all but a group of townspeople who had made known their intentions of driving the black soldiers assigned to Ft. Brown out of town.

POIGNANT CEREMONY

They succeeded all too well. The War Department and the President took the position that unless the soldiers delivered up "the guilty," they themselves were culpable. Only a handful of soldiers were allowed to re-enlist, and even these were chosen without any apparent effort at equity or justice.

The ceremony at Ft. Reno where they delivered up their weapons was a poignant one. "I feel sorry for them from the bottom of my heart," one of the battalion's white officers told a reporter. "I know they are innocent of any wrongdoing, and it looks pretty hard to them."

Yet, even at that moment, their discipline held. "They were orderly and well behaved," a New York Times reporter wrote. "And not one of them displayed an ugly feeling."

Irony piled on irony. It was President Theodore Roosevelt who, succumbing to the false charges and distorted evidence, ordered the punishment of these men, among them soldiers who had made possible his famed charge up San Juan Hill by capturing the village of El Caney.

FACE-SAVING INQUIRY

The redeeming part of the story lies in the role of a few people, led by Sen. Foraker, who cut through the lies and manufactured evidence to get to the truth of the events of that night. Those who knew these men best, such as men like Col. A. S. Daggett who had commanded them in Cuba, defended them against the cabal of generals who participated in the face-saving inquiry set up by the Army.

Both the physical evidence and the testimony of reliable witnesses, we find in this close and dispassionate study of the documents indicate that the fusillade of shots which killed two people was the work of a small group of townspeople determined to force issue.

Rumor and racism were at the heart of it. It is clear that every effort was made by the battalion's commissioned and noncommissioned officers to avoid trouble. Virtually all the men were accunted for and in the ranks soon after the shots were fired.

One important aspect of the work—one of many—is that it gives a full account of Sen. Foraker's tireless and courageous efforts in behalf of these men. His activities are a profile in courage, fully as worthy as any in our history.

Sen. Foraker paid the price. His political career was ended. He had been offered any distinguished post he desired by President Roosevelt if he would abandon his fight for justice in the Brownsville affair. He would not compromise.

INNOCENT CONVICTED

"No 167 men ever lived," he wrote, "who could have withstood successfully such efforts to unearth the truth about such a crime if they had been the parties who had committed it, or had possession of knowledge with respect thereto which they were attempting to withhold. Neither do I doubt if the government has spent the one-tenth part to discover the men who shot up Brownsville that it did spend to convict its innocent soldiers of a crime they never committed, the truth would have been easily and long ago established."

[Chicago Courier, Feb. 6, 1971]

MY POINT OF VIEW

(By Doris Saunders)

All of the incidents and the hearings which followed the incident at Brownsville are included in a new and perceptive book by John Weaver, called The Brownsville Raid: The story of the American black Dreyfus affair, published by W. W. Norton.

What is the significance of dragging up the Brownsville affair at this point some sixty-five years later? To set the record straight. To put it in the history books correctly, that a wild bunch of black soldiers did not go on a drunken spree and "shoot up" the town of Brownsville, but instead that black men, who had served their country well, were charged with crimes of which the evidence indicates they were not guilty. . . .

As Weaver has indicated, it is too late to help the men, who suffered unjustly, but it is not too late for their names to be vindicated and justice, even tardily, to be done. It is for black people to see that it gets done. We now have 12 black men in Congress, as well as Senator Brooke in the Senate.

A joint resolution coming from the House and Senate asking that the names of the black soldiers of the 25th Infantry Regiment be cleared could get the job done. If you want to wade through the volumes which establish, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the injustice of the Brownsville affair, read the Report of the Proceedings of the Court of Inquiry to the Shooting Affray at Brownsville, Texas, in 12 volumes published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, 1911, or read the important summary that has been written by a skilled researcher and sympathetic outsider, John Weaver, who said it all in The Brownsville Raid. It is relevant. It's about judgment without trial. It's about justice and black folks.

ADVERSITY PROVES BOON TO COTTON CROP

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, recently, an article appeared in the Los Angeles Times by Mr. John F. Lawrence on the future of the cotton industry. Mr. Lawrence points out that 1971 and 1972 could be the years that bring the cotton industry back to life. As many of us in this Chamber are quite aware, 1967, because of high costs, was one of the worst years the industry has faced. I submit this article for my colleague's review so that they will have an opportunity to analyze what some people are saying about the recently passed farm bill and as it pertains to cotton:

ADVERSITY PROVES BOON TO COTTON CROP

(By John F. Lawrence)

Farmers will tell you 1967 was the year that killed cotton. Now some of them are saying 1971 and 1972 could be the years that bring it back to life.

That would be something of a paradox. In 1967, cotton prices soared and growers pocketed big profits. Today, cotton prices have recovered only a little from recent lows and many growers talk about some small producers facing bankruptcy.

Pile on top of that a major change in the federal government's cotton subsidy program, limiting the maximum any one farmer can collect to $55,000, and it's difficult to spot surface reasons for a rebound.

So why predict one?

Two reasons: those low prices and the new subsidy program. The former has made cotton competitive with synthetics and with cotton grown in other countries. The latter is encouraging growers to boost plantings and thus, hopefully, add to what some experts contend is a dangerously low cotton supply.

"We haven't been producing as much cotton as I think we should have," says Joseph Moss, director of the Cotton Division at the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. He figures the carryover supply next July 31, the end of the current crop year, will be only 4.5 million bales, the lowest in 20 years.

Back in 1966, the carryover was 16 million bales.

There's nothing growers can do to affect that supply this crop year—the harvest is over. But as next year's crop is planted this spring, they could do a lot to affect it.

Moss figures a 5.5 million to 6 million-bale stock would be a good deal healthier—and is vital to cotton's competitive success. With stocks as low as they are now, textile mills are reluctant to boost their consumption of the fiber at the expense of synthetics for fear of running into a serious shortage, he explains.

If cotton supplies do turn around in the coming 18 months, there's reason to believe the textile mills will welcome it. Consumption of man-made fibers now exceeds that of cotton.

But last year thanks to the cotton knits, corduroys and denims that have caught the eye of the fashion world, cotton held its share of the market against the other fibers for the first time in a decade. Cotton consumption dropped a little from 1969, but man-made fiber consumption declined, as well.

Cotton consumption reached its highest point since the Korean War in 1966 at 9,497,000 bales before slumping steadily to last year's 8 million bales.

The slump started after prices rose sharply in 1967. Reflecting a small harvest in contrast with heavy demand, growers received as high as 43 cents a pound for top-grade fiber and the average price was some 20% more than the previous going rate.

As a result, the mills began switching to less expensive man-made fibers. Many all-cotton fabrics became cotton-synthetic blends, observes Tom Smith, corporate secretary of Calcot Ltd., Bakersfield, a huge marketing cooperative with 3,800 grower-members. California suffered most since it was this state's costlier top-strength fiber that was replaced in many of the blends, he adds.

Soon California growers, which have always collected a premium price for their cotton—as high as $40 extra a bale—were collecting barely $5 a bale premium.

"It was a real tragedy for the cotton business—we are still paying for (1967) in lost markets," says W. P. Handwerker, an executive vice president of Cook Industries Inc., Fresno, a major corporate marketer of cotton (the company's stock is traded on the American Stock Exchange). "Once you lose a market, it's tough to get it back."

Currently, California is making some progress in regaining its markets. The price of top-grade cotton is up slightly to 25.5 cents a pound from last year's low of 24.5 cents and the premium over other grades of the fiber is back up to $15 a bale. Yet the price is still low enough that "we are more competitive—and that's fine, if the grower can survive at this level," observes Handwerker.

One way he can survive is to boost production and hold down costs per bale. While the new subsidy program limits the total payments to any one grower to $55,000 (paid at the rate of 15 cents a pound), it also removes acreage limitations. The grower is free to grow all he wants for the first time in almost two decades.

It's too early to know how much more cotton will be planted this year than last, but one survey of farmers' intentions indicated at least a 5% increase nationally.

An improvement in cotton yields—output per acre—could push production further above the recent harvest. Some strange perverseness of nature has cut cotton yields to unusually low levels over much of the world in recent years. In California, this year's yield averaged 845 pounds per acre, compared with 1,100 two years ago. (Weather may not have been the sole cause. Faced with lower prices, growers may have skimped a bit on yield-increasing expenses. Bans on DDT and other chemicals have hurt, as well.)

In addition to a hoped-for increase in U.S. consumption, the industry is banking heavily on selling more fiber abroad. Handwerker of Cook Industries forecasts exports in the current crop year of 3.6 million to 4 million bales, up sharply from last year's million bales, and looks for an even bigger total in the 1971–72 crop year.

The biggest markets are in Japan, Hong Kong and other parts of the Far East.

With the U.S. price at a low level, some Mexican and South American growers have been discouraged from boosting output, leaving bigger export markets for this country, industry leaders say.

AFFECTED BY LIMITATION

These markets will be especially important to California growers. Some 250 growers in this state, unusual for the large size of its average farm, are affected by the $55,000 sub-

sidy limitation. A number of these undoubtedly will try to make up for lower subsidy payments with increased production.

"The big growers are going to find out this year if they can make it without subsidies and a lot of the valley is in trouble if they can't," says one California farm expert. "A lot of them are planting more cotton, utilizing land they didn't before."

Calcot expects its grower-members to boost acreage a little.

Not all of the added acreage will mean added production, however. In some cases, growers plan to plant more but plow less money into fertilizers and other farming practices which maximize yield. They figure it will be cheaper per bale to get their production that way.

That's the case with Jack Stone, who farms 1,300 acres 12 miles southwest of Stratford, some 40 miles below Fresno. Stone, who is also the current president of the Western Cotton Growers Assn., figures he's faced with the prospect of making barely 2% profit on his investment this year—"enough to keep me going but it's scaring the hell out of me."

Like many big growers in the state, he plans to take steps to maximize the subsidy payments that will be received on the acreage he's been farming. Typical of growers his size (large but not among the handful of super-large), he leases some of the land he farms. He plans to form a partnership with those he leases the land from, thus putting them back in the farming business and making their parcels eligible for separate subsidies.

Some of the super-large growers are taking another tack. They're permitting smaller growers to rent some of their land and thus collect subsidy money on it.

Some California experts contend the subsidy program will be beneficial to those smaller growers who can rent more land and thus upgrade their operations to a more efficient size.

A good bit of discussion has been centered on whether the partnerships or rentals will erase the savings Congress might have hoped for in setting the $55,000 subsidy limitation. But some leaders insist saving money wasn't the intent of the change. They argue the law was intended to end million dollar subsidy payouts to a few huge growers and to create more farms and increased production. Hence, they see the arrangements being made by the big growers as a proper response.

In any case, many growers figure the days of subsidy may be numbered and that they'd better learn to live without that support. James Camp, a major grower near Bakersfield, figures that an end to subsidies will be a benefit to California growers because their farms usually are bigger and more efficient.

In the Southern states, some growers have said lower subsidies will help their region compete with California because of this state's high property taxes, wage rates and so on. But California growers have two big things going for them: much higher average yields (1,000 pounds per acre in an average year compared with 600 in some Southern states) and the premium grade of fiber.

Meantime, new technology may have an early impact on both cotton growing areas. Growers have been experimenting with a new planting technique, called narrow row culture, in which the number of plants per acre is increased to 100,000 or more from the usual 10,000 to 20,000. The result is less cotton per plant but it may mean as much yield per acre with less expense, explains an official of the National Cotton Council in Memphis.

REPORTS MIXED

Combined with the new culture is a new harvesting device. Unlike the old mechanical picker, which runs between the rows pulling off the cotton with spindles, the new device cuts off the whole plant and then harvests the cotton as the plant goes through the machine. It picks more rows at a time and completes the harvest in a single pass over the field instead of two.

In California, reports from the fields where the new culture and machinery were tested last year are mixed. "There's no dramatic breakthrough but there are certain situations where they will work," says Calcot's Smith. "There's considerably more testing to go."

Growers say new types of cotton will have to be bred before the new systems will perform up to expectations. But they do see technology contributing to their ability to survive low prices in the years ahead.

J. G. Boswell Co., Los Angeles, the biggest of all cotton growers with 106,000 acres, has been experimenting with narrow row culture for two years. Where fields are flat enough and soil of the right consistency, the method can trim harvesting costs 35% to 40% and overall costs perhaps as much as 13%, according to Boswell officials.

DEVELOPED IN TEXAS

So far the method is approaching commercial use only in parts of Texas, where it was first developed.

Cotton growers are trying to compete more actively with synthetics in more ways than prices. They are improving the uniformity of the bales and the quality of cotton in them to help offset the uniformity advantages of man-made fibers.

In addition, the industry is stepping up its efforts to battle the other fibers in promotional efforts. Since 1967, farmers have had $1 a bale skimmed automatically from their revenues and contributed to an industry research and promotion fund. Now, under the new subsidy program, the government has agreed to plunk down $10 million a year, about doubling the amount going into the effort.

The idea is to work with the textile mills in developing new products—and perhaps in switching the ratio of some of the blends from 35% cotton-65% synthetics to the reverse proportions.

While most of the gains are still in the future, cotton producers are showing some new muscle after years of taking a beating.

INCORPORATION OF THE GOLD STAR WIVES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to grant a Federal charter to the Gold Star Wives of America. This is a national organization established by the widows of members of the Armed Forces who died while in the active service of their country, and I believe the services performed by the organization make it worthy of national incorporation.

The Gold Star Wives of America seeks to assist, both materially and spiritually, the widows and minor children of those Americans who paid the supreme sacrifice while serving in the Armed Forces. The group seeks to provide the benefits of a happy and healthful childhood to the children of deceased servicemen. It seeks to foster among its membership the proper mental attitude necessary to face the future. In addition, the organization provides direct aid to widows and children.

The Gold Star Wives are dedicated to the noble cause of safeguarding the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy for which American servicemen have died. They have also pledged themselves to upholding the Constitution and inculcating a sense of individual obligation to the community, the State, and the Nation.

The membership of the Gold Star Wives comes from all parts of the country. Its purposes and objectives are national in scope. The activities of the Gold Star Wives demonstrate the ability of individual citizens to work together for a common goal. The grief which brings together the women of the Gold Star Wives serves as the impetus for constructive action. Mr. Speaker, the Gold Star Wives serve the Nation, and I believe the organization should be accorded the Federal charter it seeks.

CANADA IS ZEROING IN ON U.S. OIL

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Canada is performing a neat trick in trying to divert the oil pipeline away from the route designated as the least expensive and yet the one that is the most essential to our national security. We are going to horse around on the construction of the pipeline just so long and find the oil moving through Canada.

It is my firm position that America should not overlook her own best interests. We must not jeopardize our own interests to Canada. And, what is more, we should approve the pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, with proper environmental safeguards, as soon as possible.

The importance of this project to our country and to the west coast was clearly spelled out in the testimony presented the Department of Interior's hearing in Anchorage, Alaska, February 25, 1971, by Merle D. Adlum, president, Port of Seattle Commission. So that my colleagues may have the opportunity to fully understand the importance of this pipeline, Captain Adlum's statement is included at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF MERLE D. ADLUM BEFORE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR CONCERNING THE PROPOSED PRUDHOE TO VALDEZ, ALASKA PIPELINE, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, FEBRUARY 25, 1971

My name is Merle D. Adlum. I am president of the Port of Seattle Commission. I appear here on behalf of the port of Seattle and also as chairman of the Seattle Mayor's Maritime Advisory Committee. For the record, I am a master mariner and a licensed Puget Sound pilot. I have many years of experience in captaining major vessels on inland and ocean waters including virtually every Northwest American and British Columbian port. I know of no two safer areas that could have been chosen for ease of access and deep waters for big ships than Valdez and Upper Puget Sound.

I am here today to lend what support we can to the efforts of Alaskans to gain inde-

pendence. The history of this State is one of outside management and dependence. The national interest, the interests of Puget Sound and California, and the intercession of Canada all gain headlines, but I would hope that the Interior Department would give first consideration to the interest of Alaska.

In 1970 Alaska and Seattle exchanged goods valued at $1.1 billion. It is estimated that the total economic impact on Seattle of trade with Alaska in 1970 was $100 million in annual payrolls. 458,000 passengers departed or arrived at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport with Alaskan origins or destinations. The Alaska State ferry system originated or terminated 11,031 passengers at Seattle. The fishing cannery and packing industry are also closely linked in the two regions with an estimated value of $200 million per year.

Puget Sound refinement capacity is about equal to the local Washington State market, and it is expected that growth in oil refinement capacity, if any, will depend upon local northwest demand.

It can also be assumed that—with the coming of the pipeline—added refinery capacity will be developed in Alaska, which means most of the initial pipeline capacity could be consumed by refineries in the two regions.

However, it is more logical to expect that much of the crude will be shipped to refineries in California, which now imports up to one-fourth of its consumption from foreign sources. The Pacific coast could easily consume 50 to 60 per cent of the ultimate capacity of the pipeline by 1980, with the balance being available for sale on world markets. Refineries on Puget Sound have received more than ¾ billion barrels of foreign crude oil in the last ten years to cost of $1.5 billion. Approximately half of the oil products shipped from these refineries are by tanker, with no major oil spills, attesting to the skill of our pilots, careful supervision by oil companies and the relatively safe navigational waters of Puget Sound. Incidentally, I have been fishing and oystering near the Ferndale-Cherry Point refineries since they were built in the 1950's, and as a close associate of the Fishery Association, I know of no ecological damage done in any local waters by any of these refineries.

As a shipping man, I am amazed at statements which seem to depict tanker traffic as something new to the area: Oil tankers have been plying our waters for years. I was amazed to hear the remarks by Dr. Wenk concerning a computerized forecast of two to four tanker collisions in the next decade What did he feed his computer?

The narrowest channel width between rock hazards in the publicized "treacherous Rosario Straits," for example, is approximately one mile and most of the strait's channel is two to three miles wide. We had 5,000 ships using the strait of Juan De Fuca last year, all without collision. Our records show only 5 or 6 major collisions out of 200,000 ship movements since the pilotage act of 1935. I shall have more to say about what can be done to add more protection on Puget Sound and inland waters of Alaska from possible shipping accidents, but first I would like to outline the environmental needs for this new oil supply.

Ninety-thousand citizens in Alaska and Washington have no gainful employment and little or no prospect of employment unless, for one thing, we are able to assure basic energy requirements. There are competing and conflicting values in the effort to protect our environment, as there are in other fields of endeavor.

Consider, for instance, the problem confronting the city of Los Angeles, which operates its own municipal generation system for electric energy. On August 31, 1970, the utility requested bids for 2 million barrels of low-sulfur oil. There was no response from the 13 oil companies from whom bids were solicited. In September, December, and finally in January, 1971, the city again requested bids for low-sulfur oil but the only amounts offered by the oil companies were substantially less than that requested. Southern California Edison has had a similar problem. Its limited supply has been obtained from Indonesia. This affects the State of Washington which planned to depend upon the northwest-southwest intertie for peaking power.

How does this tie in with Alaska oil? In this way: the fuel on the North Slope is low-sulphur, paraffin-based oil, the lowest contributor to air pollution. Without this kind of oil, California faces either increased air pollution or, in the alternative, a gradually but steadily widening gap between the need for power and the available supply. Failure to have electric energy is not simply a question of lights going out or stoves refusing to cook: It is also a question of jobs—thousands of jobs. The situation has also become critical with the threatened closure of the Hanford nuclear reactor in eastern Washington State. This reactor was part of the Bonnevile power supply system and its shutdown will leave the Pacific Northwest approximately 300,000 kilowatts short of the ability to meet the demand for power.

The United States now imports each day 3 million barrels of foreign oil, or about 20 percent of the Nation's total consumption, at a cost of $9 million per day. If this Nation must depend upon foreign oil, we will continue the practice of having this oil carried in foreign-registered and foreign-manned vessels.

On the other hand, if we move oil between two United States ports—Valdez to Anacortes, for example—special protection becomes possible. Movement between two United States ports is subject to historic cabotage laws. Such movements *must* be made in United States built and manned vessels. United States built vessels can be required to have double bottoms, transverse propulsion, bridge-to-bridge radio. American crews can be required to meet American standards of training. As California would switch over to Alaskan crude, with the large tanker traffic visiting her shores, a large portion of the now foreign fleet would be switched to these safer ships under control of American standards.

We are not unmindful of the need for improvement. Although the State of Washington already has a most strict law controlling tankers, we are currently seeking an amendment to the Pilotage Act, before the Washington State Legislature, which includes, among other revisions, expansion of the Pilotage Commission, mandatory pilots for all hazardous cargoes—including oil—an on-going pilots' training program, and a feasibility study of 1-year duration to devise shore-based radar, fixed sealanes, shore-to-pilot communication and pilot-to-pilot communication.

These improvements must be made whether the tanker fleet is foreign or domestic. All amendments call for Federal cooperation, some of which is already underway. Page one of yesterday's Seattle Post-Intelligencer carries a map outlining a U.S. Coast Guard program for safeguarding the tanker route from the Straits of Juan de Fuca to the North Puget Sound refineries. The Coast Guard must be given more power and funds to accomplish these objectives. Modern safety standards for foreign-built and manned vessels will be more difficult, but these changes must come in all events.

If the environmental interests can best be protected by a United States owned, controlled and manned transport system, it is evident that our economic interests are even more dependent upon such a system. If the transport system—whether it be a tanker fleet or pipeline—is located in or owned by a foreign country, then the value added from the transportation will be lost and the deficits in balance of payments will be an extra burden to our already faltering economy.

The economic losses if the pipeline is not built are apparent and will be sizeable. Certainly the regional economic plight of both Alaska and Puget Sound should move our national leaders to demonstrate their constructive concern by providing employment opportunities and alternative energy sources. With our pressing need for jobs, every effort must be made to prevent the export of United States employment to foreign lands.

Energy supplies in the Pacific Northwest are in short supply. Natural gas must be imported from Canada—as must oil at the present. Additional hydro-electric sites are virtually non-existent. Nuclear power is a long-range alternative to electricity, but pretroleum is still needed for other energy, such as gasoline.

In recent weeks we have read of the concern of certain Canadian officials with possible tanker operations off their coast. The comments of the Canadian officials are thinly veiled efforts to retain and expand the pipeline sales through Canada and to give Canada the economic benefit and strategic control of our energy resources. I, for one, resent brazen meddling by Canadian officials in U.S. domestic affairs. Will we be granted the same right to comment on each Canadian program of resource development? It is interesting to note that approximately 150 tankers carried 12 million barrels of petroleum products through Vancouver harbor last year. With four refineries inside the Vancouver harbor and more planned at their Roberts Bank Superport, I wonder why their own citizens are not concerned. And speaking of the Roberts Bank Superport, some of the supersized coal bulk cargo carriers have bunker fuel storages equal to the size of medium oil tankers. I have personally captained tankers for Vancouver refineries to outlying British Columbia ports in far more hazardous areas with no accidents.

Should we not also subject the Canadian pipeline to the same rigid environmental standards as we will have in Prudhoe to Valdez? Would an underwater connection to the Canadian pipeline be required, or are we to violate the Arctic national wildlife preserve for a connection between Prudhoe and the Canadian line? What would be the dangers of a submarine pipeline in the Arctic icepack? Furthermore, the distance in the sensitive permafrost Tundra via a Canadian pipeline is much greater than that of the Southward Alyeska pipeline. Our information suggests that the permafrost to be traversed by Alyeska is one-third that of a Canadian line. Alaska's development should not be by-passed to enrich Canada, nor should Alaska be a stepchild of American development. It deserves equal status with the other 49 states. The already lengthy delay and much of the objection to the Alyeska pipeline fit into the old territorial days' mold of everyone knowing what is best for Alaska but Alaskans.

In summary, if we do not develop the Alaskan oil, we must certainly remain dependent on foreign oil and the dangers of foreign tanker fleet operations. If we do develop Alaskan oil, but transport it through Canada, our foreign dependence continues, and the new environmental dangers are created with a submarine pipeline link and construction over greater stretches of permafrost. The Canadian line might serve midwest areas, but would leave Puget Sound and California refineries dependent upon foreign suppliers of oil.

And perhaps an even greater loss to Alaska—one less frequently mentioned—would be that of an access to the vast, rich interior of Alaska. The pipeline and its access road

offer the first—and maybe the last—opportunity to unlock that vast wealth of interior Alaska, without taxing the Alaska citizen or the Alaska environment.

The port of Seattle wishes to thank the Department of Interior for this opportunity to present its views on this vital subject. We share the concern of all Americans that the environment be protected. Our concern is not limited to United States soils and waters alone, but to the environment of international waters as well. We would hope that speculation of the horrors of ecological damage would be treated for what it is—speculation. Every human endeavor contains risks. Life without risk is not a realistic objective. What is realistic is a system of environmental protection and control which can bring to a minimum the chances of injury to life, property and the environment.

ISRAEL: PLAYING INTO THE HANDS OF THE ENEMY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, U.S. pressure on Israel to agree to pre-1967 boundaries is an unwise exercise in foreign policy. In my judgment, Secretary of State Rogers should not be overeager to complete arrangements for a political settlement in the Middle East.

No settlement which ignores geography will be a complete settlement. For those who, like myself, have stood on both the Heights of Golan and on the farmlands below, it is painfully obvious that the pre-1967 border cannot be tolerated there.

Anyone who has looked at the map and noted that the Straits of Tiran at Sharm el Sheikh are only a few hundred yards wide, knows instantly that geographical guarantees are needed to keep this vital seaway life line open. International guarantees have provided no security in the past.

Tiran and Golan are the most obvious examples of the difficulties involved in returning to old borders. Jerusalem is another example. Those borders invited a continuous, systematic program of violence and terrorism against the people of Israel, actually carried out by guerrillas, but encouraged, protected and financed by Israel's Arab neighbors.

Part of the difficulties in achieving a complete Middle East settlement is that negotiations are being conducted through a third party, Mr. Jarring of the United Nations. I have asked for face-to-face negotiations for over a year. Until U.S. policy recognizes this fact, progress will be painfully slow. Immediate attention should be given to demands for such negotiations, despite the difficulties in achieving them.

Another flaw in U.S. policy is our surprising reliance on the good faith of the U.S.S.R. in Middle East negotiations. The U.S.S.R. is helpful when it is in her interests, and its interests here run counter to ours, and to Israel's.

Finally, it seems to me to be doubtful wisdom to articulate, as a part of our foreign policy, our willingness to provide, and indeed, our promotion of, U.S. troops as peace keepers in the Middle East. We may be asked, and we may have to agree, to provide peace-keeping forces outside of the United States, but, surely, at this time, we should be seeking permanent international agreements reliable on their own merits—not reliant on our troops.

I believe that our country has been the No. 1 seeker of peace in the Middle East. Our efforts have been most successful when we have met Arab-Russian force with a firm stance. We do not further the cause of peace by agreeing to concessions for a third party nation Israel, which we do not represent. We do nothing for international amity by caving in to the threats of termination of the cease-fire. We should continue our diligent search for a permanent peace based on face-to-face negotiations, defensible boundaries, free commercial access, and normal international relationships.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES ARE NOT ENOUGH

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the other day the House approved a conference bill increasing social security benefits by a paltry 10 percent. While I joined in voting for its passage, I did so with some reluctance, for I believe the bill falls far short of giving the senior citizens the relief they so desperately need today.

I was extremely disappointed to see the House conferees strip away some of the more liberal reforms which had been contained in the Senate bill. I regret they did not see fit to retain the $100 a month minimum provision. Despite the retroactive provision in the conference bill, the flat 10-percent increase is hardly enough to support those on fixed incomes, some with no other source of revenue. Certainly no one here really believes the raise from $64 to $70 a month is adequate with our high cost of living. This token offering will be quickly erased by taxation and inflation, vanishing so quickly I doubt if the recipient will realize he has received it.

I had hoped the House itself would report out a bill containing provisions I know the 26 million recipients of social security would have appreciated. I had hoped this year the Congress would deliver something meaningful to them, not merely make another empty gesture at helping them in their plight. I regret to say I was extremely disappointed at the ultimate result.

During the past few months I have been conducting "Congressional Workshops" throughout my 20th District. These meetings are attended by quite a few senior citizens, and I listened to them explain their needs and wants. Many of the individual cases are quite tragic. Our older citizens are in desperate financial straits and to many of them the social security program is their only hope of survival. They do not want welfare. They do not want charity. They do not want to come back here to Washington begging for help.

Based on what I learned from these people, I submitted a bill a few weeks ago which I believe would have given them the help they need. It would have established a cost of living escalation clause enabling the senior citizen to keep abreast of rising prices. It would have lowered the age requirements for full eligibility. This provision would have been of great benefit to the "gray widows," women who have lost their husbands and, because they are too young to qualify, are denied social security payments. Today, many women find themselves caught in this predicament and, although physically unable to work, they must, of necessity, perform menial jobs which offer hard work and low wages.

Unfortunately, my bill, as well as those of several colleagues, died in committee. The House never did report out a social security bill. Instead, because of the legislative footwork performed in the other body, we not only were forced into accepting or rejecting a watered down version of what was a good Senate bill, but many of us were put in the embarrassing position of having to reverse our vote on raising the national debt ceiling.

I was among those who opposed this increase when it was brought before the House a few weeks ago. I was against it then, although it eventually passed, and I am against it now. However, because the Senate exercised its right to attach nongermane amendments to any bill and tacked the social security increase to legislation boosting the national debt ceiling to $430 billion, I, along with many colleagues, was forced to change my vote, but not my opinion, on this bill.

We were not permitted to split our vote. We could not vote "yea" on social security increases and "nay" on the national debt proposal. Under the circumstances, therefore, I had to vote "yea" for I know well what the increased social security benefit, small as it may be, will mean for 26 million Americans. I want it recorded, however, I still believe the increase in the national debt is unwise and further evidence of a financial fiasco which costs the American taxpayer more than $20 billion a year.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 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?

JOHN D. HEMENWAY—THE OTEPKA ORDEAL REVISITED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of John D. Hemenway from the State Department Foreign Service, where he formerly had been Chief of the Berlin Section, is not unprecedented at the Department of State. Many still recall the reverse McCarthyism witch hunt which was unleashed on Otto Otepka and which to this date has never been corrected.

Apparently in the State Department there is only room for those who are soft on communism, pinks, punks, and fellow travelers. Hemenway's disqualification will probably be because he said he did not like communism—which would make him suspect in the State Department.

The American people will follow with great interest the results of the closed hearings which commenced several weeks ago in room 1205 of the State Department Building—that is if our free press can consider the purging of another American by the State Department crew as being newsworthy, and report it.

Thus far the only news leak has been by that great and fearless American journalist, Mr. Willard Edwards, in his column, "Capitol Views," carried by the Chicago Tribune.

I insert Mr. Edwards' column of March 13, 1971, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 13, 1971]

STATE DEPARTMENT DRAMA UNFOLDS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Quietly and without benefit of press or public, a hearing with explosive potentialities was opened last week in Room 1205 of the State Department Building.

After 18 months of fighting for the right to be heard, John D. Hemenway, former chief of the Berlin section, was permitted to begin airing, before an official grievance committee, a factual outline of what he called "distortion, lying, misrepresentation, abuse of personal position, irresponsibility and ineptness" in the State Department.

It is no exaggeration to state that the committee's findings are awaited with trepidation in some circles of the United States Foreign Service.

Hemenway's allegations affect a number of high-ranking officials, notably Alfred Puhan, the present ambassador to Hungary, and Alexander Johnpoll, the consul general at Hamburg, Germany.

Prospective witnesses include former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and a host of ambassadors and diplomats.

The remarkable circumstances of Hemenway's dismissal from the Foreign Service have been previously detailed in this space.

After a highly commended career in which he became known as an authority on Russian and German affairs, he was removed Jan. 17, 1969, just three days before the Nixon administration took office.

He was victimized, he claims, and is prepared to prove that he was fired because he differed with his superiors, chiefly Puhan and Johnpoll, for taking a firm stand on policy issues related to dealing with Communist nations.

Hemenway did not remain long unemployed. His talents were so obvious that the Defense Department, at the suggestion of the White House, made room for him as a special assistant to the assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs.

This might have satisfied an ordinary man, but Hemenway was disturbed by the fact that there remained in his State Department file a variety of false and malicious accusations placed there to justify his dismissal.

He began demanding his rights, under Foreign Service regulations, to erase this blot on his record. For a year and a half, he battered down obstacle after obstacle as holdover State Department officials opposed a hearing which might expose a tale of shameful intrigue.

Their dilatory tactics continued during last week's hearing. But Hemenway opened his case and he made an impressive showing.

The record is clear—he was thrown out of the Foreign Service because he called the turn, time after time, on the twists and turns of Communist policy. The more often he was proved correct, the greater the resentment of some of his superiors.

He seeks only, he told the committee, an opportunity to refute, with documented evidence and sworn testimony, the "untrue, misleading and slanderous" statements placed in the record to justify his dismissal. He asked that his accusers be called for cross-examination.

Those accusers, he noted, have stayed on under the Nixon administration and have been promoted.

If Hemenway wins his plea, his personal reward will be a clean record and a formal apology. But he suggested that the committee explore the broader implications of his treatment, remarking that criminal statutes may have been broken.

The State Department still hopes to cut off the hearing. It challenged the qualifications of a distinguished committee member and secured a postponement after the initial session.

But even the powerful holdovers still running the department, it is generally agreed, may not be able to hush up this one.

ONLY THE LAW-ABIDING OBEY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD a fine editorial appearing on WJBK-TV 2, Detroit, Mich., by Mr. Robert C. White, editorial director, entitled "Only the Law-Abiding Obey":

ONLY THE LAW-ABIDING OBEY

Alarmed over Detroit's incredible homicide rate, some top officials propose an equally incredible remedy—namely, that handguns be outlawed for everyone but policemen.

Police Commissioner John Nichols estimates that there are 500,000 unregistered handguns in Detroit. And such illegal weapons, Nichols says, account for 75 percent of all shootings in the city. We see no reason whatever to believe that the owners of these guns, already committing a felony by failing to get permits, would obey another law requiring them to disarm.

In other words, if handguns were to be banned, it's clear where confiscation would begin and, to a large extent, end. Arms would be taken first and foremost from those owners known to authorities—citizens who obeyed existing law and submitted to fingerprinting and investigation to qualify for permits. Thousands of others carrying unregistered guns doubtless would continue to do so.

The lack of enforcement of handgun laws can't be blamed on the Detroit police. Last year, they sought warrants against some 27-hundred persons for carrying concealed weapons, only to have the courts free all but about 400 with little more than a slap on the wrist.

In TV 2's view, there's nothing to be gained—except for hold-up men and murderers—by disarming citizens who choose to lawfully possess weapons. The crackdown should be on those who have amply demonstrated their contempt for the law—*any* law—by failing to register those half-million handguns in Detroit.

AN EXAMPLE OF "OPEN HOUSE USA"

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—ARBC—the organization established by Congress to plan the celebration of our Nation's 200th anniversary in 1976, has developed three programs through which all citizens will have the opportunity to participate. They are: Heritage '76, Open House USA, and Horizons '76. These programs will provide guidelines for the Commission to encourage, develop, and coordinate programs and events originating at the local, State and National level. They will provide for an intensive review and reaffirmation of the basic principles on which the United States was founded, how these principles affect and influence our lives today, and whether they should be enhanced or changed in guiding our people in the future.

One of the programs, Open House USA, contains as one of its features the invitation of citizens from abroad to visit our country during the celebration in 1976. It will be the coordinating framework to inspire individual and private groups to a great outpouring of hospitality by encouraging American clubs and organizations to invite their counterparts from abroad. A national voluntary effort, citizen to citizen, working together for a common peaceful cause coming to an understanding and appreciation of the worth of an individual and the other person's point of view.

Any American who has traveled abroad knows there is a tremendous interest in America, her people, what they do, and what they think. Modern communication has heightened the interest, and convenient methods of transportation and a rising prosperity are enabling foreign tourists to visit this country.

A good example of how the Open House U.S.A. program could work, and the good will created when people of different cultures meet on a person-to-person basis, was demonstrated recently in Virginia. The information was contained in an article in the March 13, 1971, edition of the Virginian-Pilot, a leading newspaper in my district, and one of the outstanding papers in the State. It may generate ideas among Americans how they can participate in one program of Open House U.S.A. I want to share it with my

colleagues and insert it at this point in the RECORD.

HONORARY CITIZENS—WILD VIRGINIA CORRALS 129 ITALIANS

RICHMOND.—Because they were charmed by a sheriff's Stetson hat and gunbelt, impressed by the honesty of an innkeeper and generally happy with their stay last year, 129 Italians will become honorary citizens of Virginia next week.

Virginia State Sen. and Mrs. James C. Turk of Radford will leave for Genoa, Italy, Sunday on a goodwill trip sponsored jointly by Alitalia Airlines and Italsider, a state-owned steel company.

Turk will carry with him the 129 citizenship certificates. The Italians visited Virginia last year on a package tour put together by Alitalia—the first such tour to Virginia.

Lynn Shelton of the Virginia travel office in New York City said the group, of which only four spoke English, wanted to see what they called "provincial grass-roots America."

They toured through the farmlands and mountains of Virginia and stopped one night at Charlottesville.

One of the group left $30 in American currency in his hotel room when he checked out, Miss Shelton said. The hotel maid found the money and turned it over to the manager. The manager bought $30 in American Express travelers checks and sent them to the departed guest in care of the airlines.

Miss Shelton said this gesture was "worth a million dollars in good will."

The "Wild West" fascinates Europeans and a little bit of the flavor enhanced the trip last year.

When the group visited Loudoun County, the sheriff met them replete with his high-crowned, wide-brimmed hat, his badge, and his pistol strapped to his waist.

The Italians crowded around the sheriff, had him pose for pictures with them, tried on his hat, and had themselves handcuffed, prison style.

This, in part, whetted the airlines' appetite, and it has scheduled two more such tours to Virginia this year.

Gov. Linwood Holton was invited to Italy for the goodwill trip but commitments are keeping him home. He named Sen. and Mrs. Turk to represent him.

WE NEED MEN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was sent to me by a constituent recently. It certainly provides a measuring stick for Members of Congress and for all men who seek to serve and to represent others. I insert it in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues and other readers can benefit also by studying the qualifications focused upon in this article:

WE NEED MEN

Who cannot be bought.
Whose word is their bond.
Who put character above wealth.
Who possess opinions and a will.
Who are larger than their vocations.
Who do not hesitate to take chances.
Who will make no compromise with wrong.
Who will not lose their individuality in a crowd.
Who will be as honest in small things as in great things.
Who will not say they do it "because everybody else does it."
Whose ambitions are not confined to their own selfish desires.
Who give thirty-six inches to the yard and thirty-two quarts to the bushel.
Who will not have one brand of honesty for business purposes and another for private life.
Who are true to their friends through good report and evil report, in adversity as well as in prosperity.
Who do not believe that shrewdness, sharpness, cunning, and long-headedness are the best qualities for winning success.
Who are not ashamed or afraid to stand for the truth when it is unpopular, who can say "no" with emphasis, although all the rest of the world says "yes."

EIA "MEDAL OF HONOR" GOES TO MARK SHEPHERD, JR.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure on the evening of March 10 to be a guest at the annual Government-industry and awards dinner of the Electronic Industries Association here in Washington. I heard a fine speech by Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe describing how some of the discoveries of our space program are being put to use in ground transportation safety.

I was particularly impressed though by remarks made by Mark Shepherd, Jr., president and chief executive officer, Texas Instruments, Inc., Dallas. At the dinner, Mr. Shepherd was awarded the EIA Medal of Honor, the industry's highest personal award.

His acceptance remarks were quite challenging and thought-provoking. They contain a great deal of interest for all of us concerned with the future of technology and I submit them for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH FOR ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION "MEDAL OF HONOR," BY MARK SHEPHERD, JR.

Thank you for the honor which you have paid me this evening. It's always gratifying to be singled out by one's associates, but when an association like EIA does the honoring, the gratification is even greater. As a member of EIA one can't help but feel he is playing a greater and greater role in a smaller and smaller world. Also, it's a source of pride to be a member of the professions represented in EIA, which, through their collective efforts, are creating a higher standard of living and a more personally rewarding society for all people.

Having had the privilege of serving previously as your president and chairman, I am now doubly honored by this award, which I accept with humility and deep appreciation.

I can't resist the opportunity to spend a few minutes—it will be a few—to take a look at this industry we represent. Year after year, here in the United States, we've grown rapidly—that is, until this past year when, for the first time since World War II, we experienced a decline. Now, this blip in growth can't help but be a sobering experience for many of us, but let's put it in the right perspective as we look ahead.

I am excited about our future. As you well know, our industry is very pervasive. That is to say, the technologies we employ continually become basic tools of other industries, and offer new product and market opportunities for our own industry's continued expansion. There is a great opportunity for us in this decade to exceed our expectations for the industry's, and our own individual, growth throughout the world.

How great can this expectation be? Let me build it up in several steps. Based on numerous projections, the free-world electronics market promises to grow from its current level of $44 billion to some $80 billion by 1980 by continuing to serve, and develop, the markets it is engaged in now.

In the same period of time, there is an opportunity to realize at least another $20 billion growth by extension of our technologies into new markets—in many cases as substitutes for other technologies—such as telecommunications, manufacturing automation and industrial and consumer surveillance and security systems.

Further, there is an opportunity for an additional $10 billion growth through continuing technological innovation in electronics—principally solid-state developments to provide innovative products to open new markets. Many of these markets can be the high-volume consumer-oriented markets which are now limited to providing entertainment for the consumer. The first of these products are beginning to appear—such as small, personalized calculators and electric watches; and definition is underway for a number of non-entertainment automotive functions such as skid control for applying braking power, and fuel injection computers. But the real thrust of bringing electronics into the home for non-entertainment functions largely lies ahead and offers an important stimulus to growth for our industry.

Now, will this happen? I believe that we have the potential for a worldwide industry of $110 billion in a decade. I further believe that U.S. electronics will realize an increasing share of this huge and growing industry, but only if we face up to a number of problems and deal with them as opportunities. I'll point up just two: (1) The requirement for more and better educated professionals, and (2) The necessity for operating in a one world, one market competitive environment.

Concerning the first problem: As recently as April of last year, an increased demand for electrical and electronic engineers was still being projected for the 1971/1975 period. You all are aware of the dramatic shift in this picture with the general hiring and college recruiting cutbacks of today. There is now an apparent oversupply in many fields. Just two weeks ago, the Labor Department curtailed the unrestricted immigration of engineers and most scientists, which has been a significant factor in the U.S. being able to meet its overall technical manpower commitments.

The fall-out psychological effect of this supply-demand unbalance is certain to be reflected in a reduction in the number of college entrances in engineering fields. There is still another factor working against us. There are many who blame technology for the problems of the world: pollution, overpopulation, the quality of life—incorrectly, I believe. But I won't take the time tonight to build a defensive case. This anti-technology orientation, if we let it flourish, can further discourage many potential engineers and scientists. It's very possible that we are in the beginning stages of an over-correction which will not show up clearly for some time.

I think the projections of future increased demand for engineers and scientists made a year or more back will turn out to be correct. I'm concerned that an over-correction caused by the above factors, reflected by a reduction in college entrances in the engineering fields, will bring about a severe shortage by the mid to late 1970's—impacting the electronics industry ability to support the potential growth I projected.

Moreover, this potential supply of engineers and scientists must be gauged against a further complication. Dr. Fred Terman reports that, principally because of changes in selective service, there has been an alarming drop in fresh Bachelor of Science graduates entering full-time graduate work.

This, coupled with reductions in funds for academic research, will perpetuate a lower order of Masters level study. Considering the growing body of knowledge in modern science and engineering and the complexity of concepts that are in common usage, Dr. Terman notes if this condition is not arrested, the U.S. "will have to learn how to compete with Japanese and German industry and with U.S.S.R. military technology in a situation in which an undesirably large proportion of our engineers and scientists are undertrained."

Moving to the second problem, the world market environment, who can doubt that competition in the industry operates in a shrinking global village? Recent experience shows that electronic markets are growing at a faster pace outside the U.S. than within our country. Our Association must promote a national trade policy which will permit us to do what we clearly excel in—as an industry and as a nation: developing high technology products and marketing such expertise throughout the world.

Whether or not we can handle these two problem areas—inadequate professionalization and international competition—will depend heavily upon our Association. We need an analog to the highly successful Future Farmers movement—namely a "Future Scientists and Engineers of America." We must inspire questioning youth and follow through on the challenges we hold up to them. Further, we must learn how to communicate a global philosophy more effectively to our many publics, especially to government officials and indeed to members of our own industry who still don't believe that other countries of the world are pulling ahead in the race for technical supremacy.

I'm confident we can and will solve these and other problems. To do so, we will have to heed the advice of the essayist John Ruskin when he said "the wise man escapes from the tyranny of the immediate." Let us not be tyrannized by our immediate problems, but, rather, let us rise to an elevation which will permit us to see the business horizons of the world, and let us plan deliberately for a promising future.

Again, I sincerely thank you for the honor of this award.

THE INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have introduced legislation and supported proposals to provide a 15 percent across-the-board increase in monthly social security benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of $100. I have again this year introduced a bill, H.R. 4085, to accomplish those objectives.

I voted in favor of the conference report on H.R. 4690, which provides for a 10 percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1971. I would have preferred the Senate version of the increase in benefits; but, we were told that yesterday's vote was stop-gap action and indicative of congressional concern and awareness.

The Ways and Means Committee is presently considering amendments to the Social Security Act which I hope will be more helpful to meet the financial needs of our senior citizens. There is need for at least an additional 5-percent increase in basic benefits. The cost of basic necessities for so many who must rely on social security has increased at least 15 percent since the last increase in benefit payments. A minimum payment of $100 per month, is an absolute necessity—the validity of this figure has been established far too often to be a matter of controversy. We must raise the amount a social security beneficiary may earn and still receive his full benefits for that year. A realistic figure would be $2,400.

Mr. Speaker, 26 million Americans are awaiting congressional action on comprehensive amendments to the Social Security Act. We have been assured that they will be forthcoming. We hope that this will not be in the too distant future.

ELIMINATE BOUNTIES ON COYOTES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine editorial appearing on WJBK-TV 2, Detroit, Mich., by Mr. Robert C. White, editorial director, entitled "A Chance To End Cruelty—and Save Cash." The editorial follows:

A CHANCE TO END CRUELTY—AND SAVE CASH

Thanks to the unrelenting efforts of conservationists and animal lovers, the Michigan Senate now has an opportunity to wipe out the last vestige of our state's cruel, costly and ineffective bounty system.

Bounties on wolves, foxes and bobcats were wisely done away with during the Sixties. A bill to end the one remaining bounty—on coyotes—was overwhelmingly approved last month by the State House and now awaits action by the Senate Conservation Committee.

The legislation—House Bill 4803—has the endorsement of the Governor, the Department of Natural Resources, and virtually all of the state's conservation and anti-cruelty groups. It would put Michigan with 31 other states which have eliminated all bounties as unnecessary, inhumane, and ecologically unsound.

In a 20 year period ending with 1964, Michigan paid out more than $1½ million dollars in bounties on some 91,000 coyotes, many of them left to die in traps or clubbed to death as pups. Total bounties paid on coyotes in 1970 alone in Michigan are estimated as high as $70,000. The money, which comes from fishing and hunting license fees, obviously could be put to much better use.

If you agree with TV2 that Michigan's bounty on coyotes is cruel, outmoded and wasteful of public funds, we urge you to let your State Senator in Lansing know how you feel. Just tell him to vote for House Bill 4803.

Delivered by: Robert J. McBride, Director of News & Community Affairs on Tuesday, March 9, 1971 on WJBK-TV2.

WHITNEY M. YOUNG

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am filled with a deep sense of loss over the tragic and untimely passing of Whitney M. Young, a man of justice and a great national resource. I extend my deepest and heartfelt condolences to his family and I pray that the knowledge of his immeasurable contributions to humanity will be a source of comfort to them.

I wish also, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Newark Star Ledger:

A TRAGIC LOSS

His was a moderate voice that rationally articulated the historical injustices that have been the burden of the black people. He spoke with calm assurance that the regressive social tides eventually would have to be reversed, and before his premature death at 49, there was heartening evidence that his words were prophetic.

Whitney Moore Young Jr. was an urbane national leader who etched out an impressive record of accomplishment in a decade of great social change with which he was closely identified. He was a major force in the National Urban League, a group he headed as exectuive director.

Under his able guidance, the Urban League was gradually transformed from a socially oriented middle-class base into an activist organization that assumed a prominent role in trying to bring a sense of self-sufficiency for black poor in this country. A principled, dedicated advocate, he sustained an abiding belief that the American system, with all its deficiencies, had the resiliency to accommodate massive social and economic changes.

"We can agree on objectives and disagree on techniques," Mr. Young once said. "The difference between myself and the others is that they have given up on the American system. As poor as the system is, until they can provide me with an alternative, I'm convinced we can follow no other without committing suicide."

Whitney Young was rarely a familiar figure at protest demonstrations, sit-ins and other confrontations in the street. But he made it a point to keep up with the ideas and thinking that motivated and stimulated young American blacks. He may have had philosophical differences with militants in the movement, but he completely concurred with them on fundamental objectives—social justice and economic betterment.

The death of Whitney Young tragically removes a compassionate and forceful figure who did much for the cause of justice and racial equality in America. But even his early passing does not obscure the high standards he set for himself and his people. He insisted on being measured on whether or not, in his lifetime, he helped to improve the economic, political, health and social future of the black people. The record would indicate that he measured up to these demanding goals in an eminent manner.

SOLVING THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

HON. JOHN WARE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, in the highly respected magazine, Traffic Quarterly of October 1970, there is an article entitled "The Rapid Tramway: A Feasible Solution to the Urban Transportation Problem." It is a fine article.

The author is Mr. Stewart F. Taylor, who is a transportation expert and the project manager—transportation with the renowned consulting firm of Day & Zimmerman of Philadelphia. Mr. Taylor's article draws on the best European experiences as offering a solution to the transportation snarls and frustrations now existing in our great metropolitan areas.

I commend Mr. Taylor's article to my colleagues and herewith place it in the RECORD:

THE RAPID TRAMWAY: A FEASIBLE SOLUTION TO THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

(By Stewart F. Taylor)

The problem of urban transportation in America has endured for so many years that it is assuming the characteristics of an unfortunate but inseparable component of our national life. If it stood apart, the problem might be tolerated as a necessary cost of the country's enviable achievements. Current events indicate, however, that the shortcomings of transportation hinder the remedy of other ills which threaten our urbanized society.

The search for solutions has also been long. Governments at all levels have expended billions of dollars in enlarging and improving our networks of public streets and highways. Hundreds of millions more have been committed to improving or, at the very least, resuscitating the mass transit industry, and its transition from private to public ownership has moved rapidly. Legal structures have been altered to improve the financial and operating climate for public transportation. In the areas of conceptualization and planning, activity has been equally vigorous. Scores of proposals for new transportation techniques and hardware—from the conventional to the visionary—have received serious consideration. Nearly every large city in the United States has been the subject of a plan emphasizing the role of one or more transportation modes.

Few will gainsay the tangible accomplishments to date. Some critics complain that fiscal emphasis on highway development has only intensified the problem, but other authorities have marshaled statistics demonstrating these programs as appropriate responses to the massive shift in demand from public to private transportation. The fact remains, however, that in spite of obvious improvements there is almost universal dissatisfaction with today's urban transportation. The critical issue is, therefore, what courses of future action can produce effective solutions.

CONVENTIONAL ANSWERS DISCREDITED

In recent years a vast array of concepts have been offered as instruments for achieving plan objectives. Many claim technical and economic superiority over a wide range of circumstances. It must be recognized, however, that preeminence in these areas is often irrelevant to the problems of today. Not long ago technology stood as the challenge as well as the touchstone for commercial development of new transportation schemes. On the other hand, evidence seems to indicate that sociological factors now predominate—with economic criteria playing an important but lesser role. The most formidable victim of the new environment is the urban highway program. For decades most transportation experts have held out the public road as the panacea for our increasingly dispersed and automobile-oriented urban society. Yet in spite of an abundance of impressive cost-benefit statistics vital freeway projects have been arrested for years or irrevocably annulled in such important cities as San Francisco, New Orleans, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. This has been achieved by local interests in spite of full recognition that their direct funding burden would be insignificant. Construction programs will continue in the years ahead, but the recent, widely separated defeats are not isolated aberrations. The popularity of this approach has unquestionably waned.

Mass transit proponents have been heartened by the growing disillusionment with automobile-based programs, yet their efforts have been less rewarding. In the rail transit field only one totally new system has been completed since World War II, and in the minus column laborious proposals have been overturned by taxpayer referendums in Seattle, San Francisco,[1] Los Angeles, and Atlanta. The primary issue in each of these defeats was obviously economic: the individual citizen recognized his personal cost burden and was unwilling to carry it; but the diversity of circumstances suggests that sociological factors also influenced the outcome.

It is all too evident that the nation must simultaneously cope with more problems at home and abroad than its resources will allow. Taxes have been increased but at the same time priorities for the application of public revenues have, perforce, been established. It must be acknowledged that these rapid transit proposals—of such elaborateness and complexity as to entail billions in capital construction cost—could not match such claims as national defense, space, crime, and poverty. Requiring support from all, they were viewed as exorbitant luxuries for the relatively few who found them convenient.

New schemes for bus transit have been similarly frustrated. In spite of decades of advocacy and trivial capital requirements, reserved busways in city streets have never gained wide acceptance. Optimum economics are beside the point to motorists observing unencumbered and seemingly underutilized thoroughfares forbidden to them while they are confined to plodding in overburdened lanes. Practical reality also points to the difficulty of policing curbside street space, which is essential to local bus operations. More recently there has been a surge of interest in reserved expressway lanes. This concept has merit as a solution to the line-haul segment of bus service.[2] The question remains, however, as to the downtown distribution function. Even if allocated street lanes can be guaranteed a high degree of immunity from parallel traffic, Central Business District (CBD) intersection delays are less amenable to solution. Grade separation would obviate the problem, but to date no bus subway scheme has been carried beyond the stage of cost estimation. Paramount among several adverse factors is the high capital construction requirement for a mode of limited capacity: 5,000 to 8,000 passengers per peak hour per direction in contrast with 45,000 to 55,000 for rapid transit.

If conventional approaches are meeting with disfavor, what of the more advanced schemes for improving urban transportation? The record of success is equally spare. For more than a decade a parade of concepts have been winning professional recognition. Some have enjoyed substantial federal support. However, while the need is now, none has materialized into commercially acceptable operation. Nor does the near future hold promise for greater success. A forward look becomes conjecture, but the impediments to most of these schemes—their technical problems aside—appear to have continuing validity. Most new concepts can be divided into two categories: the guided transit capsule and the guided personal vehicle. The common denominator is the fixed pathway to permit automated control which, in turn, provides high speed, close spacing and maximum capacity with safety. Total segregation from free-flowing traffic is mandatory, so a choice must be made between subterranean and elevated planes. The provision of origin-and-destination convenience proximately equal to the automobile would require a large and complex network of lines. As a consequence, the tunneling necessary in a Central Business District for trunk lines, feeders, junctions, and drop-off points severely tests the imagination. On the other hand, it is difficult to envision community acceptance of overhead guideways lacing a metropolitan area when elevated highways and railways have become anathema.

Transit capsules offer greater frequency of service than train systems. Against this, however, must be measured the safety and psychological aspects of no on-board attendant, less capacity, and the greater problems arising from malfunctions. Their outstanding characteristic—automated control—is hardly revolutionary. This technology will soon be demonstrated in commercial service on the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit System. The guided personal vehicle raises its own set of questions. If the conveyance is designed exclusively for "tracked" operation, what incentive is there to purchase (or rent) for such a limited scope of travel—particularly if it successfully accomplishes its objective of reducing conventional highway congestion? On the other hand, it is difficult to envisage a completely versatile dual-mode car offered commercially at a price competitive with a new or used automobile. It must be remembered that a current social goal is to provide conveyance for all segments of the urban population including those who cannot afford private transportation. Moreover, irrespective of cost, those handicapped millions who are unable to drive because of age or infirmity can never benefit from advancements in this technology.

THE RAPID TRAMWAY CONCEPT

Stress upon the drawbacks of revolutionary concepts is not intended to discredit their eventual utility. It would be presumptuous to predict the technological and sociological environment of metropolitan areas toward the end of this century. The point is that a present need exists for faster, safer, more reliable and harmonious urban transportation. It has already been noted, however, that conventional concepts face serious resistance. What, then, is the answer? One near-term technology that has attracted little interest in this country but has seen wide adoption on the continent of Europe is the rapid tramway,[3] a mass transit concept which can be simply described as an innovative fusion of conventional technologies.[4]

Salient features consist of lightweight, electrically powered vehicles with flanged wheels operating singly or in trains on dual

Footnotes at end of article.

rail trackage. Separation from other traffic is material to optimum performance. This is accomplished by subways in central urban areas and by surface segregation on highway medians or along separate routes in less congested peripheral districts. Characteristics of the concept suggest a broad range of application: 1) lower cost and less environmental intrusion than conventional rapid transit; 2) a promisig instrument for integrating urban mass transportation; and 3) a capability for upgrading and conversion to the highest levels of automation and passenger-carrying capacity. Each will be briefly considered.

Lower Cost and Less Environmental Intrusion than Rapid Transit. A basic characteristic of the rapid tramway is overhead power collection. In addition to its relatively low capital cost and greater ease of maintenance compared with third-rail systems, it opens the door to other benefits. As was stated earlier, separation from other circulation systems is important, but total isolation—required of the dangerous powered-rail configuration—is unnecessary. Outside of the CBD, land values permit conventional rapid transit to be located in the open, but the third rail dictates a high degree of property protection as well as separation of unattended grade crossings. The latter is accomplished by a depressed or elevated right-of-way. Both approaches present problems. Cuts entail special drainage systems, and unless substantial retaining walls are employed land-use requirements are trebled for a typical two-track line. Aerial structures are more costly, while they—as well as earthfills—obtrude conspicuously into the communities through which they pass.

Above a certain intensity of land use, open-cut or elevated construction for rapid transit is either too costly or aesthetically unacceptable, and subway operation becomes mandatory. Tramways, on the other hand, can be inoffensive and function effectively on the surface in reserved rights-of-way or boulevards or parkways passing through urban sectors of similar density. Hence, while both forms must operate underground through core areas, the tramway may be brought to the surface sooner in a radial direction. This can reduce overall subway requirements, the construction costs of which are at least five times as great as open rights-of-way.

It must be recognized that median strip operation on other than limited-access highways introduces the cross movement of other traffic at grade, leading to slower operation and the possibility of schedule interruption. Steps can be taken to minimize these drawbacks: train-controlled traffic signals, the closing of minor cross streets, prohibiting left-hand turns, and employing as yet untried designs of low cost, modular construction overpasses. The fact is, however, that this type of operation can only be marginally satisfactory. On the other hand, the tramway mode is also employed in other configurations with superior characteristics. And while median strip running is less effective than pure rapid transit, it is a vast improvement to rush-hour circulation of general traffic on most urban arteries. More importantly, as this type of operation is unavailable to conventional rapid transit, paying the price of lower speed and reliability over limited sections of a comprehensive system can spell the difference between realizing a broadly attractive mode or no effective mass transit at all.

A more desirable method of surface operation can be achieved at less cost by exploiting little-used or abandoned railroad rights-of-way. Every city in the United States with a population in excess of a quarter million is the focal point of railroad lines radiating in several directions. With the vast corporate merger movement in progress and the shrinkage of passenger business to less than 500 scheduled intercity trains a day throughout the nation, the utilization of all portions of surplus rights-of-way becomes increasingly plausible.[5] High voltage power transmission lines also frequently require property tracts of sufficient width to be suitable for sharing with a fixed-rail transport system.

A necessary adjunct to any safe and efficient urban rail operation is a train control system. Again, the requirements for tramways are less burdensome than those of full-fledged rapid transit. Lower maximum speeds (ca. 50 mph vs. 75 mph) and higher braking power made possible by shorter and lighter-weight trains reduce the structure of essential safeguards. Sectional division of lines into protective "blocks" demarcated by train-actuated wayside signals is a minimal requirement, but automatic train control, overriding train stop or on-board signal indicators are superfluous under normal circumstances. Obviously the performance and capacity of any system have a direct relationship to the extent that these latter devices are employed, but route segregation is the principal factor permitting multiple-unit train operation and point-to-point speeds substantially higher than rush-hour general traffic. Less pronounced is the degree of improvement over the tramway provided by rapid transit with its more complex and costly safety equipment.

Aside from roadway and track the largest segment of capital required for rapid transit fixed facilities is ordinarily allocated to stations. In rapid tramway development this figure can be materially reduced. Vertical dimensions for platforms can be selected from a range of options. Those designed to be level with car floors obviate steps and thereby reduce station dwell time. This is important at high loading points, but in outlying areas of lighter traffic density they can be lowered, and requirements for stairways, structural members, and foundations are correspondingly reduced. Variations in height within the same system have been made feasible by a car-mounted device—utilized by several European transit systems—which enables the operator to adjust the number of exposed boarding steps from station to station. Typically close operating headways minimize passenger waiting, and the need for elaborate shelters is also eliminated.

Cost characteristics of rapid tramway vehicles correspond to those of the system's fixed facilities. They offer a lower, narrower configuration and carry less undercarriage gear than standard rapid transit rolling stock. This results in less weight per unit of linear dimension, and propulsion requirements are correspondingly reduced. Traffic-inducing performance levels can thereby be achieved at relatively lower first cost and with less power consumption. At the same time, standard production tramcars display acceleration and braking potentials corresponding to maximum levels of rider acceptability. Their movement is also as free of vertical and lateral vibration as the most advanced high-capacity vehicles.

A Promising Approach to Integrated Mass Transportation. An important characteristic of the rapid tramway is close station spacing within the CBD. Subway designs for five European systems call for an average of 1,500 to 2,000 feet between stops. This intense coverage exists only in sectors of highest population density. Station intervals lengthen as distance from the CBD increases until a typical suburban surface running pattern will call for spacing of 2,300 to 3,300 feet. In no instance is the central area of any city—irrespective of its size—to be served by a single line. However, the universal *modus operandi* is to construct and open for service one tunnel (or only a portion thereof) at such a time as moneys are periodically appropriated. This provides, at the earliest possible moment, an incentive to sustain the patronage of regular riders as well as a tangible demonstration of the potential worth of a well-planned public transportation system. Beyond the core area a previously described advantage obtains: The lower cost of right-of-way construction permits the development of more and/or longer routes for each dollar of available capital, and greater geographical coverage is effectuated than is possible with totally segregated rapid transit.

The concert of these two features offers an attractive level of convenience to most population strata of a metropolitan area. In the CBD, pedestrian travel from a tramway stop to any destination can be a practical reality. In peripheral areas walking becomes feasible for a greater proportion of the population, while accessory transportation by private or public means can be quicker and more convenient. But the principal virtue lies in combining the speed and reliability of rapid transit with the convenience of the bus to achieve a genuinely integrated public transportation system performing the three essential functions of collection, line haul, and distribution. The boon of this concept is the reduction in passenger-transferring, a task ranging from inconvenient to onerous. The only auxiliary requirement is a thin network of feeder bus routes. For example, upon completion of projected tramway tunneling in Cologne, Germany (population: 1,400,000), the CBD of approximately 1.7 square miles will be served by surface transit (buses) operating on only one street.

A Capability for Upgrading to the Highest Levels of Automation and Passenger Capacity. Events in Europe make clear that development of the rapid tramway does not require an irrevocable commitment to this technology. To the contrary, it can be—and is frequently—a preliminary step toward the implementation of conventional rapid transit. Permanent way structures, such as track, tunnels, and stations can be so constructed to serve ultimately as maximum capacity facilities merely by the introduction of faster and more capacious rolling stock. The inverted "T"-shaped design of the continuously welded running rails for the precedent-breaking San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit is virtually identical with those of tramway systems operating on the Continent. Other devices, such as centralized, automated train monitoring and control can be added in a building block pattern. Requisite segregation of the right-of-way can be achieved by a staged procedure. Surface routes can be depressed, elevated, or tunneled in segments where the needs are greatest, and the gradual conversion will further enhance the pre-existing service. Several systems currently in construction or operation are designated "Pre-Metro," signifying that the initial service is only preliminary to a metropolitan railway, the European term for full-scale rapid transit.

THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE

Table I is a list of European cities where rapid tramway systems are either planned, under construction, or in operation. While this demonstrates a widespread adoption of the technology, it is worthwhile to examine five differing situations in some detail. Populations of the cities to be discussed are indicated in the table.

TABLE I.—EUROPEAN RAPID TRAMWAY DEVELOPMENTS

City	Population served	Current status[1]	Underground lines[2]	New extensions of surface lines[2]	Future role of metropolitan railways (heavy rapid transit)
Amsterdam	854,000	In operation	Plans not finalized	Plans not finalized	Plans not finalized.
Antwerp	700,000	do	Under construction	Long-range possibility	Conversion to Metro is only long-range goal.
			Planned		
Basle	345,000	do	do	Planned	Rapid tramway only.
Belgrade	850,000	do	do		Long-range plans uncertain.
Bern	210,000	do	In operation	Planned	Rapid tramway only.
			Planned		
Bielefeld	170,000	Under construction	Under construction		Do.
Bochum	1,117,000	In operation	Planned	Under construction	Planned integration with Ruhr Valley high-speed network.
			Planned		
Bonn	300,000	do	Under construction	do	Rapid tramway only.
			Planned		
Bremen	596,000	do	do	Planned	Long-range conversion plans.
Brussels	1,090,000	do	In operation	None	Conversion of urban lines but preservation of rapid tramway suburban feeders.
			Under construction		
			Planned		
Charleroi	161,000	Planned	do	None	Rapid tramway only.
Cologne	1,400,000	In operation	In operation	Planned	Do.
			Under construction		
			Planned		
Dortmund	774,000	do	do	Planned	Planned integration with Ruhr Valley highspeed network.
Duisburg	496,000	do	do	do	Do.
Essen	729,000	do	In operation		Do.
			Under construction		
			Planned		
Frankfurt	1,100,000	do	In operation	None	Hybrid Metro-Tramway plus rapid tramway.
			Under construction		
			Planned		
Geneva	299,000	Planned	do		Rapid tramway only.
Ghent	246,000	do	do		Do.
Gothenburg	422,000	In operation	None	Under construction	Do.
				Planned	
The Hague	685,000	do	do	do	Do.
Hanover	743,000	do	Under construction	None	Do.
			Planned		
Kosice	102,000	do	None		Do.
Leipzig	850,000	do	Planned		Do.
Leningrad	3,300,000	Planned	None		Both systems will be employed.
Ludwigshafen	173,000	In operation	In operation		Rapid tramway only.
			Planned		
Mannheim	330,000	do	None	Planned	Do.
Milan	1,583,000	do	Favored but no specific plans	do	Conversion to Metro.
Oslo	483,000	do	In operation		Long-range conversion plans.
Rome	2,500,000	do	Planned	Planned	Both systems will be employed.
Rotterdam	897,000	do	None	Under construction	Do.
Stuttgart	870,000	do	In operation	do	Rapid tramway only.
			Under construction		
			Planned		
Vienna	1,780,000	do	In operation		Long-range conversion plans.
			Under construction		
			Planned		

[1] This refers to segments of each transit system.
[2] All stages are indicated.

Sources: Modern Tramway, Ian Allan, Ltd., Shepperton, Middlesex, England, vols. 26 (1963) and 29-32 (1966-69). Reynaert, P., A Consideration of Underground Urban Transport Systems: Metropolitan Railway, Underground Tramway or Motorbus Tunnels?, a paper presented to the 37th International Congress of The International Union of Public Transport, Barcelona, 1967. Statistics of Urban Public Transport, The International Union of Public Transport, Brussels, Belgium, 2d edition, 1968. Tchebotarev, E. V., Study of New Systems of Public Transport: Air Cushion Vehicles, Conveyor-Belts, Monorails, Ropeways, etc., a paper presented to the 38th International Congress of The International Union of Public Transport, London, 1969. Van Der Gragt, F., Europe's Greatest Tramway Network, Leiden, Netherlands, E. J. Brill, 1968.

Gothenburg, Sweden. This industrial and maritime center is the second largest city in this prosperous Scandinavian nation. It is served by a public transportation network of 65 route-miles of tramway and 152 of bus. The rail system, 65 percent of which lies in reserved rights-of-way, carries 70 percent of the annual passenger volume. Only two of the 33 bus lines pass through the CBD; the function of the latter mode is principally oriented toward tramway feeder service. The predominance of rail transportation cannot be attributed to a paucity of motor vehicles or to a captive mass transit market. A total of 123,000 vehicles are registered in the city, and the ratio of 4.0 persons per passenger car compares with a 3.5 average for the ten largest cities of the United States.

The tramway network has been gradually expanded since World War II, and plans call for an additional eight percent increase in mileage over the next five years. The delivery this year of 60 new units will expand the rail car fleet by 16 percent. A notable landmark was the opening late last year of a 5.1-mile line constructed on the roadbed of an abandoned railroad. Trains have a start-to-stop schedule of exactly ten minutes for the entire route, including discharge and pickup at an intermediate station. This service will be performed by regeared conventional vehicles in trains of up to four cars with a total seating and standing capacity of 496 passengers. They will be operated by a single employee.

Rotterdam, Netherlands. Intensive destruction of the CBD during World War II enabled planners to execute a thorough restructuring of its traffic arteries. The principal boulevards are sufficiently wide to accommodate six lanes of automobile and commercial traffic, motor/bicycle lanes, wide sidewalks, two or three tramway tracks, commodious loading platforms as well as extensive landscaping between transit stops. This has resulted in the placement of 49 percent of the tramway system—totaling 52 line-miles—in reserved rights-of-way.

In early 1968, service was inaugurated on an impressive, high-capacity (35,000 passengers/hour/direction) double-track rapid transit line. Approximately one-half of the 3.6-mile route lies underground and the balance on a reinforced concrete aerial structure. The total cost, excluding rolling stock: $61.5 million. Since then two new rapid tramway lines have opened. One acts largely as a suburban feeder to the rapid transit. Eighty percent of the six-mile lateral line is new and situated on separated right-of-way. Rail underpasses avoid several active intersections. A half-mile branch is under construction, and the remaining 20 percent will be relocated away from general traffic. The other line is a radial extension of a route originating in the CBD, entirely separated from other traffic. This was accomplished most noticeably by a 3,000-foot viaduct spanning a canal and other intercity transportation facilities. The line totals five miles of single track and cost $4,760,000. Passenger traffic has increased 12 percent over that of the bus line which was replaced. These two capital projects are an indication that rapid tramway technology is not confined to the role of substituting for pre-existing street railway operations.

Brussels, Belgium. Over 950 streetcars and half as many buses provide frequent but slow transit service in this capital city. Since its origins as a center of commercial activity can be traced back nearly a thousand years, most downtown streets are narrow and ill-suited for a full range of transportation modes. As the initial step of a comprehensive program for improving public transportation which will extend over two decades, the first section of a contemplated 36-mile metropolitan railway system was opened in December, 1968. The "cornerstone" is a subway 2.2 miles in length which serves in a pre-metro phase as a funnel for several surface lines radiating at both ends. Fifty of the newest streetcars have been equipped with high-speed, overhead current collectors and automatic train stop devices to override driver failure. Another fifty-five 173-passenger vehicles are on order. A second tunnel approximately two miles long is scheduled to begin analogous service toward the end of this year.

It is interesting to note that full-scale rapid transit rolling stock was to have been ordered late last year, but available funds under a national program affecting the five largest Belgian cities were redirected to initiate the construction of a tram subway system in Antwerp. Tramcars will, therefore, serve the Brussels subway system for an indefinite period of time. When these vehicles are eventually phased out, they will be assigned to a planned network of 42 miles of

rapid tramway—including a mile of subway—largely in peripheral areas.

Cologne, Germany. Encompassing 210 square miles, this metropolitan center has been enhanced by the development of a prime example of the rapid tramway concept. Subway construction was initiated in 1963, and the first section of 4,600 feet was opened in the spring of 1968. A second section of 5,300 feet, intersecting the first, began revenue service in October, 1969. The third, extending operations another 4,000 feet, will be brought "on stream" late this year, and it is anticipated that by 1974 approximately six miles of tramline will be located in tunnels or on aerial structures. Arithmetic projections are simplified by a straightforward capital program: By a ratio of 50%-30%-20%, respectively, the federal, land (state), and municipal governments will contribute $16,000,000 annually for the construction of approximately 1.3 miles of double-track subway. Ultimately, 15 percent of the total system will lie underground. The present 186-mile network of surface routes, two-thirds of which lie in reserved zones, is in the gradual process of extension and upgrading by relocation in underpasses or on viaducts.

Five tramlines operate in the present subway sections. At the temporary underground terminal for all routes, the operator of each vehicle manipulates a wayside control before starting on his run. This device not only operates all track switches and signals to guide and protect the vehicle along its assigned route, but it also actuates highly visible signs over all subway platforms to display the route number and destination of the approaching car.[6] When the temporary terminal is nullified by the opening of the next tunnel section, this function will be taken over by a central dispatcher who can presently monitor the exact location and direction of every train. As is the case with many European systems, all tramcars are equipped with on-board automatic fare collection devices, public address systems, and two-way radios.

Bonn, Germany. The status of public transportation in this seat of federal government is particularly relevant to a large stratum of urban areas in the United States. On August 1, 1969, by political annexation of surrounding communities the city expanded its population from 144,000 to approximately 300,000. It is now comparable to Omaha, Nebraska, which is forty-second in this country in the number of inhabitants. In addition to a handful of motor and trolley bus routes the area is served by a tramway system consisting of 31 miles of urban and suburban line and a fleet of 72 cars.

The significant fact is that in spite of its still modest size the city will open a three-mile subway this year which will remove most rail operations from the narrow streets of the CBD. A second tunnel branching from the first will complete the transition. The initial undertaking links the older city with the government quarter to the south. As the reunification of Germany has become more distant, an extensive office-building program and restructuring of the traffic system have been carried out in the new administrative district. The principal north-south artery has been upgraded in speed and capacity, and a reserved median strip provided for the tramline. Pedestrian access to several stations can only be gained by underground passageways which also serve as avenue crosswalks.

It is also important to note that capital projects have not been confined to improving existing rail operations. Nearly a mile of new line was opened in 1966; more than two miles are planned in connection with a new Rhine River bridge; and discussion has dealt with replacing a suburban bus route with rail service. Together, the various programs and undertakings initiated by Bonn demonstrate that rapid tramway technology has practical application for urban areas other than the largest metropolitan centers.

POTENTIAL APPLICATION IN AMERICA

Undoubtedly the European milieu in which the rapid tramway has developed differs on many counts from that of the United States. Among other conditions, urban population densities are higher and private car ownership lower. These factors do not, however, negate the soundness of the rapid tramway concept and, in fact, encourage a thorough, practical appraisal of its applicability. Higher motor vehicle populations make grade-separated transit systems all the more compelling, while the increasing dispersion of our metropolitan areas militates against high-capacity, high-cost rapid transit.

What kinds of urban traffic corridors are suitable for rapid tramway application in the United States? While it lies across our border, Toronto, Canada, offers a valid example for larger population centers. The Toronto Transportation Commission, an unquestioned leader in accomplishing improvements in all modes of public transportation—including conventional rapid transit—plans to construct an eight-mile rapid tramway as a northeastward extension of the recently opened Bloor-Danforth subway. The line will run through medium-density residential areas and terminate at a future housing development for 40,000 residents. Commission planners observe that the tramway bridges a service gap between low-capacity buses and subways which do not become economical until patronage reaches 20,000 per hour. It is expected that the line will attract peak loads of 10,000 to 15,000 passengers per hour. If successful the line will be extended in a 35-mile circumferential loop around the northern and western portions of the metropolitan area.

For smaller cities the Regional Transportation Plan of Dayton, Ohio, is pertinent. It proposes a nine-mile "rapid transit" line in a corridor linking the two fastest growing suburban quadrants (northwest and southeast) with the CBD. While a conventional, high-platform subway or elevated facility is described as undesirable for the foreseeable future because of its high capital cost, the study looks with favor on a lightweight, semigrade separated system to serve as the "backbone" of public transportation for this metropolitan area of approximately 750,000 population.

CONCLUSION

The need for more efficient and attractive urban transportation in America has never been greater, yet current trends suggest that the possibility of widespread improvement is remote. Sociological forces are impeding massive highway programs as well as the broad development of costly rail rapid transit systems. On the other hand, in spite of strenuous research effort the practical success of more technically advanced concepts remains elusive. Without doubt this nation is capable of establishing new transportation media which will markedly improve urban life, but the necessity to arrest a rapid and already profound deterioration is immediate.

Recent developments beyond our national boundaries suggest that the situation is not hopeless. Numerous European cities of varying size are meeting problems analogous to those in the United States with an evolutionary technology known as the rapid tramway. This concept displays the following characteristics which are essential to an antidote for our urban transportation malaise:

1. An independent physical plant of minimal unit cost and a capability for staged development which establish the plausibility of community acceptance.

2. Segregated rights-of-way in areas of potential traffic conflict and congestion to ensure speed, safety, and reliability.

3. Vehicles which are totally pollution-free today.

4. Versatility in operation and physical plant configuration making possible its exploitation as a fully integrated system for performing the roles of collection, line haul, and distribution.

5. Engineering and design which are not locked into a given technology.

Together these factors offer a promise of early improvement and a footing for more distant technological achievement.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This was a rejection by city voters on November 8, 1966 of a $96.5 million bond program initiating a $495 million comprehensive modernization (including new subways) of the San Francisco Municipal Railway and was unrelated to previous three-county approval of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

[2] While only a modicum of freeway mileage has been opened for practical tests of this approach, it has already been subject to compromise. The United States Department of Transportation recently contracted for a feasibility study of sharing freeway bus lanes with car-pool private vehicles, i.e., those carrying one or more passengers.

[3] The concept and its close variations have been identified by a number of terms. Among the more common are "Limited (or) Express Tramway," "Light Rapid Transit," "Subway-Surface System," "Semi Metro" and "Intermediate Capacity Rapid Transit."

[4] For a detailed description of an antecedent approach see Henry D. Quinby, "A New Concept in Transit," *Traffic Quarterly*, April 1962.

[5] In July 1959, the former Metropolitan Transit Authority of Boston inaugurated rapid tramway service on 9.4 miles of discontinued diesel railroad line which was converted to electrified, signal-protected operation for a turnkey cost of $6,994,000.

[6] Radio transmitters carried on the rapid tramcars of Frankfurt, Germany, are preset at the start of a run to the assigned route number and automatically operate, in succession, the same wayside equipment by remote control.

MOON LANDINGS—GO ON OR CEASE?

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial, entitled "Moon Landings—Go on or Cease?", which appeared in the Alameda Times-Star, under date of March 6.

I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues and want to congratulate Don Oakley on his splendid analysis of the space effort.

The article follows:

MOON LANDINGS—GO ON OR CEASE?

(By Don Oakley)

One measure of the decline of popular interest in space is said to be the fact that only about 45 million Americans watched the televised moon walks of Apollo 14 astronauts Alan Shepard and Ed Mitchell.

By contrast, upwards of 100 million, were glued to their sets during the landing of Apollo 11 in 1969.

Considering the early morning hours of the

Apollo 14 broadcasts, 45 million would seem to be a rather impressive audience.

Nevertheless, if man-in-the-street reaction to the third moon landing could be summed up in a few words, they would have to be "a polite yawn"—polite, out of respect for courage, skill and effort that made the feat possible, but still a yawn because even with the best will in the world, it was impossible to conjure up the same enthusiasm that surrounded the first landing.

This is sad, but it is a fact of human nature. But it is even sadder that those who have opposed the moon program from the beginning, or who have lately come to question its value, will now become more and more strident in their criticism of the remaining Apollo missions.

Apollo 14 cost something like $400 million. Never mind the fact that, compared with the $30 billion spent over the past decade to make the Apollo flights possible, this is almost cheap. Never mind that failure to capitalize on this vast investment by continuing the scientific exploration of space would be wasteful in the extreme over the long run.

Half a billion dollars is a lot of money. Think what it could do if spent on rehabilitating our slums or cleaning our rivers or in the fight against cancer, say the critics.

Yet imagine what would have happened if the United States had elected not to race Russia to the moon.

Suppose we had chosen instead to land robot explorers, as the Russians have done. Even this curtailed program would have cost many billions and the critics would still be complaining.

Suppose we had opted out of the moon race entirely and the Russians had been the first to land an instrument package, or a man, as they will land sooner or later.

The world would be scornful of America and the same critics would decry the Apollo program would be moaning that America had failed herself, had lost her sense of mission, that a free society had proven itself incapable of competing with a totalitarian one.

And they would be quite right.

The price of not going to the moon would have been immeasurably greater than its actual monetary cost—99 per cent of which was spent right here on earth.

We have to put that in the balance before we can talk about the "waste" of space exploration.

H.R. 6413, TO PROHIBIT THE IMPORTATION OF FISH FROM A COUNTRY THAT ILLEGALLY SEIZES OUR FISHING VESSELS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, American fishing vessels are being harassed and unlawfully seized and detained while conducting fishing operations on the high seas. In fact, since 1954, over half of the entire U.S. tuna fleet has either been chased, seized, harassed, or shot at.

Most recently, we have seen the seizure of 25 fishing vessels by the Government of Ecuador. These vessels were released after the payment of fines and after the purchase of fishing licenses.

Mr. Speaker, international law authorizes a 12-mile limit of jurisdiction over territorial waters. The United States and the great majority of nations recognize the 12-mile limit of jurisdiction. However, three Latin American countries—Chile, Peru, and Ecuador—have unilaterally extended their jurisdiction over the high seas to 200 miles. As a result, Ecuador has used this authority to seize our vessels which have been fishing on the high seas—many miles outside the internationally-recognized 12-mile limit.

In order to protect the rights of U.S. fishermen to fish without the interference of foreign governments on the high seas, the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1954 was enacted. Under a 1968 amendment to this act, the Secretary of State may file a claim with the offending country for reimbursement of the fines levied against our fishermen. If the foreign government refuses to pay, then the Secretary of State shall withhold an amount equal to such unpaid claim from any foreign assistance programed for the offending country. To date, no Secretary of State has requested payment from an offending country. Thus, we continue to pump millions of dollars into these countries which seize our vessels. For fiscal year 1970, Ecuador received $23 million in foreign aid.

In addition to this authority, when a nation unlawfully seizes our vessels, the Secretary of State may withhold defense articles which the United States sells to our allies.

On January 18, I sent Secretary Rogers a telegram urging him to use his authority to protect our fishing vessels on the high seas. I was pleased that he took action to suspend all new military aid sales to Ecuador, but, obviously, this suspension has taken no effect on the Government of Ecuador since they seized two more of our vessels recently.

Mr. Speaker, we have a policy of loaning warships to our allies. At least two vessels on loan from the United States—the *Guayaquil* and the *25th of July*—were used by Ecuador in making recent seizures.

Currently, we do not have a policy for recalling smaller warships—even when they are misused in this fashion. For this reason, I joined with Chairman GARMATZ in introducing a bill to require the return of certain vessels if they abuse our ships in this fashion.

Mr. Speaker, we are importing fish and fish products from these countries which persist in harassing and seizing our vessels. In 1969, Chile exported $2.5 million worth of fish and fish products to the United States; Peru exported $61.8 million of fish and fish products to the United States in 1968; and Ecuador exported $12.8 million worth of fish and fish products to this country in 1969. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that some of the fish seized from our ships was later exported to this country.

Obviously, our current policy has not deterred Ecuador from illegally seizing U.S. fishing vessels. Thus, I am introducing today a bill designed to assist and provide another approach to the enforcement of the Fishermen's Protective Act. These provisions amend the act by providing additional, optional measures the United States can take against a foreign country seizing fishing vessels. Very simply, if the Secretary of State feels that the offending country is not going to pay our claims or is unwilling to realistically discuss the situation, then he can request that the Secretary of the Treasury issue prohibitions against the importation into the United States of any fish products from the offending country.

I believe such an amendment can make a real contribution in the interest of peaceful settlement of disputes because it will have the practical effect of inducing an offending country to reach accommodations via the negotiation table.

This is a grave matter, Mr. Speaker, and I sincerely hope my colleagues will lend their support toward enacting this measure into law.

RUSSIAN OUTRAGE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and greatly dismayed to learn that on March 16, Soviet police invaded U.S. Embassy grounds in Moscow and seized the wife and two children of a Russian doctor who apparently had come to our Embassy merely to seek information about emigration. Fortunately, Embassy employees intervened to save the doctor from the clutches of the Soviets; but his wife and their two young daughters aged 5 and 9 were dragged away screaming by the Russian policemen.

Incidents like this are a grim reminder of what life under Communist rule is like; a grim reminder of the fact that the personal freedoms and liberties we enjoy and sometimes take so lightly are beyond the reach of millions of less fortunate human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter of protest to the Russian Ambassador to the United States. According to the explicit terms of the Consular Convention and Protocol of 1968 which we entered into with Russia, the Embassy grounds of each country are inviolate. Accordingly, the Russian police clearly had no authority to enter our Embassy grounds uninvited and violently drag away Dr. Nikitenkov's wife and children.

I urge all my colleagues who are concerned with preserving international law and fostering individual liberties to express their feelings to the Soviet Ambassador to the United States. Correspondence should be addressed to: His Excellency Anatoly F. Dobrynin, Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1125 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

THE HARPERS FERRY CHARTER FOR INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARY SERVICES, INC. IN THE 1970'S

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, International Voluntary Services, Inc. and its executive director, Richard J. Peters, have developed the following charter outlining the organization's plans for the 1970's:

IVS IN THE 1970's

The Board and staff of the International Voluntary Services meeting at Harpers Ferry on February 19–21, 1971 asked themselves three fundamental questions:

A. Does volunteer work abroad, which peaked in the mid-1960s and is now declining, have an important role in the 1970s

B. If so, does IVS with its concept of volunteerism, have a significant contribution to make in this new era?

C. If IVS does have a significant contribution to make, what changes are required in the IVS structure and program to make them responsive to the new circumstances and potential of the 1970s? What changes should be initiated in 1971 if the longer run goals are to be achieved on a timely basis?

The conclusions of the discussions follow:

THE IVS ROLE IN THE 1970'S

IVS in the 1950s pioneered the non-sectarian international use of volunteers when it was established with its charter:

To utilize the services of volunteers on an organized basis to combat hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world and thereby further the peace, happiness, and prosperity of the peoples thereof.

The success of the concept and of its initial implementation was attested to by the establishment of the Peace Corps in 1961, and of comparable organizations by many other developed countries in the 1960s. IVS performed a more limited role of service in the 1960s in those countries, notably South Viet Nam and Laos, in which the Peace Corps would or could not operate. By the late 1960s, the programs in South Viet Nam and Laos had become caught up in the turmoil and controversy of the war. They contracted rapidly from their peak of some 250 volunteers to the present level of approximately 70.

Today, the people of the United States are at the end of one era in international affairs and at the beginning of another whose outlines are just now being perceived. The overwhelmingly dominant role of the U.S. in the world is passing. Other developed and developing countries rightfully play an increasing role. The U.S. has turned inward in response to urgent internal needs and discord over the Indo-China war. At the same time the U.S. with each year is becoming increasingly interdependent with the other nations in a shrinking world. There is a growing gap between rich and poor. This gap is widening *between* the rich and the poor nations; it is also widening *within* developing countries, faced with unprecedented problems and an expanding unemployment born of the population explosion and accelerating urban growth. The 1970s are likely to be years of turmoil as there are struggles over fundamental changes within developing societies and in the international structure itself and there will also be need for unprecedented growth to meet requirements of expanding populations and growing aspirations. It will be an era both of increasing need for cooperation between the peoples of the rich nations and the poor nations, and in many cases of increasing difficulty for the government to government activities which characterized the international development cooperation, and volunteerism of the 1960s.

The new need for IVS in the 1970s, and the changing climate for government to government relationships, is testified to by the steadily decreasing number of countries in which the Peace Corps now operates. This comes when the requirements are greater than ever for development, for middle level manpower, and for increased understanding of the rapid and major changes taking place within developing countries. At the very time when some countries are experiencing radical societal change, when the need is growing for communication and mutual understanding between Americans and peoples of these countries, government to government programs are being reduced or eliminated. In response to pressures from overseas and at home, the U.S.A. is separating its development programs from other foreign policy programs. For the same reasons it appears to be turning away from direct USG operated programs in the developing countries. It plans greatly to increase support of the programs of multinational institutions and of private organizations willing to provide assistance to developing countries. This increasing emphasis on support of independent, private organizations willing to conduct their own programs comes at a time when many Americans have a growing preference to work within private rather than government agencies.

For IVS to contribute effectively to human betterment and social justice in the 1970s, it must be characterized by program independence, financial flexibility, and responsiveness to felt needs of the people of developing countries. The volunteers in turn must be characterized by an ability to work closely with the people in the country of their assignment, a willingness to receive little financial remuneration for their work and a combination of technical ability and commitment to social and economic development. The organization must constantly strive to be independent of outside pressures which would compromise its fundamental posture of sensitivity to and guidance by goals of the people hosting its programs.

THE IVS MODEL FOR THE 1970'S

The model of IVS we foresee in the five years ahead has a combination of traditional and new dimensions. We seek to build on the successes of the past. We hope to inject new features growing out of experience, and applied to the new circumstances of the world in which we must operate.

Such new features include the following:

1. Broadened financial support.

2. Additional and diverse programs in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the United States.

3. Multinational representation at all levels: volunteer, staff and Board.

This projection suggests an increase in size during the next five years to 500–1000 volunteers. It may also suggest additional and new patterns of service. This will depend on the requests and needs of host country leaders, public and private, as well as the personnel resources available to IVS in the years ahead. Crucial to the implementation of IVS goals in the 70's is a restructuring of the basis of financial support for the organization. As IVS reconsiders its priorities and its world-wide program challenges, it must seek to diversify its funding We should move away from dependence on funding by individual project contracts. We should try for global financing with freedom to allocate funds according to IVS-determined priorities.

We commit ourselves therefore to working in the 70's toward financial independence of the organization through multi-funding sources. Specifically, we aim towards 51% of our total funding from sources other than the U.S. Government. We are well aware of the enormous problems implied in this commitment, but we will try. We will aim to increase host-country contributions along the lines of the program in Algeria and that proposed for Libya. We will explore ways to solicit greater volunteer financial contributions. We will continue to seek reduction of overhead charges, as measured on a per-volunteer basis, but not at the cost of efficient administration.

IVS will, in the foreseeable future, seek to become more multi-national in character and to avoid a strictly American view of our goals and of policy implementation. IVS has in the past been "international" primarily in the sense that it has sent American volunteers out to other countries. There have been non-American volunteers, and both IVS and the countries in which they have served have benefited greatly by their work. It is time, however, to enlarge upon this modest effort and to become more of a multinational organization in every sense. This will require increased efforts to recruit volunteers outside the U.S.; it will require the inclusion on the Board of Directors of several non-Americans who will be able to attend meetings regularly. Selection might be from those resident in North America or who would otherwise be able to attend meetings at modest expense to IVS.

Teams of staff, alumni and Board members should be established promptly to explore, within the next six months, new program possibilities in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the U.S. to supplement present activities. From this effort, we hope for several proposals that can be initiated within the next year which will diversify and broaden our total program. They should be geared into the new needs being felt by peoples of the third world, both official representatives and private citizens. Programs in the U.S. initially should be on a limited basis and will utilize the special characteristics of IVS.

The Board and staff will take all steps necessary to facilitate greater participation by volunteer and alumni in formulation of IVS policy. We will seek to include former volunteers as Board members until, by the end of the 1970s, a majority of the members of the Board will be men and women with previous experience in IVS, Peace Corps, or comparable organizations. A weekend retreat meeting of the Board will be held each year at which there will be made a special effort to involve volunteers from the field.

FIRST STEPS

The Board recognizes the need to give greater attention to fund raising from both public and private sources. This may involve adding special staff in the near future. The Board membership should be strengthened with this in mind. ePrhaps cooperative efforts with similar organizations would be fruitful. We believe that a greater cultivation of our constituencies, especially alumni, would help.

We resolve to take immediate steps to supplement staff efforts in seeking broad support from business groups, church organizations and foundations. Further, we will negotiate with various agencies of the USG. AID, Peace Corps, and Cultural Affairs have contributed in the past. We need to make prompt approaches to the new semi-autonomous agencies being created to work in the developing countries, for example in Latin America. If special funds are needed our first request should be for an exploratory and development grant.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

The Board is deeply troubled by the problems and risks inherent in working in a country torn by civil and/or international war, particularly when the American government is involved. It is difficult, if not impossible to do development work and to remain free of political or even military involvement.

In this regard, the IVS programs in Viet Nam and Laos merit special attention. If the security of the individual volunteer is not threatened and volunteers are able to work in programs making effective contributions to the Vietnamese and Lao people, IVS will continue programs in these countries for the present. Unless required sooner by events, the Board will reevaluate the situation in Southeast Asia in the winter of 1971–72. If there has been no substantial improvement in the situation, the Board presently is of the opinion that programs should be completed as the then current volunteer contracts expire. During this period, the IVS Field Directors will lay what groundwork is possible toward continuation of the programs given a favorable change in the military situation.

IVS/VN will operate in accord with the February 21, 1970 Board decision: an AID contract for up to 24 volunteers; greater international participation; privately funded IVS activities in Viet Nam.

IVS/Laos will continue in the direction set for it in the November 1969 Board meeting: less program involvement with USAID; a closer cooperation with the RLG; a more austere standard of living.

IVS consciously remains in low profile in Indo China in the hope that an expanded program commensurate with the IVS model for the 1970s will be possible in the future and that in the meantime, we can provide effective service to the Vietnamese and Lao people.

PRESENT AID CONTRACTS

IVS will continue with the AID contracted programs in the Congo and Morocco as long as we can provide effective service to the people of these countries by this vehicle. The overhead money generated by these and the Southeast Asian contracts will be used to assist in the development of other programs and other funding sources.

CONCLUSION

Those of us who have participated in this Harpers Ferry Conference have felt keenly the responsibility and opportunity of considering the present and future role of IVS as an organization in a global context. Our thoughts have been continually directed with appreciation to the effective work of the volunteers in the villages and schools of Asia and Africa. We have sought unity on important issues affecting the organization and volunteers. We have been grateful for the participation of several volunteers and staff. Our confidence in the future of IVS derives from their commitment.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MILFORD HOSPITAL—"HOSPITAL WITH A HEART"

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Milford Hospital in Milford, Conn., will celebrate its 50th anniversary in early May by opening a new $3-million wing which will include a new emergency room, intensive care units, operating rooms and lab and X-ray facilities.

While I am delighted that this modern facility will soon be used to care for the people of Milford and other communities, I am particularly proud of the efforts of those who have made it all possible. The staff of the Milford Hospital has earned for it the title of "hospital with a heart"—the theme of this year's anniversary celebration.

Founded in 1921 in a 165-year-old, 5-room building, this hospital has grown into a 150-bed facility. More importantly, although it is smaller than other medical centers in Connecticut, the Milford Hospital has set an example that is being copied by other hospitals throughout the Nation.

For instance, the quality of service provided in its emergency room is rare, particularly in a community which does not have an intern program. Veteran physicians from the community rotate on a voluntary basis so that a doctor is in the hospital 24 hours a day to provide emergency treatment. Such dedication is commendable, and it is shared by the entire staff.

I want to congratulate the men and women who have contributed so much to the success of the Milford Hospital, Mr. Speaker, and to wish them many more years of humanitarian public service to the people of Connecticut.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, although I cannot help but applaud the prompt action that both Houses of the Congress took in voting for increased social security benefits, I view with alarm the tactics that were employed by the other body in returning this bill.

I object to the maneuver which attached the social security measures to the debt ceiling bill. They are two distinct matters, both of which should have been voted on separately according to their respective merits.

I think that the attachment of nongermaine items is an objectionable and unfair practice; it only serves to tie the hands of the Members of this body. Because of such tactics, for example, Members could not offer opposition to the debt ceiling bill without opposing the much needed increases for social security recipients.

In the future, I hope that such legislative matters will be carried out in a more equitable and just fashion; one which will permit Members to vote according to their best judgment, not according to the dictates of parlimentary tactics.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT OF 1971

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a bipartisan coalition of more than 70 of my colleagues in introducing the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1971—a bill to provide legal services through a private, nonprofit corporation. This bill would free the legal services program from any direct political pressures or interference from the Government.

Since the legal services lawyers become involved in litigation with various governmental agencies from time to time, it is essential that this program operate as free from political influence as is possible. The integrity of the attorney-client relationship and of the adversary system of American justice requires no less.

At this point I would like to insert a section-by-section analysis of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1971 into the RECORD.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT OF 1971

Section 1—*Short Title: Legal Services Corporation Act of 1971*—authorizing a National Legal Services Corporation by amending the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Section 2—Establishes Title IX to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 entitled "National Legal Services Corporation".

SECTION 901—DECLARATION OF POLICY

(1) it is in the public interest to encourage and promote resort to attorneys and appropriate institutions for the orderly resolution of grievances and as a means of securing orderly change, responsiveness and reform;

(2) many economically deprived Americans are unable to afford the cost of legal services or of access to appropriate institutions;

(3) access to legal services and appropriate institutions for all citizens of the United States not only is a matter of private and local concern, but also is of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

(4) the integrity of the attorney-client relationship and of the adversary system of justice in the United States require that the performance of provision of legal services be free from political or fiscal interference;

(5) existing legal services programs have provided economical, effective, and comprehensive legal services to the client community so as to bring about a peaceful resolution of grievances through resort to orderly means of change;

(6) a private nonprofit corporation should be created to encourage the availability of legal services and appropriate institutions to all citizens of the United States, free from extraneous interference and control.

SECTION 902—ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION

Establishes a non-profit Corporation, under the laws of the District of Columbia, which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.

SECTION 903—PROCESS OF INCORPORATION

There is established an incorporating trusteeship made up of the President and President-Elect of the American Bar As-

sociation, and the Presidents of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, American Association of Law Schools, American Trial Lawyers Association, and National Bar Association. The incorporating trusteeship shall, within sixty days after enactment, establish an eleven member Client Advisory Council from among persons recommended by the Boards of Directors of existing Legal Services programs and who are representative of the client community. Similarly, the trustees shall establish a Project Attorneys Advisory Council. Within ninety days of enactment the Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory Council will select three representatives to serve on the Corporation's Board of Directors.

SECTION 904—DIRECTOR AND OFFICERS

The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors made up of nineteen persons, one of whom shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. Five members of the Board are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States. Six members serve by virtue of their office (Presidents of the ABA, NLADA, American Association of Law Schools, American Trial Lawyers Association, and National Bar Association) and the President-Elect of the American Bar Association. Six members are chosen by the Clients and Project Attorney's Advisory Councils (three members each). The Executive Director of the Corporation is a voting member of the Board of Directors. The term of office for a Director is three years. The initial Board will be so constituted that members will have staggered terms of one, two, and three years. The Executive Director shall be an attorney and no individual can serve in this position for a period which exceeds six years.

SECTION 905—ADVISORY COUNCIL; EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Establishes Clients and Project Attorneys Advisory Councils selected in accordance with procedures promulgated by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall also establish an Executive Committee of five members.

SECTION 906—ACTIVITIES AND POWERS OF THE CORPORATION

(a)(1) Provide financial assistance to qualified programs furnishing legal services to the client community.

(a)(2) Carry out programs, including research, training, technical assistance, and law school clinical assistance, to improve the provision of services to the client community.

(a)(3) Increase opportunity for legal education for individuals who are economically disadvantaged or members of minority groups.

(a)(4) Co-ordinate activities in various parts of the country through information collection and dissemination.

(a)(5) Assist and coordinate all Federal programs for the provision of legal services to the client community by reviewing and making recommendations upon (a) grants and contracts concerning legal services and (b) proposed legislative or executive action.

(a)(6) Assure that attorneys paid in whole or in part by funds from the Corporation owe the same duty to clients and enjoy the same protection from interference as if the attorney was directly employed by the client.

(a)(7) Establish eligibility standards for clients with first priority on those who are destitute or extremely poor.

(a)(8) Establish policies which assure the professional quality of the attorneys.

(b) The Corporation is further authorized to make grants, contracts, and enter into cooperative agreements. Promulgate regulations approving grants and contracts using criteria regarding (1) the most economical, effective, and comprehensive delivery of services (2) peaceful and orderly methods of seeking change and (3) maximum utilization of organizations presently delivering legal services. Insure that the Board of Directors of grantees are made of a majority of attorneys and at least one-third representatives of the client community.

SECTION 907—NON-PROFIT AND NON-POLITICAL NATURE OF THE CORPORATION

The Corporation may not contribute to or support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

SECTION 908—ACCESS TO RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE CORPORATION

Full access to records is insured. The Corporation is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.

SECTION 909—FINANCING

(a) The Corporation may issue bonds, debentures or other certificates of indebtedness.

(b) Authorizes appropriations from Congress of $140 million. Funds authorized remain available until expended.

SECTION 910—RECORDS AND AUDITS OF THE CORPORATION AND THE RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE

(a) Authorizes annual audit by the GAO and requires Comptroller General to make an annual audit report to Congress.

SECTION 911—REPORTS TO CONGRESS

An annual report shall be prepared for the President and the Congress.

SECTION 912—DEFINITIONS

"Client Community" means that group of individuals not able to obtain private legal counsel because of inadequate financial means.

"Legal Services" includes legal advice, legal representation, legal research, education concerning legal rights and responsibilities and similar legal activities.

SECTION 913—FEDERAL CONTROL

Prohibits Federal control over the Corporation or its employees.

EXPANDING SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution today which would extend the summer intern program as originally provided for by House Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress.

In 1965 when the House passed H.R. 416, minimal funds were set aside enabling each Member to employ one summer intern. I took advantage of this opportunity last summer and found the summer internship program a welcome addition to my office. My only regret was that more adequate funds were unavailable to offer this opportunity to the many other young people interested in participating in the congressional process and learning how the Government operates.

I am sure that other colleagues have found congressional interns as helpful as I have. Interns have supplemented regular staff and in many cases provided much-needed manpower.

Most importantly, spending productive time in Washington affords a young person an opportunity to learn about his Government firsthand. It has been widely publicized that many young people are disenchanted with this Government and regard it with some distrust. In view of this I think it is a very good thing to allow some of our young people to work within the Government and to learn about the process through individual participation.

Our young people need adequate funding support if any viable internship opportunity is to be offered. I therefore propose extending the minimal funding for interns to cover an additional two summer interns. The total additional appropriation would be small and well worth the ensuing advantages to both the interns and to the congressional office.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL GIVES REPORT ON HIS FUNCTIONS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service today had the pleasure of hearing a report by the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, on the functions and activities of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. Staats and his top staff appeared at the committee's request to discuss in particular the relationship of the General Accounting Office to the U.S. Postal Service as a result of the Postal Reorganization Act enacted last year.

The committee had a very informative session, and for the convenience of all Members I am including the text of the Comptroller General's formal statement with my remarks:

STATEMENT BY ELMER B. STAATS, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

We are pleased to be here this morning, at your request, to discuss the functions and activities of the General Accounting Office as they relate to matters within the jurisdiction of this committee. We have enjoyed a good and we believe mutually beneficial relationship with the committee over the years and hope that this relationship will continue.

As you know, the General Accounting Office was created by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 as an independent office in the legislative branch of the Government.

The Congress gave the GAO extensive authority to render legal options, to adjudicate certain types of claims and contract disputes, and to make independent audits and reviews of the executive branch.

It intended clearly that the GAO be a nonpolitical, independent arm of the Congress to assure that funds were spent in accordance with law and that programs were carried out as intended by Congress.

CHARTER OF THE GAO

The GAO charter is broad and may be summarized under five principal headings:

1. Audit and Review—The primary purpose of General Accounting Office audits and re-

views is to make independent examinations of implementation of legislation by the executive branch, including inquiring into such questions as:

(a) whether the funds and other resources are utilized only for authorized programs and activities and are properly accounted for and reported.

(b) whether agency resources are managed efficiently and economically, and

(c) whether programs are achieving the objectives intended by the Congress in enacting the legislation.

In addition, the GAO audits negotiated contracts and audits, centrally, bills and claims for transportation services purchased from commercial sources.

2. Assistance to Congress—The GAO provides direct assistance to the Congress through special reports made at the request of congressional committees and individual members, through informal staff assistance to committees and by assigning staff to the committees.

We are often called upon to testify before congressional committees and to furnish reports on several hundred bills during each session at the request of committees. We are pleased that we have had the opportunity to be of service to this committee many times in the past.

EXECUTIVE ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

3. Accounting Principles and Standards—The GAO is required to prescribe principles and standards for accounting in the executive agencies; to cooperate with those agencies in the development and improvement of their accounting and financial management systems; to determine the adequacy of their accounting systems; and to approve them when they meet our requirements.

4. Legal Opinions—Many legal questions arise as to the authority for expenditures of funds. These questions arise in the course of our audit work; some originate in the agencies or in the Congress; or they arise in connection with claims originating outside of the Government. The Comptroller General's decisions are final and conclusive on the executive branch subject only to contrary action by Congress or the Courts.

5. Claims Settlement—The law places final responsibility for settling most claims for and against the Government in the General Accounting Office.

In addition to our basic authorities and responsibilities under the 1921 act and certain other legislation of general applicability, the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950 (39 U.S.C. 2206, et. seq.) placed specific responsibilities upon us with respect to the Post Office Department.

These responsibilities related to auditing of the Department's financial transactions and the development and approval of its accounting system, and were generally consistent with similar responsibilities we have with respect to other departments and agencies of the executive branch.

RELATION TO POSTAL SERVICE ALTERED

With the enactment of the Postal Reorganization Act which was approved on August 12, 1970 (P.L. 91-375), our relationship with the postal establishment has been significantly altered. In effect, this law negated our prior authorities and responsibilities, both under general legislative provisions and those specifically applicable to the Post Office Department. The general legislative provisions were rendered inapplicable to the new Postal Service by section 410 of the act which provides that, with some exceptions not pertinent here.

"* * * except as otherwise provided in this title or insofar as such laws remain in force as rules or regulations of the Postal Service, no Federal law dealing with public or Federal contracts, property, works, officers, employees, budgets, or funds, including the provisions of chapters 5 and 7 of title 5, shall apply to the exercise of the powers of the Postal Service."

Those legislative provisions which had previously given us specific responsibilities with respect to the Post Office Department were repealed.

Our relationship with the new Postal Service will be based upon two provisions in the Postal Reorganization Act. Section 2002 of that act provides in part that:

"* * * The value of assets and the amount of liabilities transferred to the Postal Service upon the commencement of operations of the Postal Service shall be determined by the Postal Service subject to the approval of the Comptroller General * * *."

This provision places upon us a very specific and important responsibility. The value of assets recorded on the books of the Postal Service will be an important factor in determining the amount of depreciation costs which, in turn, will have an effect on postal rates and fees.

Section 2008 of the act provides, in part, that:

"The accounts and operations of the Postal Service shall be audited by the Comptroller General and reports thereon made to the Congress to the extent and at such times as he may determine."

This provision gives us rather broad authority and responsibility to review not only the financial transactions of the Service but also the entire effort put forth by the Service to fulfill its mission. It also gives us broad discretionary powers to select for review those areas in which we can make a significant contribution.

ASSISTANCE TO COMMITTEE CONTINUES

We will, of course, also continue to give such assistance to the Congress and its committees with respect to the new Postal Service as we may be called upon to provide.

Aside from our work at the Postal Service, which I will discuss in a minute, we do carry out under our general authorities work in a number of areas within the jurisdiction of this committee.

These include, among other things, the activities of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Census, matters relating to civilian personnel employed by the Federal Government and to their utilization, generally, and certain statistical gathering and reporting activities.

For example, we have in the past done a considerable amount of work in connection with the civilianization of military positions and the use by Government agencies of support service contractors, and are currently looking at the impact of employment ceilings on management of civilian personnel in the military establishment.

We would be happy to discuss our current work in these areas to the extent you may wish, or as you suggested in your letter dated March 8, discuss them at a later time with the appropriate subcommittee.

With regard to the Postal Service, I would like to briefly describe how we see our role in our audit capacity and the approach we propose to follow in carrying it out.

I would also like to mention some of our recent reports to the Congress on postal operations and activities, which, I believe, illustrate to a degree the types of reports we will be making to the Congress in the future.

NEW ROLE WITH POSTAL SERVICE

As you know, section 2008 of the Postal Reorganization Act, in addition to authorizing our Office to audit the accounts and operations of the Postal Service, contains other provisions relating to audit.

Subsection (b) requires that the Postal Service maintain an adequate internal audit of the financial transactions of the Postal Service; subsection (d), in effect, authorizes the Postal Service to obtain audits of its accounts by certified public accounting firms; and finally, subsection (e) requires that beginning with the fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1971, the Postal Service obtain an opinion from an independent certified public accounting firm on any financial statements of the Service used in determining and establishing postal rates.

The authorities and requirements for audit contained in these provisions properly place upon the Postal Service the responsibility for assuring the integrity of its financial transactions and of its statements of financial condition and operations.

We will, of course, keep abreast of the manner in which these authorities and responsibilities are implemented by the Postal Service.

We will work with its internal audit organization and with its outside auditors, to the extent appropriate, and in carrying out our own audit work will give consideration to the adequacy of the audits performed by them.

AUDIT TRANSPORTATION CHARGES

In addition, in the area of financial auditing, we will continue to audit, on a centralized basis, transportation charges to the Postal Service as we do for the Federal Government generally. This function will be performed on a reimbursable basis under agreement between our Office and the Postal Service.

These and other matters concerning our relationship to the Postal Service have been the subject of two exchanges of correspondence which I would be happy to submit for the record.

Beyond the strictly financial audit activities, as I have mentioned, section 2008 of the act gives us broad authority to examine into postal operations and activities generally.

The Service remains a public service institution charged with responsibility to provide reliable and efficient postal service to patrons in all communities. Its operations will continue to have large financial dimensions and to affect virtually all the citizens and enterprises in the nation.

Therefore, Congress retains a strong continuing interest in the Postal Service and has, of course, retained the power to alter, amend, or repeal any or all sections of the act under which the Service is established.

Accordingly, we intend to continue with our previous practice of examining selected postal operations and activities and reporting thereon to the Congress.

AIM OF POSTAL AUDIT

Our audit coverage of postal activities is planned with two major considerations in mind—the interest of the Congress and the benefit to the Postal Service.

As in the past, to maximize the benefits resulting from our work, we will concentrate our efforts in those areas of postal operations and activities which seem to have the greatest potential for improvement.

Various factors influence our judgment in selecting an area for review including indications of congressional interest, the financial significance of the area, and indications of weaknesses in its management.

The types of reviews we make can be categorized as (1) management efficiency reviews—studies of management's utilization of resources—and (2) program reviews—studies dealing with the extent program objectives are being achieved.

Our recent efforts have been concerned primarily with evaluating management systems for assuring the assessment and collection of appropriate revenues for postal

services rendered and management's efficiency in utilizing resources.

RECENT REPORTS LISTED

For example, in a May 1970 report to the Congress, we stated that the Department did not recover the full costs of providing address correction service.

In September 1970 we issued a report to the Congress in which we noted the need for better controls over the assessment and collection of postage for second-class mail because certain publishers were charged a postal rate lower than that to which they were entitled.

In an October 1970 report to a member of Congress, which was subsequently released to the public, we stated, among other things, that the Department had exceeded its legal authority in its use of emergency contracts for air taxi service to transport mail; that a number of contracts were awarded without obtaining formal competitive bids; and that questionable contract rate increases were granted because the Department did not have adequate procedures for evaluating rate increases requested by the contractors.

In December 1970, we reported to the Congress that maintenance costs on certain post office equipment could be reduced, without adversely affecting the operation of the equipment, by reducing the frequency of certain routine preventive maintenance and by reducing the time prescribed for performing such maintenance.

CURRENT POSTAL STUDIES

Our current reviews concern such matters as whether the Postal Service is:

1. making the best use of its manpower and machines,
2. providing certain publications priority treatment at no additional charge to publishers,
3. recovering additional costs and postage due for processing mail with insufficient postage,
4. adequately planning, testing, and contracting for the installation of an automated system for collecting and processing management data (the postal source data system),
5. using sound methods to collect data to serve as the basis for allocating costs and revenues to the various classes of mail and types of services provided,
6. permitting only eligible nonprofit organizations to mail matter at reduced rates, and
7. following efficient traffic management practices in the transportation of mail.

Our plans for future work call for more emphasis on reviews dealing with the extent the Postal Service is providing patrons with reliable mail service at reasonable rates and fees.

We will also be looking at the effectiveness of some recently initiated programs such as the express mail program—a door-to-door service provided by postal employees serving as special messengers; reviewing the use of the mailgram and other systems to reduce the physical volume of mail; and reviewing the value of assets and amount of liabilities transferred to the Postal Service. We will also stay abreast of the Postal Service's capital expenditure program, including its borrowing activities and its investments in postal equipment and facilities.

We will hold periodic discussions with the Postal Service concerning the scope, frequency, and nature of our reviews. In the past we have found such discourse between the staffs to be mutually beneficial.

We will also be glad to discuss with this committee or its subcommittees at any time our audit plans and areas of mutual interest and concern.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. We will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

FARMERS NEED ADVANCE PAYMENTS—II

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation providing much needed advance payments for feed grain farmers.

This bill, H.R. 5707, would entitle feed grain farmers to receive advance payments under the farm program shortly after program signup time next month. As such, it would change present USDA regulations which prohibit feed grain farmers from receiving payments on corn and grain sorghum until after July 1, 1971.

When I introduced H.R. 5707 I stated that I was also in the process of drafting similar advance payments legislation for cotton and wheat producers. This afternoon, I am introducing the products of my efforts; two bills designed to enable cotton and wheat farmers to receive advance payments under the farm program of 7½ cents per pound on cotton and, half the estimated face value of certificates on wheat.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize once again advance payments are vital to the success of many farming operations, especially the smaller ones. They are vital because in the next few months farmers must make critical decisions of what to plant, how much to plant, and how to best accomplish his production goals. These decisions involve determinations about such things as the number and kind of help needed, whether to purchase new operating equipment and machinery and maintain present items, what kinds and amounts of fertilizers, seeds, insecticides, and other operating supplies that will be needed in the months ahead, and so forth. These decisions can only be made of their relative financial costs. For no matter what kind of operation a farmer would like to have or needs to have to turn a profit, he can really only have the kind of operation he can afford. If he has any other, he soon finds himself bankrupt.

If farmers, taken as a group had substantial ready cash, or had access to flexible lines of credit, their key operating decisions would not be too difficult to make. Neither, however, is the case. Farm income is normally modest or marginal income. It is awfully difficult to get rich farming, despite the myths of the mint-julip-sipping farmer sitting under the shade tree watching his money grow. The facts paint the true picture; during the last decade, a quite prosperous one for the Nation as a whole, farmers shared precious little in that prosperity. Despite the fact that the gross national product rose an average of 9 percent a year, farm income rose less than one-half of 1 percent. The situation is not any brighter when it comes to the ability of the farmer to get rural credit. It seems that farmers are among the first to feel the pinch of a tight money situation, and among the last to benefit from expansionary monetary policies. The reasons for this condition lie in the very nature of the rural credit system and the condition will not be rectified without major reforms, some of which, by the way, I plan on proposing in the next few months.

What it all boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is that farmers do not have and cannot readily obtain the kind of financial support it takes for them to make the kinds of decisions most likely to permit them to profitably produce food and fiber for the Nation. And as I have stated repeatedly, the ability of American consumers to spend the lowest percent of their disposable income on food and clothing of any time in our country's history or in the history of the world for that matter, rests on the sweat and toil of the farmer.

To produce food and fiber at reasonable costs requires that farmers be able to make economically sound decisions. To do this they need proper financing. My three bills provide money that cotton, wheat, and feed grain producers participating in the farm program are already entitled to by law. My bills merely enable those farmers to get the funds when they need them most, before rather than after the growing season commences.

In conclusion, enacting these three measures would be in the best interest of the farmer and the consumer. I urge their prompt adoption.

LEADERSHIP NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this week eloquently depicted the situation in which our President finds himself in Vietnam: Instead of "winding down" a war almost universally assailed as a mistake, the President is trying to change the way that war is being fought. He misconstrues the discontent in the land to mean that only American dead and wounded count when adding up the casualties. Vietnamization means, the President has shown, no diminution in his resolve to persevere in Vietnam; instead of American soldiers, we will continue and increase our support of the war by South Vietnamese.

I reintroduce today my resolution of the last Congress calling for the withdrawal now of all U.S. forces from Vietnam, with the pace of withdrawal limited only by the steps needed to insure the safety of our forces. Although I have supported other resolutions which set various dates for withdrawal, I am convinced that withdrawal now, under this single condition, is the proper and urgent goal.

I include below the Times editorial and the text of my resolution:

LEADERSHIP NEEDED

The most unassailable statement made by President Nixon in the interview with him

published in this newspaper last week was that "there has never been so great a challenge to U.S. leadership." Whether the President had in mind a challenge to the United States to show leadership in the world community, or a challenge to the President of the United States to show leadership within this divided country, the challenge is there on both counts. Yet nothing that Mr. Nixon said indicated that he has the slightest idea how to meet it.

Instead, Mr. Nixon seemed more interested in making high-school debaters' points than in analyzing the issues. By posing fictitious opposites, the President tried to make it appear that "the great internationalists of the post-World War II period" have now become "neo-isolationists" and that he alone occupies the middle ground in the American political spectrum—his critics being either "superhawks" or "superdoves," or, to put it only a little more crudely, irresponsible extremists.

Mr. Nixon suggests that the "former internationalists" who oppose Vietnam or who now advocate a smaller defense budget have become *ipso facto* "neo-isolationist." He readily overlooks the fact that many Americans who have opposed military involvement in Vietnam almost from the beginning have done so precisely because they feared that the inevitable overcommitment in Southeast Asia would dangerously weaken American power, prestige and influence elsewhere in the world.

In fact, it is just because they believe that the United States with its vast strength has an absolutely essential moral and political role to play in the international community and must under no circumstances be isolated from it that so many American internationalists so bitterly deplore the entrapment of the United States in the morass of Southeast Asia. Far from being an expression of "neo-isolationism," American opposition to the escalation of Vietnam—whether in numbers under the Johnson Administration or in area under President Nixon—is largely based on a deep sense of the American commitment to and responsibility for world peace.

Mr. Nixon speaks of "the moral force behind our position." Does he not recognize that this is exactly what is being eroded by the senseless destruction and devastation carried now into four Southeast Asian countries? Does anyone still believe that the indiscriminate killing of combatants and noncombatants alike, through the use of massive air power, will make the world (or Vietnam) safe for democracy?

Whether talking about "superhawks" or "superdoves," or something called "the Establishment," Mr. Nixon disarmingly pictures himself as the moderate, or the defender of the faith, versus the extremists or the enemies of the people. "I am not talking about my critics," he says, "but about a basic, strange sickness that appears to have spread . . ." a "sickness" stemming from disillusion over Vietnam and concern with domestic problems. On this point the President is right. It is a sickness; but it is not strange and it certainly is not limited to the so-called "Establishment," or to the super-extremists, as he would have the public believe.

It is a sickness felt throughout this land. It will not be cured by turning the war in Vietnam from a land war, in which many Americans and Vietnamese were killed, into an air war, in which relatively few Americans and many Indochinese will be killed. It will not be cured by escalating the bomb-power and broadening the locus of this war. One does not have to be either "superhawk" or "superdove" to know that.

It will not be cured until a President of the United States has the courage to recognize that we Americans have long ago fulfilled in good faith, in blood and in treasure whatever commitment we have had to the South Vietnamese. It will not be cured until our country recoups its moral position in the world by ending the mass slaughter through which we are insuring the antidemocratization of Southeast Asia. It will not be cured until the leadership of the United States, recognizing America's responsibilities to itself as to other countries, reshapes American policies to bring domestic needs, foreign responsibilities, physical capabilities and moral commitment into a sensible and viable relationship that will advance the welfare of the American people and of the community of the world.

WHAT IS AT STAKE

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, may well be struck by this editorial by Anthony Harrigan in the March 15, 1971, Bulletin of the Southern States Industrial Council. Mr. Harrigan rightly points out that overstressing the needs of those on the dole often tends to distort what the true values and interests of our largely middle-class populace are. It is all very well for sophomores to sniff at middle-class values. It is quite another thing for the leaders of our country to tolerate their destruction. I recommend, along with Anthony Harrigan and others, that this process be reversed with alacrity and that the value of self-help once again be stressed for all the good it has done this society and Nation.

The editorial follows:

WHAT IS AT STAKE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

What we are witnessing in the United States is an effort to place the political control of our country in the hands of the least capable and most dependent people—to give the drone element a whip hand over taxpaying, productive citizens, whether skilled industrial workers or management people.

The end result of such an effort—such a system of political domination—would be the ruination of our society. The well-being of our country depends on the intelligent, property-owning elements in our society—our great middle class—having the dominant influence in the shaping of public policy. If these elements don't have this degree of influence, one can be sure that business—our productive resources—will be exploited and eventually expropriated. In short, our society is in danger of being looted by the dependent elements and the political opportunists associated with them.

What does this mean for the average young businessman who is educated, who is married and has children, who is buying a home, who pays an increasing percentage of his income in taxes?

I would say to the young businessman that the significance of these events is that the basis of his life—the good life of his expectations—is being undermined. The radical trend means cancellation of the future he envisions for his family—unless this hurtful trend is arrested. If the drone elements dominate our cities, they will become uninhabitable for middle class people. The skyrocketing cost of welfare will be felt most keenly by businessmen and professionals with good incomes—and by the companies that give them employment. In plain terms, the businessman will find, after years of hard work, that he won't have anything like the real income that he anticipated when he commenced his career. That means a lessened ability to build up an estate for children or to educate them. The prospects of a comfortable life will be greatly diminished.

I don't mean that a comfortable life should be our sole or ultimate goal. All of us have a sense of idealism, and are willing to sacrifice for great ends. But advocates of massive new welfarism haven't any noble social vision in mind. They would end the poverty of some people in our society by redistributing wealth without respect to the enterprise or energy of the persons whose wealth is being redistributed.

In other words, the planners of the new welfarism have in mind nothing save confiscation. To take from the working and give to the non-working is no way to strengthen this or any other society.

A strong society can only be built on those persons who demonstrate a desire to be builders, savers and producers. In the end, impoverishment of the productive middle class will reduce everyone in the society to permanent poverty. And with the disabling of a middle class comes the aggrandizement of government into a totalitarian force that dictates all patterns of life and work.

To prevent this happening, we must increase our effort to understand, be articulate and active regarding our problems. We must oppose the subsidization of indolence. We must acquire and stress a positive view of the economic system that makes possible our personal, community and national wealth. We must defend our country's values.

The radicalized elements in our country are working very hard to shatter the patterns American businessmen adhere to in their personal and business lives.

Therefore, the businessman in his community in the mid and late 1970s must be *energized* and *dedicated* to our defending our embattled society, to maintaining a way of life that he knows to be decent, progressive and rewarding.

MIGRANT WORKER DISASTER RELIEF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend President Nixon on his decision to extend $2.5 million in Federal disaster relief to Florida's migrant workers who have been unemployed due to crop failures. Some 15,000 workers are unemployed in Dade and Collier Counties due to a combination of freeze and drought which has ruined tomatoes and other crops. I commend the administration's initiative to provide unemployment compensation for these workers, both because of its unprecedented and humanitarian nature.

The fact that this situation does warrant disaster relief because these workers were left without any form of assistance to fall back on points to a glaring deficiency in existing unemployment compensation laws. It is unfortunate, I

think, that it takes a disaster like this to really drive home the urgent need for remedial action. You will recall that on July 8, 1969, the administration sent to the Congress its message and legislation on the unemployment insurance system—legislation which would have extended coverage to an additional 4.8 million of the 17 million workers not covered by unemployment insurance. That legislation, in modified form, did pass the 91st Congress to become Public Law 91-373, and did extend coverage to an additional 4.7 million workers. But the bill reported from Ways and Means did not include the administration's proposal to extend coverage to some 400,000 workers on farms employing at least four persons in each of 20 weeks per year. And although the Senate approved extending coverage to workers on those farms employing a minimum of eight individuals, even that provision was knocked out in conference.

The upshot of all this is that migrant farmworkers are still not covered under our unemployment compensation insurance system and, as a consequence, we are faced with the possibility of more disaster situations, such as that which prevails in Florida at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a sad commentary on our times when we allow conditions to persist in our own country which eventually require disaster relief for our own citizens not unlike that extended to the starving masses in Biafra or Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Ways and Means Committee to reconsider the administration's proposal to extend unemployment compensation coverage to migrant workers. By our action we can prevent the recurrence of such disaster situations in which large segments of our social are left without any means to purchase food, pay rent, gas and electricity bills, and provide medical attention for their children. While I can appreciate that committee's unusually heavy workload, the fact that we are faced with a disaster in this area and may be confronted with more, clearly points to the priority attention which this legislation deserves.

At this point in the RECORD I include the text of the White House migrant worker relief announcement and the New York Times article of March 16 on the same subject:

MARCH 15, 1971.

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

The President today declared a major disaster for the State of Florida. The disaster has been declared in order to provide additional food and financial assistance for workers unemployed as a result of severe crop freezes in January and in February.

The President's action makes available unemployment compensation under the President's disaster assistance program for farm laborers unable to work because of the severe freezes and not included under the state unemployment program. The Department of Agriculture is already providing food to those in need and will work with the responsible state and local officials and private relief organizations to institute additional assistance by the food stamp program.

The President's Office of Emergency Preparedness presently has under way a study, directed by Congress, to determine the applicability of existing disaster arrangements in freeze and frost emergencies. However, owing to the apparent severity of the Florida problem, General Lincoln, Director of OEP, recommended to President Nixon that a disaster be declared for the state.

Last year, the President recommended to the Congress that agricultural workers be afforded unemployment compensation benefits. This proposed legislation did not pass. Thus, unemployment compensation is available only through such programs as the disaster relief program.

An initial allocation of $2.5 million has been made to the Department of Labor from the President's Disaster Fund to initiate the unemployment compensation program. The disaster unemployment compensation program is administered by the Department of Labor through state unemployment offices.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1971]

PRESIDENT ORDERS MIGRANTS' RELIEF—$2.5 MILLION IN DISASTER AID EXTENDED TO JOBLESS AFTER CROP FAILURE IN FLORIDA

(By Robert H. Phelps)

KEY BISCAYNE, FLA., March 15.—President Nixon extended the concept of disaster relief today to include aid to migrant workers unemployed as a result of crop failures.

Mr. Nixon, winding up a long weekend in Florida and the Bahamas, acted on an appeal from Gov. Reubin Askew for help to thousands of migrant workers made jobless as a result of a freeze and drought that ruined south Florida's commercial tomatoes and other crops.

The President declared the crop failure a major disaster and allocated $2.5 million for paying unemployment compensation to the migrants. Until now Federal disaster relief had been applied only to calamities like floods, hurricanes and earthquakes.

It had not included Federal financing of unemployment compensation for workers ineligible under state laws. In addition to jobless benefits, the President's declaration of an emergency will permit additional food relief to the migrants under the Federal food stamp plan.

The United States Agriculture Department and private groups have been helping to feed the migrants.

The President acted even before the Office of Emergency Preparedness completed a study to determine whether the Federal disaster law applied to freeze and frost emergencies.

The White House explained that Gen. George Lincoln, director of the O.E.P., had recommended that the President act because of the "apparent severity" of the Florida problem.

COMPOUND PICKETED

Hundreds of migrants quietly picketed near the Nixon Key Biscayne compound Saturday asking for help. They asked that the President or a civilian aide meet with them and accept a petition they had prepared. The petition said in part:

"We are without work, without hope of work. We have no money for food, for rent, for gas and electricity. We cannot provide for the necessities of life—our children are weak and sick—we don't have enough money to escape these dehumanizing conditions.

"If this country can airlift emergency aid to Pakistan, if this country can provide relief for starving people over 15,000 miles away, surely it can take care of its own people who find themselves, through no fault of their own, in a disaster situation here in Florida."

A Secret Serviceman at a guard house talked with the leaders of the pickets, and the police kept the demonstrators from getting close enough even to see the President's home. Some of the wealthy residents along Bay Front Drive gave milk and cookies to the pickets, who always remained orderly.

Late Saturday the pickets moved from the area of plush Bay Front homes to Crandon Park, where they camped out for the evening. Yesterday morning they attended a Roman Catholic mass.

Kneeling in prayer they asked "God and President Nixon" for help because "we are desperate." Then they boarded 10 old buses and 15 ancient cars and chugged back to the labor camps.

The migrants estimate that more than 15,000 of them are unemployed in Dade and Collier Counties.

Governor Askew's request for Federal help was presented to Mr. Nixon last Thursday. Ronald L. Ziegler, the White House press secretary, said that the President had ordered aides to consider it with "utmost speed."

Meetings were held in Washington over the weekend. Federal officials met with Askew aides today to work out a way to help the migrants.

Mr. Ziegler called the President's action "unprecedented" but emphasized that future applications would have to be made on a "case-by-case" basis.

The White House announcement pointed out that the President had pending in Congress a recommendation that unemployment compensation be extended to agriculture workers.

The legislation, which was bottled up in a conference committee last year, would cover all farms employing eight or more workers for at least 20 weeks. About 400,000 workers would be affected.

Details of administering the emergency south Florida plan have not been worked out. Among the questions to be decided are who will be eligible and the compensation to be paid. Florida's average unemployment compensation payment of $36.52 a week is one of the lowest in the country.

TODAY'S "POT" SMUGGLERS FLYING BUSINESSMEN

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the following in-depth analysis appeared in the San Bernardino, Calif., Sun-Telegram of March 14 concerning the overwhelming task that Sheriff Frank Bland faces in controlling the importation of drugs across the border by air. These smugglers are able to use the dry lake bottoms to their advantage as landing points for their illegal cargo. This is not a local problem for illegal drugs are brought into this country all along the Mexican-United States border. I am deeply concerned with this problem and I am disturbed by the lack of strong Federal assistance to our dedicated local law enforcement officials. I believe that this article will prove interesting and informative reading for my colleagues and Federal customs officials:

TODAY'S "POT" SMUGGLERS FLYING BUSINESSMEN

(By Bob Smith)

SAN BERNARDINO.—Not since its outlawing in 1937 by the federal government has the

weed cannabis sativa, the Indian hemp popularly known as marijuana, enjoyed such popularity in the United States.

Whatever the sociological and psychological reasons that have brought such a fantastic increase in marijuana smoking (more than one million pounds of it were thought to have been consumed in Southern California last year), there has been a concurrent increase in the market prices.

In the shifting pattern of marijuana smuggling, San Bernardino County has become the funnel through which much of Southern California's supply of "grass" passes.

Today, during its short trip from the interior of Mexico, where most of the California-bound weed is grown, to the state's metropolitan areas where it is ultimately peddled in small quantities to the users, marijuana's value can multiply 45,000 per cent.

With such a fantastic profit margin, smugglers are beginning to switch from bringing marijuana into the United States by car or foot to more exotic methods, including small boats and light aircraft. For the aerial smuggler leary of landing in populated areas, the deserts of San Bernardino County offer a perfect alternative.

During the past two years, droves of marijuana smugglers have discovered this fact and are now beginning to realize another that Sheriff Frank Bland and other officers have known for years: It is almost impossible for officers to effectively patrol all 23,000 square miles of San Bernardino County and stop the smugglers from landing.

The Mojave Desert and the areas around Twentynine Palms are strewn with abandoned airstrips built during World War II; flat, hard dry lakebeds, and mile after mile of flat, hard desert roads.

But although many different agencies—federal, state and local—are concerned with halting the lucrative dope traffic into the United States, local narcotics officers have repeatedly complained about the lack of cooperation they receive from federal units working in San Bernardino County.

Augie DeLaRosa, long-time narcotics officer in the Sheriff's Department who recently resigned to pursue law studies, voiced the complaints of many of the narcotics officers working here.

"There have been cases when the federal agencies—such as Customs—have circumvented the Sheriff's Office. They let a guy enter the country with a small amount of marijuana, sell it in San Bernardino County with the hope that he will go back for a larger load later. But as a result, the local agency is faced with another load of drugs among its populace—a load that could have been stopped."

He also told of cases where sheriff's deputies had staked out a cache of drugs in the desert—or were waiting for an incoming flight, only to learn later that customs agents knew that the drop point location had been changed, caught the people involved, but never bothered to tell the local agencies also working on the case.

But for any law enforcement officer, whether he works for the federal government, the state or a local agency such as the Sheriff's Office, the first line of defense is the Mexican border.

Sheriff Bland summed up the situation for all agencies when he pointed out that the only effective way to stop the traffic is to seal the border.

But as was seen in the short-lived but extremely effective Operation Intercept, international and local economic pressures soon forced the abandonment of this concept, and the federal government reopened the border to virtually unrestricted vehicular traffic.

To halt the now uncontrolled air traffic across the border, law officers have long considered the idea of deploying a radar screen to detect low-flying aircraft along the border.

"There is no question that they have been smuggling marijuana into the country by aircraft for a long time, but we don't have the resources to stop it on a local basis only," Bland said.

Both Bland and Allan C. Owens, assistant chief of the U.S. Border Patrol's El Centro office, went on record recently that radar might solve the drug intercept problem. But so far, according to Owens and members of the U.S. Customs Service in Los Angeles, electronic experts have not been able to find a system capable of detecting a small aircraft flying on the "deck" across the border.

But pilots, such as Chief Inspector Komer Dyal of the San Bernardino Sheriff's Department, and former servicemen familiar with radar systems used in combat area, find such a reply difficult to accept.

Dyal referred to times when he has been tracked by radar run by the Federal Aviation Administration's facility at March Air Force Base right down to the ground at the Tri-City Airport. And, he said, when air traffic was light, the controllers would even follow him on their screens right up to the hangar door—"just for fun."

Other pilots and former servicemen tell of air search and surface search radars installed on U.S. warships for many years that routinely picked up small observation planes and helicopters flying just above treetop level 15–20 miles away, in Vietnam.

Planes, almost identical in size and speed to those used by the Army in Vietnam, are now being used by smugglers in the Southern California area, authorities say.

For the potential smuggler who has access to a small aircraft, the profits from the marijuana trade are staggering.

Normally, the farmer in the Mexican state of Sinaloa and its major city of Culiacan on the western slopes of the Sierra Madre Occidental Mountains sells his marijuana for $2 to $4 a kilogram (2.2 pounds) to a processor-wholesaler in Culiacan, who then uses cottonseed presses to press it into kilogram bricks. The bricks are then sold to smugglers for $20 to $25 a kilogram.

Depending on the size of the aircraft, a flying-smuggler who touches down at Culiacan may be able to pick up a return payload of 400 to 700 kilograms of "grass."

Safely back into the United States with his load, a pilot can sell his marijuana for $150 a kilogram. Ultimately, it is resold on the streets and school campuses for prices which sometimes equal $900 to $1,000 a kilogram.

Thus the planeload of marijuana that might have netted $1,500 for the Mexican farmer ultimately garners up to $630,000 from its users.

One aspect that frustrates law-enforcement officers is the easy access a potential smuggler has to a light aircraft, and the lack of penalties if officers track down the airplane but not the pilots.

Dyal points out that most aircraft rental agencies make only a cursory check of the prospective renter's background and qualifications as a pilot, possibly no more than a check ride around the field.

Under the present system, Dyal said, an airport operator does not have access to police files that might indicate if a person had been engaged in smuggling activities in the past or has a prison record.

Also, Dyal said, there is no way for even a police agency to quickly check if a pilot's license with all of the desired endorsements—which normally takes hundreds of hours of flying time to acquire—can be purchased for just a few dollars in Los Angeles.

And because the Federal Aviation Administration's files are located in Oklahoma City and available only in the daytime Monday through Friday, an operator can't check the qualifications of a prospective client there quickly enough to avoid losing a sale.

Because of the way the present laws are written, a plane owner who rents a $100,000 aircraft to a smuggler and then finds that it has been seized by Customs or another agency, has no need to worry.

As shown by two cases in Twentynine Palms recently, rented aircraft seized in dope cases are normally handed back to the legal owner in just a few days. The present state and federal laws don't allow officers to seize a plane used to transport marijuana.

One of the problems faced by the narcotics officer today is obtaining enough evidence to convict a smuggler if he is not caught in the act of bringing the "grass" into the country or distributing it.

According to DeLaRosa, who was involved in several county cases of this type, the biggest problem now is the non-user who decides to go into the business just for the profit.

In most cases previously, the peddler or importer was generally a user who decided to import enough for his own use as well as selling a little on the side to pay expenses.

But now, DeLaRosa said, businessmen, otherwise perfectly legitimate, are coming into the picture. And instead of working through informants, the Sheriff's Department has found itself faced with costly and time-consuming surveillance chores—tasks that it is woefully undermanned to carry out. The county's vice-narcotics detail has only seven detectives, a sergeant and a captain—in addition to two secretaries.

This is the same manpower, DeLaRosa said, that the detail had in 1963 when it made 149 arrests; in 1969, the nine men participated in 1,458 arrests.

To DeLaRosa and others who asked not to be named, the key to the future of the county's narcotics program is that the county officers will not have to depend on anyone. In the future "they will have to depend on their own resources," DeLaRosa said.

To these people, part of the answer is to have the Sheriff's Department acquire its fleet of airplanes. It now owns one, a six-passenger Cessna 205.

But, Sheriff Bland said, the department has a request being processed in Washington, D.C., for purchase of two high-speed helicopters.

They would be used not only for surveillance work but for transporting departmental personnel and search-and-rescue work.

Other agencies besides the sheriff's and local police departments are active in the smuggling war.

During the past nine months, border patrolmen from the El Centro office have seized 17,249 pounds of marijuana—as well as an unspecified amount of heroin and dangerous drugs.

The magnitude of the seizures increases when you consider that a border patrolman is not paid or trained to control marijuana traffic, but just prevent aliens from illegally entering and working in the United States.

How do they do it? "Chance, mostly," said Owens.

Dope smugglers play for high stakes and some shoot when cornered. The murder of two border patrolmen north of El Centro one night several years ago when they stopped a car loaded with drugs is still unsolved.

Last year, a lone border patrolman came upon a sedan that had high-centered on a dirt ridge bulldozed to mark the international boundary.

When the driver saw the patrolman approaching, he grabbed a rifle, crossed back into Mexico, and opened fire.

Unable to pursue the smuggler, Owens said the patrolmen watched the man picked up by an auto that then drove into Mexicali.

But although the American officers on the ground could not cross the border in pursuit, nothing prevented a small border patrol scout plane from shadowing the car into

Mexicali, and then through a four-way telephone relay, guiding Mexicali police through dense crowds in downtown Mexicali to where the four men were trying to hide.

Even though Owens' office has two airplanes assigned to it, he says they are only suitable for air surveillance of the boundary—looking for vehicles or men trying to sneak through. Their slow speeds prevent them from chasing the much faster planes smugglers use.

It is up to the U.S. Customs Service to detect and then intercept planes crossing the border with illegal cargoes, Owens said.

Paul Samaduroff, the assistant special agent in charge of the Los Angeles District at the Costoms House on Terminal Island, says his agents have had more success during the past two years but are still hampered by lack of manpower and equipment.

Senior Customs Agent Bill Rosenblatt, in charge of the air operations group, said his group has prosecuted more than 100 successful cases involving airplanes during the past three years. But he says his men are stretched far too thin to do an effective job.

"Because of the mobility of the aircraft, the ultimate destination of the marijuana is up to the principals involved. It is conceivable," Rosenblatt said, "that a load could be flown into Southern California, and then picked up by another plane or vehicle and sent to any location in the United States—all in just a few hours.

"So far as the amount involved in the traffic, no one can make an adequate guess, not even the Mexicans. We don't know if we're catching one per cent or 50 per cent of the total amount smuggled into the United States every year. But during the fiscal year 1969, Customs intercepted 70,000 pounds and during 1970, we got 100,000 pounds."

And federal authorities have been receiving increased cooperation from the Mexican government, Samaduroff said, "They have been finding marijuana fields, arresting people and seizing shipments while they are still in Mexico," he said.

A TRIBUTE TO WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Whitney Young has deprived us of a great American who was a paragon of modesty and fortitude and effectiveness.

His work in the field of civil rights—striving to insure equality for all men—gained world renown. His work as executive director of the National Urban League was based on the proposition that jobs and opportunities must be opened to all men, a noble idea in which he had complete faith.

Whitney Young was known to the public as one who worked within the system, in fact, some called him a moderate, and not always in a kindly context. It was a term he came to despise. He said:

Nobody who's working for black people is a moderate. We're all militants in different ways.

Here was a man who, during the past decade, had the ear of three Presidents. A man who, as he often said, could talk to the leading businessmen and industrialists and obtain more jobs and opportunities for his people. He claimed, and I am inclined to agree with him, that this was not a question of moderation versus militancy, but rather one of "effectiveness versus ineffectiveness."

He knew where the sources of power in America lay, and he approached these sources without trepidation. He knew of the many ills that faced America, and he knew that they required action. Just before his untimely death, he said to the group of Americans and Africans he was addressing in Nigeria:

We have to talk to people who are hungry tonight. The rats are biting the kids tonight.

These are the words of a man who was deeply concerned, and deeply committed, to a cause. These are the words of a man who fought tirelessly against inequality, and these are the words of a man who will be missed by all those in America who will continue to insist on equality and justice for every citizen.

As part of my remarks in the RECORD Mr. Speaker, I include an article on the death of Mr. Young which appeared in this week's issue of "The Voice," the newspaper of the black community of Plainfield, N.J.:

WHITNEY YOUNG DEAD AT 49

Whitney M. Young, Jr., 49, executive director of the National Urban League, and renowned activist in the Civil Rights struggle here, died while swimming in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Lagos, Nigeria, Thursday afternoon, March 11, 1971.

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark was emerging from the surf with Young upon completion of their swim, when he noticed that Young was no longer in sight.

"I turned around, but could not see him," explained Clark. "But as I looked back I saw his arm turn over. I saw his head go under."

Clark pulled Young from the water and mouth to mouth resuscitation was administered to no avail. By the time the physician arrived by boat from the downtown Lagos Federal Palace Hotel, Whitney Young was dead.

Mr. Young was in Nigeria to attend the Ford Foundation sponsored conference to increase understanding between Africans and Americans. The cause of his death, pending results of an autopsy, is presumed to be a heart attack.

Whitney Young had served as executive director of the National Urban League since 1961. Under his leadership the League has expanded from 63 cities to 98, its professional staff has grown from 300 to over 1,200 and its budget has increased tenfold.

Born in Lincoln Ridge, Kentucky in 1921, Mr. Young as educated at Kentucky State College, M.I.T. and the University of Minnesota. He served with the Urban League in St. Paul, Minn. and Omaha, Nebraska; was Dean of the Atlantic University School of Social Work for seven years and has been a Visiting Scholar at Harvard University. Mr. Young had served on seven presidential commissions and on the Boards of many major institutions including the Federal Reserve Bank of N.Y., the Rockefeller Foundation, the Urban Institute and the Urban Coalition.

Harold R. Sims, a Deputy Director of the League, has been named acting executive director until a successor to the late Mr. Young is named.

"Words cannot possibly convey the sense of loss, the devasting grief, that we have, who have worked with Whitney Young feel today," said Mr. Sims.

"We wish today, not to eulogize Mr. Young. History will do that. History will place him as one of the most effective of all our leaders—black or white. Instead we rededicate ourselves to the goals for which he fought. He left an organization that has the depth and the dedication to survive even this terrible blow," concluded Mr. Sims.

As condolences pour in from Presidents and heads of states from all parts of the world, the body of Whitney Young is being returned to America in a KC-135 jet transport ordered by President Nixon. The plane is commanded by Brig. Gen. Daniel James, Jr., the highest ranking black man in the Air Force, now Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for public affairs.

Mr. Young, whose residence was in New Rochelle, N.Y., was married to the former Margaret Buckner. He leaves two daughters.

MR. PETERSON'S ASSIGNMENT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been very concerned in recent months by the Nixon administration's lack of a clear and coherent foreign economic policy. I was, therefore, heartened by the decision of the President earlier this year to set up a Council on International Economic Policy, and his appointment of Peter G. Peterson as Executive Director of the Council.

Mr. Peterson's past record speaks for itself—he served ably as chairman of the board of Bell & Howell, and has done much to show that business leaders can contribute usefully to the formulation of public policy. I hope he will be successful in his latest task, which will be to coordinate the Council on International Economic Policy as it establishes guidelines for other Government offices to follow in this area. In particular, I am hopeful that there will be a reassessment of the program to control U.S. direct investment abroad—and we should not, in my judgment, impose mandatory controls on investment and lending.

The March issue of Fortune magazine contained an editorial which points cogently to the policy questions which should be examined, and I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

MR. PETERSON'S ASSIGNMENT

One move President Nixon made as he began the second half of his term has had less trumpeting than it deserved. This was to set up a Council on International Economic Policy, consisting of five Cabinet Officers and five members of the White House staff, with the President himself as chairman. The executive director of the council will be Peter G. Peterson, who will also have the title of Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs. As chairman of the board of Bell & Howell, Peterson had the reputation of being, in Nixon's words, "one of the ablest chief executive officers of this generation." He has also worked hard at proving that business leaders can make a useful contribution to the shaping of public policy—for example, as chairman of the Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy, which has recommended some useful changes in the taxation and regulation of those institutions.

In his new job, Peterson is taking on a mission that still needs to be spelled out. The U.S. has no foreign economic policy, in the sense of a coherent and clearly defined set of principles and goals. There is nothing

fuzzy about the basic objectives of domestic economic policy—to achieve full employment and price stability—though, of course, there is plenty of dispute about the means of getting to those goals. But when it comes to economic matters in the world at large, the U.S. posture seems vague and confused. Indeed, the current, very understandable preoccupation with domestic problems has discouraged public discussion of international economic issues.

Yet the U.S. cannot remain indifferent to these issues. With the world's economic interconnections and interdependence growing ever more important, our domestic prosperity, not to mention the profits and growth prospects of most large corporations, can be profoundly affected by what happens in almost every part of the globe. We have seen vivid evidence of this in recent weeks, when an impasse in the Tehran oil negotiations threatened all the leading industrial nations with an interruption in vital fuel supplies, and the collapse of Rolls-Royce in England reverberated throughout the U.S. aerospace industry.

A sense of such interdependence is hard to find in Washington. The articulation of a consistent national policy is thwarted by a conflict of many interests—some economic, some military, and some diplomatic—each intent on its own advantage, and by the diffusion of official responsibility for establishing the U.S. position on critical questions. More than sixty federal departments and agencies are involved with decision making in the international economic area, from the Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to the Treasury, whose top officials double as diplomats in international monetary affairs. The result is that the U.S. speaks with many voices, often inconsistent, and the world has trouble getting the message. When a special emissary of Japan's Prime Minister Eisaku Sato came over last fall to discuss a new agreement limiting textile exports to the U.S., he had to touch base with Congressmen, the Commerce Department, the State Department, and several offices in the White House to find out what the U.S. negotiating position was. His inability to get a clear answer may help to explain why no textile agreement has yet been reached.

AN AGENDA FOR DECISIONS

No one expects Pete Peterson to supersede all those federal agencies. But the President has explicitly assigned the Council on International Economic Policy the task of laying down guidelines for other government offices to follow. The council will be in a position to study critical policy questions with a thoroughness and detachment that has been lacking up to now. The agenda might start off with these items:

The demand by various industries for protection will be heard again, and more insistently, in this session of Congress. Peterson's staff should grasp the chance to shift the focus of attention from the plight of individual industries to a sort of systems analysis of what all the proposed import quotas would mean for the economic welfare of the U.S. as a whole—very much including the welfare of consumers. And much more light needs to be thrown on the international consequences of U.S. quotas. Will other nations retaliate and thereby constrict U.S. export markets? Might there be such a shrinkage of world trade that economic activity would slow everywhere? A thorough contemplation of all the possibilities might encourage us to seek other ways to help beleaguered U.S. industries, for example, by making much greater use of federal "adjustment assistance" to retrain workers and to help companies increase their efficiency or get into new products.

Perhaps the most difficult questions in international economic policy involve relations with Japan, which persists in coupling an aggressive trade offensive with reluctance to open its own flourishing economy to foreign goods and foreign investment. The U.S. still lacks a comprehensive economic diplomacy to deal with the Japanese.

The program of controlling U.S. direct investment and limiting lending abroad, in the name of correcting the balance-of-payments deficit, has failed in its aim while subjecting business to irritation and confusion (see "Capital Is Something That Doesn't Love a Wall," FORTUNE, February). It is high time to reconsider the policy.

With no improvement in our payments deficit, dollars have been piling up in record amounts in foreign central banks. The patience of European central bankers is growing thin. Some are already proposing that no more Special Drawing Rights ("paper gold") be created until the U.S. deficit is brought under control. Another "dollar crisis" is by no means out of the question, and Washington ought to be thinking urgently about how to avert it.

The Common Market is in the midst of momentous deliberations that are likely to lead to an expansion of its membership and a closer integration of Western Europe. The U.S. should be more gracious in welcoming this movement toward a stronger, more self-reliant Europe, while at the same time exerting influence to counter any European tendency to raise barriers against outside goods and capital.

There has been a gradual relaxation of restriction on commerce with Communist countries, and American subsidiaries abroad are now permitted to trade even with Red China. But U.S. businessmen are increasingly impatient with the limitations that remain, especially since there seems to be no convincing political reason for their continuance.

These are only a few of the many questions that have lain in the limbo of policy making. When Peterson comes to recommend responses to them, we hope he will be guided by a central high principle: that it is in the best interest of the U.S. that business be encouraged to continue its multinational development and that capital and technology be permitted to move ever more freely throughout the world. In some instances, adherence to this principle will mean overriding narrow domestic politics and local interests. Pete Peterson may be stepping into one of the toughest jobs in Washington.

PARADOX OF WAR

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, in today's Wall Street Journal, there is an excellent news story by Peter R. Kann pointing out some of the tragic consequences of American policy in Indochina. As the debate continues about our expanded involvement in Laos, I would like to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues because, I believe, it is a startling account of the war's toll on that country and its people. A copy of the article follows:

PARADOX OF WAR: OPTIMISM IN VIETNAM, FEAR IN LAOS POINT UP AMBIGUITIES OF BATTLE

(By Peter R. Kann)

SAIGON.—"Our army is like a racehorse. It has been fed and groomed and trained. But it cannot stay in the stable forever. We have risked the race, and we will win," South Vietnamese president Nguyen Van Thieu told a couple of his cabinet ministers last week.

"Our army is like the water buffalo. If a farmer cannot feed his buffalo, how can it work his fields? Our soldiers have been fighting for 20 years. They are tired. They cannot even afford enough rice to feed their families. How can they defend their outposts?" a Laotian general told two visitors to his Vientaine villa not long ago.

The zoological similes say something about the contrast in mood and attitude that one finds these days in the different dominoes of Indochina.

In South Vietnam there is aggressiveness and optimism. In Laos there is confusion, doubt and fear. Both countries have lived with war for two decades. But in Vietnam risks are being taken and rewards are expected: The word "victory" is entering the official vocabulary. In Laos an optimist is a man who thinks things may not get much worse.

BUYING TIME

Saigon's optimism—or overoptimism—stems from several factors: continuing pacification gains, relative political tranquility, an increasingly stabilized economy. But mainly it's due to the South Vietnam army (ARVN), incursion on the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The six-week-old campaign into the trail area of eastern Laos is far from really cutting the broad trail complex. But despite the ARVN retreats of recent days, military officials in Vietnam believe they already have seriously disrupted the North Vietnamese army supply line and thus the enemy's future plans.

The ARVN campaign, it's claimed, will buy time for the government of South Vietnam to further strengthen its army and further pacify its countryside without fear of a major enemy offensive. This is particularly important with national elections looming in South Vietnam this fall.

ARVN troops and U.S. firepower are said to have already killed more than 6,000 Communist soldiers in the trail area. But ARVN, too, has taken heavy casualties. More than 700 of its best soldiers have been killed and three times that number have been wounded. And for all of Saigon's optimism, the ARVN push into Laos never could have taken place without massive American air support, from troop-ferrying helicopters to saturation bombing raids. ARVN's temporary occupation of the Tchepone area, a key hub of the trail complex about 25 miles into Laos, was more impressive as a demonstration of U.S. air mobility and power than in terms of ARVN combat capability. Indeed, ARVN troops withdrew. At various low points in the Laos campaign, ARVN commanders have grumbled about insufficient air support, but it's worth remembering that North Vietnam's forces are completely Vietnamized and have no air support at all.

"DOING RATHER WELL THESE DAYS"

Nevertheless, ARVN units that several years ago lacked the capability and confidence to venture into enemy strongholds not far from Saigon now are occupying positions astride the logistics lifeline of the North Vietnamese army. And even if ARVN forces withdraw back into South Vietnam well before the May monsoon rains begin, they will be able to claim some limited success.

Meanwhile, the mood of optimism in Saigon is reflected in President Thieu's recent threats to invade North Vietnam. The threats are widely viewed as having been made for domestic political effect (and so such invasion could take place without heavy American support).

But it is perhaps significant that only two years ago, during the enemy's TET offensive, President Thieu had to reassure his people that he could defend Saigon "The South Vietnamese are doing rather well these days. The North Vietnamese are a bit out of breath," says a European diplomat who is far from an avid Saigon supporter.

If there is a real danger in South Vietnam these days, perhaps it is overoptimism. To Americans, Vietnamization may simply mean an honorable way out of a regrettable war. But to the South Vietnamese leadership, Vietnamization increasingly seems to mean military victory. With or without good reason, the Laos invasion has tended to bolster this attitude. "We are six feet tall now," crowed a South Vietnamese cabinet minister last week.

NO OVEROPTIMISM IN LAOS

Overoptimism is no danger in Laos, now in its 25th year of a losing war. There's nothing dramatic about the Laos conflict. For example, only 50 or so Laotian soldiers die each week—not much of a casualty count compared with the fatalities in Vietnam or Cambodia. But then Laos is a country of only about 2.5 million people. On a per capita basis, recent Laotian losses would compare with more than 4,000 American battlefield deaths a week.

It's this undramatic but inexorable death count—and the plight of some 700,000 Laotians who have been turned into war refugees—that makes Laos in many respects the most tragic theater of the Indochina war, even if it often appears to be a theater of the absurd. Two other factors compound the tragedy. One is that the Laotians have so little control over the operation of their own war. The Pathet Lao (Laotian leftists) are almost totally controlled by the North Vietnamese. And the Laotian government is almost totally dependent on America.

The second factor is that neither the North Vietnamese nor the Americans are really interested in Laos at all, except as a buffer and a pawn in the conflicts for higher stakes in South Vietnam and Cambodia.

The South Vietnamese campaign into the Ho Chi Minh Trail area fits into this pattern. To many in Laos, the incursion is simply an irrelevancy. The trail area of eastern Laos hasn't been under Laotian control for at least four years. Even a North Vietnamese diplomat in Vientiane considers the trail area "internationalized." And to most Laotians, South Vietnam is just the latest in a long list of countries that have violated Laos' paper neutrality: first and foremost North Vietnam, but also the U.S., China, Thailand and even Cambodia. Laotian neutrality has been worn so thin that the official Laotian protest against the South Vietnamese incursion was a collaborative effort by the Laotian prime minister and the U.S. ambassador to Laos.

Some Laotians, however, are also worried over repercussions of the ARVN trail strike. It's a sad paradox of the Indochina war that what's good for one domino isn't always good for another. Thus, some Laotians fear the ARVN strike may push North Vietnamese units deeper into southern Laos (to a safer distance from the South Vietnamese border) or that Hanoi may be prompted to seek a dramatic victory of some sort at the expense of Laos, which is by far the softest target in Indochina. The American-South Vietnamese foray into Cambodia last spring caused North Vietnam to expand its supply and sanctuary system in southern Laos. And last week, in a move that may relate to the ARVN trail campaign, the North Vietnamese overran the last Laotian outpost on the strategic Bolovens plateau in southeast Laos.

"WE ARE TIRED, SO TIRED"

The mood of Laos is reflected at Seno, the last relatively secure Laotian military base on Route 9, the same route North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese troops are battling over 80 miles to the east. Only 100 miles down this road lies Khe Sanh, the sprawling American logistics base for the South Vietnamese campaign, and there the sky is thick with planes and choppers. At Seno, the only thing in the air is an occasional fly.

The senior officer on duty at the largely deserted Seno base, once a French supply depot for the battle of Dienbienphu, is a polite Laotian colonel who has considerable trouble locating his own position on his briefing map. "We are here?" he says, his pointer weaving across the map like a diving rod seeking water. "And here are 10 maybe 20, battalions of South Vietnamese," he adds, indicating a coordinate about 100 miles from the nearest ARVN unit. "The South Vietnamese are killing North Vetnamese, which is good," he explains, "but then more North Vietnamese will come and the war will spread and what will we do?"

A Southern Laotian general, ideologically in sympathy with the South Vietnamese, but concerned over the fate of his Mekong Valley riceland if the North Vietnamese should push, or be pushed, further west, puts it more succinctly: "The South Vietnamese operation in Laos is good for the South Vietnamese."

If the North Vietnamese, for military or political reasons, push west toward the populous Mekong River plain, there will be little to stop them but U.S. air power and the Thai army, and that would probably mean the final cannibalization of Laos. "We are like a cow in a barnyard waiting for the tiger," says a Laotian colonel at Pak Se in southern Laos. "We are tired, so tired."

THE CIA EVACUATES

The military situation in northern Laos may be even bleaker. North Vietnamese army units have spent months preparing for an assault on Long Chieng, base for General Vang Pao's CIA-backed army of mostly Meo mountain tribesmen. The threat to Long Chieng, by elements of two North Vietnamese divisions, is so serious this year that the CIA is said to have recently evacuated much of its sophisticated communications equipment. "If Vang Pao is knocked out of Long Chieng it means the end of his Meo army, and that means the end of northern Laos," says one Western military envoy.

For years the brunt of the Laos war has fallen on this Meo tribe, and the toll has been staggering. American agents are said to have paid death benefits to the families of more than 6,700 Meo soldiers since late 1967, tremendous losses for a force that has rarely numbered more than 10,000 at any given time.

Even more chilling are the civilian losses suffered by the Meo tribe in trekking from one ridgeline to another in the face of Communist advances and American bombings. Sources say that during each such move 10% to 15% of the Meos die from disease, malnutrition or shock. There have been some 150,000 refugees, mostly Meos, in northern Laos over the past three years, which would indicate at least 15,000 civilian deaths. And even for those tribesmen who survive, there's the tragedy of being reduced to the status of helpless refugees, dependent for their subsistance on sacks of American rice dropped from the air.

Last fall there were some flickering hopes in Laos that peace talks might be arranged between the Laotian government and the Pathet Lao insurgents (who technically remain part of Laos coalition government). Peace hopes were predicated on the prospect of a tacit recognition by all warring parties that there are really two wars in Laos. One is the trail war, involving North Vietnamese troops and American bombers, which would continue until the Vietnam war someday ceased. The second is a domestic Laotian conflict, with heavy North Vietnamese and American participation, that might be amenable to political solution if both Hanoi and Washington saw self-interest in reducing their military burdens in what amounts to a sideshow war. Then the various Laotian factions could get together to try and work out some Laotian-style settlement.

Peace hopes had faded before the South Vietnamese trail strike, however, with both sides accusing each other of using the peace ploy for propaganda purposes and for tactical military advantage. Still, it may be significant that neither the North Vietnamese nor the Americans rule out a resumption of preliminary Laotian peace contacts once ARVN troops have exited from the trail area.

Meanwhile, the war rolls on, leaving its shattered human residue in scores of refugee camps like the one about 20 miles from Pak Se in southern Laos. This camp harbors some 60 families from three primitive mountain tribes that had long lived under Pathet Lao control on the slopes of the Bolovens plateau. They fled only when North Vietnamese troops arrived, imposing harsher discipline and impressing their sons as supply bearers.

So the tribesmen fled with nothing but the rags on their backs. Everything they now own—a few blankets, mosquito nets and cooking pots—was given by American aid. They sit, languidly and uncomprehendingly in this camp, the men dressed in loincloths, the women with breasts hanging below their waists. They are given some rice to eat. "But we have no tobacco and no peppers like at home," says an aged tribesman. They are bothered by the climate, which is too hot for them, and the altitude, which is too low. They may eventually be given some land to farm, but it won't be their land.

Their land is defined by the place where the bones of their ancestors are buried, and those bones still lie on the slopes of the Bolovens. The old man explains that they must go back for the bones. How? "We will go back for the bones," he replies. Even the dead do not rest in peace in Laos.

POST OFFICE DELIVERS DROPOUTS, TOO

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the March 11 issue of the Christian Science Monitor carries a full page story on the street academy program being operated by the U.S. Post Office Department, and I commend this article to my colleagues attention. This innovative and highly successful program is well worth the cost, and I heartily congratulate the Post Office Department for the fine job they are doing. The article follows:

POST OFFICE DELIVERS DROPOUTS, TOO

(By Susan Hunsinger)

WASHINGTON.—To keep his job in a drugstore, William used to memorize the colors and positions of the bottles on the shelves. He didn't know how to read the labels.

Though he was 19 years old, he shied away from subways for fear of getting off at the wrong stop. And he always ordered hamburgers in restaurants so he wouldn't have to ask for help with the menu.

William was a high-school dropout. But in 1968 he enrolled in a privately financed "street academy" program—a storefront school for dropouts. Nine months later he was reading novels like Richard Wright's "Native Son."

Now the Nixon administration has embraced the street academy concept, an idea first developed by the New York City Urban League. And it has rerouted the idea, of all places, through the United States Postal Service.

In six urban ghettos, postal employees serve as paraprofessional teachers, "street

workers," and administrators. Former dropouts aim toward high-school-equivalency diplomas and work part time for the Post Office.

There are indications the postal academies may spread to major cities across the U.S. The program could offer a boost—or a viable alternative—to the nation's beleaguered inner-city school system.

"But why the Post Office?" people ask.

IDEAL SITUATION SEEN

"No other institution is so well situated and organized to do this job," responds Postmaster General Winton Blount.

Postal workers do business in every U.S. city; they know their communities intimately, adds Willoughby G. Walling, the program's national director. "Who else walks down every street in the nation's ghettos six days a week? What other uniformed employee is often trusted with a key to the front door?"—to ensure the safe delivery of important mail, such as the weekly welfare check.

For reasons like these, the Post Office Department set up six pilot academies last May in Atlanta; Chicago; Detroit; Newark, N.J.; San Francisco; and Washington, D.C.

And for a program that works with high-school dropouts, the first-term results are impressive:

Street-academy students—who have spent most of their lives being behind—raised their academic level by one grade in only three months, according to the Educational Testing Service.

Fifty percent of the teachers who fostered this achievement had no college education. Prior to assuming their positions, all teachers underwent a month of intensive training.

Sixty-two percent of the students became part-time wage earners with the Post Office—doing work that needed to be done. Most were previously unemployed.

More than 70 percent of the students stuck with the program—students who had helped raise the national high-school-dropout rate to 25 percent.

TOUGH KIDS ATTEND

"And we have tough, tough kids," says Mr. Walling. One-third of the students have police records along with many health and family problems.

Diplomas and jobs are the stated goals of the Postal Academy Program, which will have graduated over 1,000 students in the six cities by October. As a less tangible objective, program directors hope to prepare students for a world in which an average person, in his lifetime, will have to retrain for a job five times.

The street-academy approach is based on the premise that a dropout's chief learning difficulty is a lack of motivation and that the best way to change this pattern is through a close teacher-student relationship.

"We try any method we can to hook kids on learning," says Clarence Allen, project director for the Washington, D.C., postal academies.

Street workers, sometimes called "street sniffers," recruit dropouts "at the pool room, the corner drugstore, or wherever kids hang out," says Washington street worker Elmer Pinckney.

"We pick up the kids in the morning, check them out on their jobs, get glasses for the kids who need them, phone them at night to make sure they come to class the next day," says another street worker, Charlie Banks.

Once in the classroom, the emphasis is on informality. The inside of "Academy B" in Washington looks like an inner-city version of the old one-room schoolhouse. Gone are the impersonal corridors, the rows of lockers, the system of bells.

ACADEMY UNSTRUCTURED

"The big difference between the postal academy and the public school," says Washington academy teacher Charles Howard, "is that we're so unstructured. In public school, you have 40 kids. The person in the back row is looking at the back of the next person's head. Here we work closely with each student and have at most 15 kids per class.

"If there's a discipline problem," says the young former postal worker, "I just take the student aside, and say, 'Let's rap, man. You're messing up my whole class.' "

Teaching methods have to take into account the sophistication of dropouts who've learned to survive on the streets—yet may not know how to add and subtract.

"We try to interweave the basic skills and disciplines with topics of intrinsic interest to the kids," says Mr. Howard.

Postal-academy teachers use black-history books to teach reading, street games to teach arithmetic, rap sessions on "the dope pusher" to bring home the abstract concept of exploitation.

For his course on consumer protection, Mr. Howard gathered material from Washington-area consumer advocates and college professors. But the course also includes a trip to the supermarket for some lessons in the "practical laws of buying."

BROKEN-HOME BACKGROUND

"A lot of these kids come from broken homes," says Mr. Howard, "and one result is that they don't know the first thing about how to handle money or run a household."

The key to street-academy success, however, may have less to do with creative teaching methods than the teacher's conviction that former dropouts *can* learn. "The self-fulfilling prophecy works in a positive as well as negative direction," write Charles E. Silberman in "Crisis in the Classroom."

The author of the 3½-year Carnegie Corporation study concludes that "a major reason for success [in street academies] is the fact that project directors and teachers expect their students to succeed, and they hold themselves—not only their students—accountable if the latter should fail."

To break the syndrome of student failure, a system of rewards and reinforcements becomes important. The Postal Academy Program holds graduations every four months for the students who have progressed from the first level in the academy system to the "Academy of Transition"—the last step before the high-school-equivalency exam.

"You can't believe how much it means to these kids to finally succeed at something," says Mr. Howard. For a recent graduation ceremony in Chicago, academy students held a formal banquet, wore corsages on top of their African garb, and posed for photos with framed "certificates of achievement."

INFORMALITY POSES PROBLEMS

Informality and innovation can pose some problems for a federal-government program, however. The new postal academies—which get 10 percent of their $3.6 million funds from the Post Office Department and the rest from the Labor Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity—have critics on both the Right and the Left.

When the postal-academy training program used U.S. Army trucks to transport dashiki-clad trainees across the New Mexico desert, there was an outcry from unprepared residents of Las Cruces. American Opinion magazine, an organ of the John Birch Society, branded the expedition "a paramilitary invasion," suggested that "Communists" were taking over the Post Office, and called the whole program a "Phony Express."

Program directors also have had to screen staff carefully. Ties with revolutionary groups like the Black Panthers and pictures of militants like Eldgidge Cleaver are off limits.

Black staff, however, seem to take any restrictions in stride. "Big brother may be watching us, but we're not worried," says Mr. Banks. "We just do what we think we're supposed to do to help kids."

Perhaps a more serious problem is a lag in post office jobs. Largely as a result of postal reorganization, says Mr. Walling, "the program has so far not been able to employ as many students as it had hoped."

OTHER PROGRAMS BEING CUT

The postal academies are being advanced at a time when comparable social programs are being cut back.

The New York Urban League academies and the independent Harlem Preparatory School—both precursors of the postal academies—face drastic cutbacks in funds from private corporations. Six of the 14 original New York street academies have been forced to close.

There are various explanations for this situation. While corporations attribute the cutbacks to the recession, Urban League officials complain the companies have reneged on their commitments. Some observers suggest that the Urban League's program has been hampered by internal frictions and poor administration.

Meanwhile, the postal-academy experiment seems to have won the support of the Nixon administration largely because the program has been carefully planned.

"We've tried to refine the idea and learn from past experience," says Mr. Walling, who was himself one of the pioneers of the New York academies.

CAREFUL PLANNING ILLUSTRATED

Careful planning shows up in:

Recruitment—The Postal Academy Program has been one of the few social experiments to "overrecruit" staff members—three candidates for each of the top city administrators. Post Office directors spent several months locating indigenous, black staff who had already proved their abilities to relate to hard-core youth in the various cities.

Training—All staff members have undergone two weeks of stress-endurance training. In addition, all teachers receive a month of intensive instruction plus continuing in-service training.

Quality control—Unlike most social programs, the postal academies have been in a position to fire those employees who fail to meet standards. Since most of the employees come from the post office, "we're free to send them back if they don't work out," says Mr. Walling. "We're not playing with their bread and butter."

In one year, the program has fired 17.4 percent of its staff.

Independent evaluation—From its outset, the program established an extensive evaluation system, including a comprehensive reporting system, independent assessment by the Educational Testing Service, and a cost-benefit study.

"That's our insurance," says Mr. Walling.

When asked about costs, for example, officials can show that the program is less expensive than the public schools "per unit of achievement." And its $2,154 cost-per-student-per-year also falls far short of the Neighborhood Youth Corps' $4,600-a-year program for out-of-school youth.

Slow expansion—Perhaps most important, the program's staff does not seem bent on rapid expansion. While the Post Office is considering the possible expansion of the academies to 24 more cities, Mr. Walling issues a word of caution: "What killed so many programs in the '60's was tremendous expansion. We'd rather wait a while until we're sure we've eliminated all the kinks."

SWISSAIR

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that Swissair, the national airline of Switzerland, will soon begin serving Boston as the airline's fourth gateway in North America. Swissair, which will celebrate its 40th anniversary on March 26, has a well-deserved reputation for efficient and gracious service.

On May 8, Swissair will begin flying nonstop three times a week between Boston's Logan International Airport and Zurich. I think this will represent an important contribution to New England's economy and to the ties which bind the peoples of the United States, Switzerland, and Europe in general.

During the last 8 months of 1971, Swissair estimates that it will carry 9,000 persons—in both directions—between Boston and Switzerland. As its service grows, our world will grow figuratively smaller.

I would like to congratulate Swissair on its 40th anniversary next week. It was founded in 1931 through the merger of two small Swiss airlines, called Balair and Ad Astra. It then had 13 aircraft—with 86 passenger seats and a 2,800-mile network—operated in the summer season only, when the weather permitted. Today Swissair flies a worldwide network of more than 150,000 air miles and offers 4,393 passenger seats. Boston becomes the 76th city into which Swissair flies directly, while Logan Airport will now be served by 17 airlines.

Representatives of Government and of business and industry, including New England's great travel industry, attended a special "Swissair Boston Inaugural Luncheon" on January 26. We were privileged to hear an address by Mr. Hugo K. Mayr, Swissair's general manager for North America, in which he described Swissair's expectations for its new service.

I believe that Mr. Mayr's remarks should be placed in the RECORD, and I am pleased to insert the text, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HUGO K. MAYR

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to be here in Boston, particularly under such pleasant circumstances, namely the first official celebration of the inauguration of Swissair's service into this historic city. We shall begin flying nonstop three times a week between here and Zurich, beginning May 8th.

Boston will be the fourth Swissair gateway in North America. We already fly from New York, Chicago and Montreal, but we have had our eye on your city for quite some time. Swissair has always considered New England—and, assuredly, Boston—to be extremely important. We have, for many years, sent our best men here. Recently, when we created regional offices in the United States and Canada, we made Boston our headquarters for the Eastern Region and we named our Boston District Sales Manager, George Alessandria, Area Manager, responsible for the eastern states from Maine to Florida, with the exception of Metropolitan New York.

This week, our entire North American sales force, from 36 cities in the U.S., Canada and Mexico, has convened in Boston, for the first time, to get as well acquainted as possible with our new gateway and, in many cases, meet with industry friends with whom we have worked over the years. We have certainly been enjoying your traditional New England hospitality.

We know that Boston serves two roles. Officially, it is the capital of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Unofficially, it is the capital of all New England. Those of us here today who are European appreciate that Boston is, so to speak, the Athens of America, the birthplace of New World democracy; those of us who are Americans also appreciate that Boston is the custodian of the Nation's heritage. With New York and Washington, D.C., Boston is included on virtually every itinerary of Europeans travelling to the U.S. for the first time. Our ever-expanding Visit USA Department in New York works closely with tourism officials in this area to better acquaint our friends on the other side of the Atlantic with the historical and contemporary excitement that is Boston. Now that we shall be privileged to serve the city directly from Switzerland, Swissair will substantially increase our promotion of the New England area and bring as many foreign visitors as possible to and through your gateway city.

In many respects, Boston is one of the most attractive cities on the East Coast for transatlantic travellers. Logan International Airport, run so efficiently by our friends of the Massachusetts Port Authority, is effectively keeping pace with the explosive growth of air travel. Our tour of the premises yesterday gave clear evidence of Massport's 250 million dollar modernization and expansion program now underway.

A flight between Boston and any European or Middle Eastern city is at least 200 miles shorter than from any other U.S. transatlantic terminus. And it has the lowest air fares.

Boston's air space is not as crowded as that over New York or Chicago even though, with the advent of Swissair service, there will be 17 airlines operating out of Logan. Taxiing time between runways and airline stations is shorter. Passage through Customs and Immigration formalities is faster.

Connecting service is excellent. Distances between the international terminal and domestic airlines are minimal. Fourteen U.S. cities are served with direct daily flights from Boston, for connecting international passangers who prefer to use uncrowded Logan.

But then, our guests here today are eminently more qualified than I to speak about Boston, so allow me to tell you a little about Swissair's home country where we hope you'll be flying in the very near future.

Switzerland is a tiny country with an area approximately the combined size of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island. Like New England, Switzerland was a birthplace of personal liberty, and we have been making democracy work for over 700 years. We are one of the oldest republics in the world.

Having none of the natural resources which abound in the United States, Switzerland has become a highly industrialized nation, greatly dependent upon foreign trade. Naturally, one of our greatest partners in the world commerce is the United States.

Like the U.S., Switzerland has one of the highest standards of living in the world. Unlike the United States, and happily for us, Switzerland has virtually no unemployment, poverty, or slums. Switzerland is politically and economically stable, one of the financial and trade capitals of the world. The Swiss are hardworking, precise, dependable people. And there aren't so many of us that the values of friendliness, hospitality and the importance of the individual are forgotten.

Because Switzerland is a land-locked country, Swissair has played a gratifyingly large role in the development of our country's foreign trade. We are a privately-owned company but we are the national airline of Switzerland and our futures are tied irrevocably to each other.

Just as Boston, Swissair's home city of Zurich is presently involved in an extensive expansion program for Kloten Intercontinental Airport. Last year, more than 6,000,000 international travellers used the airport's facilities and with the expanded operation of the Boeing 747's into Switzerland, the figures should climb much higher in 1971. Zurich lies at the crossroads of the continent and is the ideal starting point for any European holiday. Swissair's vast air network links Switzerland with every continent except Australia.

Like Switzerland, Swissair is reliable, precise, hospitable and, despite the present crisis in our industry, even economically stable. And, like Switzerland, we're not too big—but we're just big enough. Big enough to offer our passengers and commercial clients a modern, efficient, and dependable worldwide service comparable to even the largest of carriers. But small enough to continue our well known tradition of individual attention and warm hospitality. And that's the nicest happiest medium I can think of.

On behalf of Swissair, in North America and throughout the world, I would like to say that we look forward to serving you and working with you to build a better bridge between our cities and our citizens.

I thought you might like to know what our people think of the economy. We are (again conservatively, as behooves us) optimistic. We feel that the stock-market and other signs suggest that a moderate upturn of the economy in the United States can be expected this year . . . along with lessening inflation.

While we feel that this should create a more favorable travel climate, it probably will *not* occur before next summer.

1970, as all of us know, was not a great year for airlines. Swissair, however, held its own, even in the face of predicaments and the atrocities of skyjacking.

It is clear to us that only the finest and most imaginative of airline carriers will make good this year. And Swissair will be one of them. We will continue to provide the superb service aboard our aircraft. We will continue our fine on-time arrivals and departures. We will continue to search for ways which will make people want to fly our airline.

We will continue to work, and to make every effort to improve. We think that coming to Boston is a most definite improvement.

COMMUNIST CORRESPONDENT'S SON PROPAGANDIZES HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the American Hungarian Federation brought to my attention a prime example of Communist propaganda spread among our high school youth by children of accredited Communist Hungarian correspondents.

The facts of the article by Peter Köves, son of the correspondent of the Hungarian News Agency, proves again that Communist state officials—for there are no free and independent journalists or correspondents in Communist Hungary—are using their journalistic cover to slander America not only in their Communist home newspapers, but also

by using their position and the position of their families in our society to spread Communist ideology and use the technique of the big lie to allay ingrained American fears of Communist totalitarianism.

It is my belief that these activities by foreign citizens who are here in official or semiofficial capacity constitutes an interference with the affairs of the United States, an interference that should not and must not be tolerated by our State Department which has the prime responsibility for licensing and admitting foreign correspondents and officials.

We all know that the Communist Party and their numerous New Left allies are now concentrating on our high schools and try to poison the adolescent minds with the notions of socialism and communism and convert them into semirevolutionary, or revolutionary dissidents by the time they reach college age. It is in this context that the lies and distortions of young Köves must be read and understood. I hope that my colleagues will gain a better understanding of the insidious character of political well poisoning that is taking place right now in American schools even by official representatives of Communist nations and I, for one, hope that our Government will take steps that at least foreign agitators shall not be allowed to participate in this conspiracy against the democratic system in the United States.

I insert into the RECORD the article published in the December 18, 1970, issue of the high school newspaper, Red and Black, by young Peter Köves:

HUNGARIAN PRAISES HOMELAND

"Freedom? Don't think that the United States has a monopoly on it!" warns junior Peter Koves, a Hungarian citizen, who has been in the United States about six months.

Peter is by no means a defector. He is here with his family because his father is a journalist for the Hungarian Telegraph Bureau. Mr. Koves expects to remain here for another four or five years.

This is not the first time Peter has traveled abroad. Although he spent the last three years in Hungary, his father had been stationed in England for five years before that where Peter learned English.

DEBATES ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Since Hungary is a Socialist nation, one might expect severe limitations of freedom. Not so, points out Peter.

"I belong to a youth movement called the Hungarian Communist Youth League. We could always say whatever we wanted.

"For example, when the Soviet Union stepped into Czechoslovakia my friends and I had some very vigorous debates concerning the legitimacy of the move.

FREEDOM OF PRESS

"Freedom of the press is also not as much infringed upon as is believed here. It's more or less the same in this country—the editors play up articles favorable to their views and bury in the ads articles they disagree with.

"Besides, most Hungarian journalists are communist, so they regulate themselves. Self-regulation happens here too—your newspapers don't go around printing socialist propaganda.

ADVANTAGE OF SOCIALISM

"There is practicaly no unemployment in Hungary. Our crime rate is minute in comparison with yours."

Peter points out that in practice the amounts of freedom in the two countries aren't radically different. At the same time, he emphasizes that Hungary enjoys many advantages not found in the United States.

"All your rights are nice on paper. But in Hungary we have pensions, job security, all sorts of services your government refuses to provide to the same degree.

"The conception most Americans have of a Communist country is usually far from accurate," Peter claims.

QUESTION OF RELIGION

"As a case in point, I'll take the question of religion," explains Peter. "Contrary to popular belief, the Hungarian government hasn't tried to eradicate religious institutions.

"As a matter of fact, there are a lot of religious people, and," smiles Peter, "the church even receives state support.

"Emigration is another problem on which there is much confusion. Hungarian citizens are free to leave when they want to.

"Sure, you have all your constitutional guarantees. But thousands of Americans have been persecuted by the government because of their political beliefs.

"Of course, we've had our problems too. After World War II, Rakosi ruled Hungary the same way Stalin ruled Russia. On the other hand, you had McCarthy, who wasn't a Stalin but proves you aren't free from political repression.

"As far as Hungary is concerned, the story of oppressed Eastern Europeans yearning to escape is pure propaganda. Most Hungarians are satisfied with the direction Hungary is taking."

LOVE OF COUNTRY

"As for me—well, I haven't read nearly enough to get the best picture possible of what's going on in the world.

"What I've told you here are just my personal feelings. When my views crystallize, I'll speak more definitely.

"But I'm glad I was born in a Socialist country," Peter declares. "The United States has a long way to go to catch up with Hungary."

DDT: SOME INFORMATIVE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, one American institution with which we are all familiar is the "letter to the editor" columns in newspapers and magaiznes. Often these letters are amusing, absurd, or incredible. Often they are informative. Such is the case with a number of letters to the editor which have appeared recently in Science magazine.

The subject in question is DDT and whether or not we should insist on the discontinuation of its use. These letters are from some of the most knowledgeable men in the area of pesticide research and I think my colleagues will find them informative. They appear below:

DDT BAN: A JUDGMENT OF EMOTION AND MYSTIQUE

Instant experts sometimes make me sick, even if they are ecologists or other types of biological scientists! The immediate cause of my nausea is the statement by Eric Johnson (Letters, 2 Oct.): "The continued use of chemicals such as DDT is the greatest act of ecological irresponsibility, *especially in light of the fact that safer substitutes are available*" (italics added). Who says? If the italicized statement is true, it surely is the world's best kept secret! Also, if some of our vocal scientists would remove their ecological blinders and really investigate the subject, they would find that the "safer" substitutes, which they so freely recommend, generally are ones that create the greatest ecological imbalance and havoc among biota, including man. All informed persons, ecologists or not, freely suscribe to the plea that, "where nonpersistent substitutes for DDT are available, they [should] be used," provided the substitutes are *practical* and, in fact, really safer to use than DDT. Even if one accepts the emotional oratory about the apparent decline of certain species of birds and fish (who derive their main nutritional needs from DDT-accumulating food chains) and about the presence of DDT residues in mothers' milk, the fact remains that there is not any evidence, emotional or not, of harm to man and his useful animals from the legitimate use of DDT and other persistent chlorinated insecticides despite widespread, high-volume use for over 20 years. Problems, yes, but harm, no. Again I ask: why not make a studied, informed effort to find ways and means for the utilization of well-proven tools, such as DDT, for pest control rather than urge abandonment of them on the basis of emotional appeals or "holy-cow" ecological reasoning or irresponsible, misleading statements? Why not assemble all of the facts and carefully digest them, before suggesting action in regard to the continued use of DDT?

LOUIS LYKKEN.

BUREAU OF CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,

New Brunswick, N.J.

E. V. Johnson's letter reiterates several shibboleths concerning DDT in the environment. . . . One such contention lies in the apparent paradoxical property of DDT to enhance its toxicity inversely to dose exposure. Johnson therefore advocates the use of equivalent, "nonpersistent" substitutes, but proposes none. The World Health Organization has critically examined over 1000 such possible substitute pesticides to replace DDT in the worldwide antimalaria program, and has found none that can meet the essential requirements of availability, efficacy, safety, stability, and cost.

The use of DDT in the malaria-control program in Ceylon was abandoned in the mid-1960's after some 15 years of virtual freedom from this major killer, in an area where malaria and its vector, the anopheline mosquito, had been endemic for millennia. By 1968 there were over 1 million cases of human malaria in a population of 10 million people, and no part of the island of Ceylon was free of the disease or its vector. The Singhalese government sent out an emergency call for 10 million pounds of DDT in 1969 to recover control.

Lettuce, lima bean, sweet corn, and a number of other crops have had to be abandoned in eastern vegetable production areas because of the inefficacy of the DDT substitutes to control major insect pests (such as *Heliothus zea*). Return to the discriminate use of DDT in these areas was recommended this year.

In Sweden, where DDT was first banned, its use was restored for control of certain forest insects, which could not be effectively controlled with the recommended substitutes, and which, if left uncontrolled, would have seriously injured the economy of that country's largest industry.

In the eastern states the gypsy moth is extending its epizootic relentlessly even in the face of the widescale use of the so-called DDT substitutes. Over 100,000 acres of hardwoods were ravaged in northern New Jersey alone in 1970—up twofold from 1969 and up fourfold from 1968. Much of the repeatedly infested area is now permanently destroyed, including some 1 million oak trees. Apparently the substitutes are ineffectual against the gypsy moth, although their impact on other wild life is more substantial.

The domestic and wild bee colonies in areas sprayed with substitutes, for example, have been curtailed approximately 25 percent. This will be reflected in reduced pollination of both domestic and wild plants. In addition, the long-term pharmacology of the substitutes is considerably less known than is that of DDT.

It is interesting to speculate how far this absurd campaign will go to replace effective, safe, and proven pesticides with ineffective, hazardous, and relatively unknown compounds. Major insect-vectored human diseases are spreading; we are losing essential food and feed crops accompanied by an escalated cost of living; vast areas of wildlands, forests, public parklands, and private estates are being devastated, with concomitant injury to wildlife; and there is a proliferation of vast hordes of flies, fleas, mosquitoes, cockroaches, termites, and myriad other annoying household and home garden insects. Will the afflicted public finally be aroused to return the administration of pesticides to those trained and experienced scientists, operators, and administrative officers who are obviously best qualified to exercise such jurisdiction?

ROBERT WHITE-STEVENS.

DDT PROPONENTS CHALLENGED

The counterattack by pesticide manufacturers and their associates in defense of DDT charges environmentalists with being "emotional" and "hysterical" in their efforts to curtail the use of DDT (Letters, 27 Nov.). Lykken, formerly with Shell Chemical Company, speaks of "the emotional oratory about the apparent decline of certain species of birds. . . ." Nevertheless, the literature reveals abundant documentation by competent scientists on the inhibition of avian reproduction by DDT, the mechanisms involved, and their deleterious impact on populations of carnivorous birds.[1]. Unsupported charges that this work is "emotional oratory" are themselves indications of irrationality, yet they continue to appear in the popular media and as letters to editors of journals. If Lykken or his colleagues have any evidence from scientific studies showing that DDT has *not* caused the declines of these birds, they have certainly kept it a closely guarded secret. Until they publish such evidence in the scientific literature, most scientists will continue to believe the numerous referred research studies they have already seen, rather than unsupported rhetoric.

White-Stevens, formerly with American Cyanimid, threatens that without DDT and the like there will be disease, losses of food crops, and devastation of forests from "vast hordes of flies, fleas, mosquitoes, cockroaches, termites, and myriad other annoying household and home garden insects." Again, this and many similar sweeping statements by a few highly vocal DDT proponents are entirely unsupported. How did we survive before 1945? The insignificance of DDT in food production is demonstrated by its use on less than 1 percent of the food crop acreage in the United States,[2] and its nearly complete elimination from use in California, our richest and most prolific food producing state. Voluminous documentation indicates that crop yields are maintained and often increased, not decreased, by integrated control programs that use less insecticide and no DDT.[3] It is a matter of record that *no* insect pest problem has been eliminated by insecticides, and, in fact, that many have been *caused* by these chemicals—by the target pest resurgences, secondary pest outbreaks, and pest resistance that follow the dissemination of broad spectrum poisons.[3]

It is curious that DDT proponents have not availed themselves of the normal channels for publication of scientific information, while evidence against DDT continues to be published in the scientific literature almost weekly. Nevertheless, the number of pro-DDT letters suggests that there must be *something* to support them. Since the Environmental Defense Fund and other organizations have undertaken litigation against DDT in several federal courts, DDT proponents will have ample opportunity to have their evidence heard in an impartial forum where its validity can be tested by cross-examination. It is unfortunate that the DDT proponents who speak so frequently in the media have so far avoided any role in this litigation, thus maintaining secrecy around the evidence for their position.

CHARLES F. WURSTER,
JERRY L. MOSSER,
Marine Sciences Research Center State University of New York, Stony Brook.
EDWIN H. BATTLEY,
ALBERT D. CARLSON,
JOHN M. EMLEN,
ROBERT E. SMOLKER.
Division of Biological Sciences, State University of New York.

FOOTNOTES

[1] D. B. Peakall, *Science* 168, 592 (1970); *Sci. Amer.* 222, 72 (1970); S. N. Wiemeyer and R. N. Porter, *Nature* 227, 737(1970); R. G. Heath, J. W. Spann, J. F. Kreitzer, *ibid.* 224, 47 (1969); R. D. Porter and S. N. Wiemeyer. *Science* 165, 199 (1969); J. J. Hickey and D. W. Anderson, *ibid.* 162, 271 (1968).

[2] *U.S. Dep. Agr. Econ. Rep.* 158 (1969).

[3] R. F. Smith and R. van den Bosch, in *Pest Control*, W. W. Kilgore and R. L. Doutt, Eds. (Academic Press, New York, 1967); R. van den Bosch *et al.*, in *Biological Control*, C. B. Huffaker, Ed. (Plenum Press, New York, in press); R. van den Bosch, *Environment* 12, 21 (1970).

INSECTICIDE EVALUATION PROJECT,
USDA, FOREST SERVICE,
Berkeley, California.

Lykken states: "Even if one accepts the emotional oratory about the apparent decline of certain species of birds and fish . . . and about the presence of DDT residues in mothers' milk, the fact remains that there is not any evidence, emotional or not, of harm to *man and his useful animals* [italics added] from the legitimate use of DDT and other persistent chlorinated insecticides despite widespread, high-volume use for over 20 years."

Population declines of the brown pelican and the peregrine falcon are well documented. Hatching failure due to thin eggshells associated with DDT residues in the parent birds is also well documented. It is irresponsible to imply that these findings are simply emotional allegation. The italicized statement reveals an arrogance that I do not share. Can anyone decide which animals are useful and which are not?

It is true that DDT substitutes that are cheap and readily available are hard to find. This does not mean that nonpersistent, safe, more selective materials are not known. We have several pesticides that are much more toxic to insects and yet are nonpersistent and safe to use. None is as cheap as DDT and most are not readily available, but this is our fault for waiting so long to work on the problem.

DDT is no longer used by the U.S. Forest Service to combat defoliating insects and there is no need or effort to reinstate it that I am aware of. We have more effective and safer substitutes. One of these is Zectran. The safety of this compound to birds, mammals, and fish has been intensively studied. It is much more toxic than DDT to every insect species we have tested; the amount needed for control of the spruce budworm, for example, is only 0.15 pound (68 grams) per acre compared to 1 pound of DDT. Other materials that we are working with are even more toxic to destructive insects though not hazardous to nontarget animals, but they are not yet registered or available.

If Sweden has had to resort to DDT to control destructive forest insects, I suspect they are not actively working on substitute materials.

DONAD C. SCHMIEGE.

CUPERTINO, CALIF.

Predator insects in a normal biotic situation, or in one unaltered to any great extent by man, are animals *useful* to man and these are known to have been destroyed by DDT and other persistent chlorinated pesticide. . . .

Some animals regarded as useful to man have, in certain areas, lost their usefulness. One example is the coho salmon of Lake Michigan: in a short period during the spring of 1969 the FDA seized 35,000 pounds of these fish because they were found to contain levels of DDT dangerous to man (*Science*, 23 May 1969, p. 936). A similar situation occurred about a year ago with mackerel caught off California. What is most shocking is that because of the persistence and relative insolubility of DDT it will continue to build up in the oceans for the next decade or so even if its use were stopped today.

RICHARD K. HOSE.

THE RISING PROFITS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, knowing the heavy reading burden my colleagues bear, I hesitate to say that any article "must" be read. If "The Rising Profits of Public Service," by Taylor Branch, managing editor of the Washington Monthly does not qualify as "must reading," it comes mighty close.

The article reads as follows:

THE RISING PROFITS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Taylor Branch)

There have been 10 federal salary increases since the fall of 1962, and they have been the prime ingredients in doubling the U.S. payroll from about $25 billion to more than $50 billion in nine years. Since mid-1969 alone, the basic annual cost of the 4.3 million white-collar employees and servicemen has risen by about $6.2 billion. Over the same period of time, the annual welfare costs of the United States have increased only $1.7 billion—a comparatively trifling figure, but one which has the nation almost howling with pain and which President Nixon has called "a monstrous consuming outrage" for the taxpayer and the poor. Most of the welfare increase has resulted from the addition of three million souls to the rolls, while the basic white-collar/military salary group—which excludes federal blue-collar workers and mailmen—has actually declined. And there is a further distinction between the costs of welfare and federal salaries: this $6.2 billion in federal pay raises has generated an increase of about $15 billion in the unfunded liability of the military and civil service retirement systems, a debt to the retired public servants of the future about which the public itself and much of the Congress is largely ignorant.

Your interest may be drawn to these matters by more than your coarse material instincts as a taxpayer or a government employee. You may, for example, be interested in national priorities or inflation. Inflation may indeed flow from the basic salary process, which now produces almost automatic annual increases for one worker out of every 19 in the United States. Or you may be in-

terested in fairness—in the fact that a grade 5 secretary's salary has risen only $2,800 since 1962, while a grade 13 (the captains or majors of the civil service) salary has increased about $8,100, and the grade 18 (the highest in the civil service) salary has doubled from $18,000 to $36,000.

On January 8, 1971, when he signed the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970, President Nixon assumed almost exclusive control over salary policy. Two of his employees, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, take the figures from a survey of salaries in private industry and make obscure but controversial adjustments to produce a new pay schedule which will keep federal pay comparable with private enterprise. Their recommendation becomes effective automatically each year without congressional involvement, except in the unlikely event that the President should disagree with them and propose an alternative. This centralization of control, along with the prospect of perpetual pay increases, is the culmination of continuing changes in the pay structure which began with the Salary Reform Act of 1962.

PAY GOES TO THE MOON

When the Kennedy Administration came to power in 1961, it was pledged to get the country moving again. Government was no longer to play the docile referee role of the Eisenhower years, but Washington would have to be a prime mover and problem solver. Business seemed to have lost the juices required for independent growth, and the problems of the nation were so intertwined that central direction seemed mandatory. To restructure government for a new, permanent role of activism, the image of the government worker needed a transformation—a pay hike for the idealists among the new frontiersmen was required to grant them the sense of self-respect that makes sacrifice worthwhile.

The dilemma of the Kennedy Administration rose from the President's 1962 Economic Report which set "guideposts for noninflationary wage and price behavior"—built upon the assumption that inflation would occur if a worker received a pay raise greater than his increase in productivity. Having said that, the Administration ran into the embarrassing fact that there is no way to measure productivity in government, leading to the economist's assumption that productivity increases in the public sector are always zero. Government workers produce decisions, rules, programs, and an occasional inspiration, but nothing whose market value can be systematically measured. And if their productivity increase is zero, then the President's own guideposts would condemn their wage increases as inflationary.

The task of the Administration was not so much to convince people that federal employees were poorly paid. The problem was to get rid of the idea that all government pay increases are inherently inflationary. Comparability was the key idea. The Administration proposed that the U.S. government *assume* that government productivity rises as rapidly as productivity in the private sector, and therefore that government pay increases equal to the growth in national productivity would not be inflationary. From there it was a relatively short jump to the position that government salaries should be equal to employee counterparts in private business: if the productivity is the same, then the pay should be the same.

Administration witnesses went before congressional committees to argue for the President's bill establishing comparability as the official government pay policy. John Macy Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, hammered home the idea that legislators would no longer have to eyeball each jobholder and summon the courage to declare how much they thought that jobholder was worth to the taxpayer. With comparability, there would be a standard, numbers, something for the harried politician to lean on.

There was another reason to "take politics out of government pay"—namely that the political bargaining over government salaries had always given an advantage to the lower ranks of public employees. The clerks and postal workers and the secretaries had more political clout than the administrators at pay time simply because there were many more votes among them and they were better organized. So they had succeeded in getting a lot of flat dollar increases through Congress—like $330 across-the-board in 1948 and $140 in 1949—rather than proportionally higher increases for the managerial ranks. It was almost like socialism, everybody getting the same. But the Administration's bill would redress such "wage compression" with comparability because the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey showed that managers in business were far better paid than policy operatives and bureaucratic professionals in the government. Elmer Staats, then Deputy Budget Director, estimated that the bulk of the cost in reaching comparability would result from upgrading the middle-level managers in grades 11 through 15 (whose 1962 salaries ranged from an average of $8,340 in grade 11 to $14,275 in grade 15, while current figures are $13,878 and $26,675 respectively).

Despite all the attractiveness of the comparability idea and the wisdom of stimulating a slack 1962 economy, the President's pay bill needed an additional boost to get past a Congress which was still clamoring for a balanced budget and remembering the good old days when you could joke about paying the bureaucrats in used erasers. The Administration added a new argument: that a salary increase would not cost money, it would actually save many dollars by attracting the kind of top-flight managers who could chop fat out of administration and get the job done cheaper. To this difficult calculation was added a message with zip and truth and a little sexiness to it: that the crusades, purposes, and problems of the nation would henceforth focus on the government. Thus it was proclaimed that the Administration needed to attract the cream of the crop to public service, as all eyes turned toward the Administration's efforts to catch up in the missile race, establish the Peace Corps, halt nuclear testing in the atmosphere, and beat the Russians to the moon. Testifying for his boss, then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, Daniel P. Moynihan instructed the House as to its duty:

"I would like respectfully to suggest that it is our conviction that if you are interested in reducing the labor cost of the Federal Government for the services it performs to the public, it is essential to pay adequate salaries to get the quality of personnel that will do that for you. If you want to reach the moon in this decade, as the President has said, we will have to get the men to do that."

The pay increase may not have saved much money, but the moon argument helped, as it was in the spirit of the times. The Salary Reform Act of 1962 passed in October and went into effect just before the Cuban missile crisis.

FUNDING THE CRISIS MANAGERS

Although the new law magnified the importance of the comparability surveys and made the increases that followed from them seem far more legitimate, pay raises still required boosts in the 1960s. Administration spokesmen emphasized that top-level increases were essential—with help from people like James Reston, who discussed the problem in *The New York Times* on March 15, 1964:

"Part of the difficulty is that Congress has refused to raise the pay of one group of public servants unless it can raise them all. It draws no distinction between a secretary who wrestles with letters and an Under Secretary who wrestles with De Gaulle. . . .

"So long as Congress refuses to distinguish between a postman and a scientist and between the shortage of brains and the surplus of bodies in Washington, the problem is insoluble, but there is a way to reconcile sanity with solvency."

And as Congress became better acquainted with the political wisdom of increasing the salaries of employee union members each election year, the upgrading of federal pay continued—until President Nixon achieved full comparability by ordering a 9.1 per cent increase effective July 1, 1969.

Then the 1970 postal strike generated a six per cent increase for all federal employees, and most Washington observers detected the end of an era. There had been nine pay increases since the 1962 comparability legislation, which erased much of the civil servant's economic deprivation. In his *Washington Post* column for government employees, Mike Causey wrote that "the financially sacrificing federal executive, long considered a dedicated but underpaid soul, isn't doing so badly these days." He predicted that pay increases would be much harder to come by in the 1970s because of rapidly diminishing public sentiment for the plight of civil servants, and because the powerful mailmen had departed from the employee consortium into their own salary system under the postal reorganization plan.

It thus came as something of a surprise when Senator Gale McGee, Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, brought a new pay bill to the floor of the Senate on December 30, 1970, in one of those evening sessions as the 91st Congress struggled to end itself.

Senator McGee's bill, which passed the Senate that night and was guided through the House by Congressman Morris Udall on New Year's Eve, boiled down to a transferral of power over pay matters to the President. Congress would have no authority at all unless the President managed to disagree with his "agent" (a team composed of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, both appointed by the President) and to recommend an alternative to comparability. Even then, Congress would have only two options: accept the President's alternative, or reject it. But in the latter case the OMB-Civil Service Commission pay schedule would automatically take effect. So Congress, when involved at all, could only choose between two plans, both of which emanated from the White House.

A week later, the President signed the McGee-Udall bill and ordered the first pay increase under his new authority, the six per cent comparability adjustment that began with the numbers collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. He will order a similar raise on January 1, 1972, and thereafter the changes will go into effect each October 1. The first October adjustment, in 1972, is expected to have some relevance to the election that year.

It is clear that the new law will result in substantial new pay increases for federal employees each year, although they will probably not be as large as the 20 per cent raise in salaries which President Nixon has ordered since July, 1969, in the eighth, ninth, and tenth increases based on the 1962 Salary Reform Act. What you think of comparability probably depends on whether you work for the government or think it possible you may work for the government some day. Or you may just think that comparability sounds like an equitable way to proceed, which it does. In any case, opinions on the subject may be affected by some information about what comparability means, which also provides insight into how much leeway the President and his agent have to play with the numbers and maximize their options.

THE PYRAMID OF DISTINCTION

The key to comparability is, of course, the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, and the key to the survey is what goes into it. This is determined by a committee of officials at the Office of Management and Budget and the Civil Service Commission, which has reduced the scope of the survey to about 1.7 million white-collar employees—out of the nearly 23 million who work outside the federal government. This is accomplished by various restrictions, such as the exclusion of small businesses, but the real controversy centers upon the process of job-matching—in which the committee links various government jobs with their 1.7 million counterparts. The unions charge that the committee stuffs lower-than-average-paying positions into the survey selections at the bottom grade levels, where union membership is concentrated.

Although there is less controversy, the figures at the high levels are also suspect. Take grade 15 (salary range $24,251–$31,523), for example, where pay is determined by comparing three jobs—grade 15 attorneys, chemists, and engineers—with the 5,000 or so private industry counterparts in the survey. The BLS obtains a figure for each of the three jobs, calculates a numerical average, and out comes the salary level for all grade 15 employees in the government—only about one fourth of whom are attorneys, chemists, and engineers.

Some details shake faith in the grade 15 numbers—such as the fact that the survey excludes lawyers practicing on their own and includes only salaried attorneys, who populate large corporations. The chemists and engineers are problems because about 50 to 60 per cent of them work under contract to the government, according to an unpublished study for the Council of Economic Advisers. This causes acute worry when one realizes that contract salaries for the government are notoriously "flexible," meaning high.

Of course, those are only the adjustments of what goes *into* the BLS survey. When the numbers come out, there is room for further flexibility. They then go to the OMB–CSC committee for revision according to the second requirement of the comparability law—that "pay distinctions be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions." This process, called constructing a payline, is full of delicacies which are usually appreciated only by those who make or lose money by them.

The committee's calculations—involving the relative amounts of distinction contained in an enormous variety of jobs, education levels, performances, and the like—are designed to be understood only by the professional in personnel management.

This is the heart of comparability. A personnel manager is not terribly concerned about output, efficiency, or specific job function—he sees the world in terms of *levels*, as an orderly pattern of grids and niches leading up to the top in accordance with increasing distinction. Each level is defined primarily by the population in the levels immediately above and below. In actual personnel management, there is a second, though far less important, rule: jobs at the bottom levels are characterized by constant repetition, concrete tasks, and simplicity (therefore boredom), while those at the upper levels become increasingly sporadic in production, vague, and complex.

There are a couple of special properties to the personnel approach. First, there must be enough employees in any establishment to figure out everybody's relative level—so that all the people in the middle have others above and below them, to whom they are related by the chain of command. "When you have a job with only one person or so, say an engineer in a small company, it's more difficult," says Alan Paisner, one of about 100 BLS data collectors who start comparability rolling every year. "It's tough to classify his level because there's no pattern of who reports to him. But firms like that have less impact statistically than the big aerospace firms." So there must be a sizable organization, which is why most survey data is collected from industry's personnel and salary administrators.

Another special property is that the comparability system cannot handle people who perform more than one function. You must be specialized so that you can be classified so that you can be assigned a level. People who do a little of everything—sweep the floor, pay the bills, make decisions, write *and* type letters—mess things up because they operate on more than one level. They are discarded by the survey.

One special benefit of the level-making system is the increasing vagueness of the job descriptions at the higher levels. Since government grade levels are determined by a description of the job on paper, a skillful person can write a description of his duties in such distinctive, sweeping language that he will be promoted solely for that ingenuity, which of course ought to be worth something. Moreover, he can do this without lying and without any danger of being found out—because both his description and his actual job are so thoroughly nestled in the realm of vagueness that no one can possibly detect a discrepancy between the two.

CONGRESS AS LOAN SHARK

The handful of economists who know anything about federal salary systems generally feel that the current government salaries are higher than true comparability would warrant, at every grade. They criticize the process for not taking civil service job protection into account. "A window cleaner on the ground will not get the same pay as a window cleaner on a skyscraper even though they are doing the same thing," observed one economist, scientifically. "The way comparability is now administered, by ignoring the added security produced by tenure in the government you are paying them both the same."

The strongest economic objection to government salary calculations is that they ignore the benefits of the military and civil service retirement plans. Over half of private businesses have no retirement plans for their employees, who must get by on Social Security. Since Social Security is a far less generous plan, this factor alone gives the government an advantage. But there is a far greater difference. Government retirement benefits are based on the highest salaries of an employee's career (final salary in the military, an average of the highest three in the civil service), while contributions to the system—one half paid by the government—are designed to provide only for retirement on the current salary base. Every government pay increase, therefore, involves a retirement "gift" to the employees, who will live out their old age on a higher pension than they were contributing to before the increase.

Everyone is for comfortable pensions, of course, but the other side of the employee "gift" is a hidden public debt of enormous proportions. The civil service retirement fund now has about $65 billion less invested than it needs to be able to pay the obligations which the public owes to the retired employees of the future. Each year, that liability grows by the amount of the interest the $65 billion would have earned if the fund were balanced. The deficit was $43 billion in 1966. In addition to the loss of interest each year, the liability grows by $2.55 for each dollar of a pay increase. The most recent increase thus added about $2.55 billion to the deficit in the civil service fund. The military system is even worse off, with an unfunded liability about twice the $65 billion figure.

Without a new financing procedure, "the retirement fund would have been bankrupt by 1980," calculates Andrew Ruddock, chief of the Civil Service Commission's Retirement Division. So Congress finally passed a law authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer, "from the general revenues of the United States," whatever funds are necessary to pay the interest on the unfunded liability and thereby keep the deficit from growing. Treasury will make its first such payment this next summer—estimated at $236 million, or 10 per cent of the required interest—and will work up to a full stabilizing payment by 1980. All these funds are separate from the budget, requiring no appropriations.

Congress also made a rather shaky provision for the liability flowing from the annual comparability adjustment. Now the law says that each pay increase bill shall "deem to authorize" annual appropriations to pay for the increased retirement liability over the following 30 years. The 1971 payment, the first one under the new law, is estimated to be $157 million. It will stay constant for 30 years. Next year's increase will require its own payment, and so on—so that there could be as many as 30 payments made in a single year.

Even if you think that government retirement should be a lot better than the average private plan, you have trouble supporting the way it has been handled. Essentially, officeholders have found it profitable to vote for pay increases which obligate the country to pay off the "gift" portion of millions of pensions about 30 years from now. The employees and their unions know the value of the pension, and how it grows with salary levels. So the irresponsible and/or ignorant Congressman can dispense a gift to government workers, pick up the political benefits now, and pass the cost on to some future Congress. The huge liability which has been thus fashioned since World War II is not yet like the national debt. It is a debt to people in the future, who will expect their monthly checks.

All these things make no sense to economists. But they can be silenced by attributing a national security benefit to the system somewhere, and they have dismally meager influence on pay matters anyway. Besides, economists only analyze whether or not a system provides *true* comparability. They are not much help in deciding what to think of the idea in the first place.

REFLECTIONS OF PROFIT

Now that comparability has been achieved and promises to be maintained with yearly raises, perhaps time should be taken to ponder exactly what the cardinal principle of government pay means. It means that the United States accepts the salaries paid to workers by private businesses as a fair wage—and that the government will pay its employees no less, and no more. Comparability means that the nation, as well as the acquiescent employees, endorses the distribution of wealth between management and labor in private industry and pledges to reflect it.

From this angle, the 10-year stream of union testimony in favor of comparability as an equitable standard of compensation seems more than a little strange. Why would a son of labor join hands with high-ranking personnel types—who were themselves spouting Restonisms about the insufficient distinctiveness afforded executive pay—and troop up to Congress sounding as if business had found the key to fair labor policy within the government? John Griner, the American Federation of Government Employees president, finds the question easy: "We have come a long way, and that last bill was a step toward the eventual collective bargaining of federal wages." Spokesmen in Congressman Udall's office agree. It was tactical, a step. And you can bet that the employee unions will move to squeeze every drop of pay for the tedium of those jobs at the lower levels, where no other joy but money abides. That would mean bargaining, but of course the whole economy seems to be bargained. That, in turn, would mean votes and power, and it might lead to another "wage compression"

like the one that had the senior bureaucrats lathered up about 10 years ago.

The union strategy makes sense, at least. But the professional has a problem. Comparability robs public service of that sacrificial overtone, since it decrees that the public servant shall make as much, on average, as he would in an organization devoted only to cold profits. The professional has always felt a slight glow of moral superiority over the more avaricious hustlers out in the jungle. Now the federal employee achieves comparability and becomes a profit-monger like everyone on the outside. No more, no less, just average. So comparability turns the slight moral edge sour.

Things are actually worse than this. Consider the young man who came to Washington in 1966 to make a difference in the vital issues of poverty, hunger, and sickness—feeling scorn toward the profit-seeking world for having tolerated these things. He worked hard and did well, managing to move up from a grade 7 to a grade 13 job, where bright young people have a lot more to say about programs. What if you were that young person and you realized that your programs were not going to really help any poor, hungry, or sick people that much? What if you also realized that your salary had more than doubled in four years, that you were now making $17,761 a year, plus full fringe benefits, and the world's most amazing retirement program? What if you knew that you would receive an annual comparability increase, even though you were merely continuing to become faithfully tired every day? What if you suddenly realized that your pay increase was not only taking funds which might otherwise be given to poor people but that it was helping to create an inflation that sizzled those same poor people most mercilessly of all—and that if the poor child in your program did make it, he would have to figure out some way to pay your pension?

These thoughts would be unsettling. You might even conclude, with Pogo, that "we have met the enemy and they are us." You might decide that the personnel people are right, as usual, that there are no real distinctions between government and industry or between different jobs. Only between levels. Whether you are grinding out profits or carrying the torch for the poor is of little consequence. What counts is your level, which determines your distinction and your pay.

If you saw these things early enough—when you could afford to consider them personally—you would think about them. You might try to change some of the little things or even take on some of the big ones. If all else failed, you might have to desert your level—which means leaving any organization large enough to have levels—and step out where people are not suitable for the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey.

CHICAGO ITALICS CLUB HONORS DR. MARY ELLEN (MANCINA) BATINICH AND HON. VICTOR A. ARRIGO

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 13, 1971, at the Chateau Royale in Chicago, the Italics Club honored two distinguished Chicagoans—Dr. Mary Ellen (Mancina) Batinich and State Representative Victor A. Arrigo.

Over 500 people were in attendance at the Italics Club annual award dinner dance to extend recognition to the outstanding accomplishments of Dr. Batinich, who is presently serving as principal of the Schmid Elementary School in Chicago, and Representative Arrigo, who is the Illinois State representative for the 20th District.

I want to extend my warmest congratulations to Dr. Batinich and to Representative Arrigo for meriting respectively the Italics Club's 1971 Woman of the Year Award and the 1971 Man of the Year Award, and at this point in the RECORD include their brief biographies. The biographies follow:

DR. MARY ELLEN (MANCINA) BATINICH

Mary Ellen Batinich was born in Eveleth, Minnesota, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Mancina, Sr., both of Italian ancestry. She is the principal of the Schmid School in Chicago and has been a master teacher, reading coordinator and college instructor.

She received her B.M.E. degree from Northwestern University's School of Music and her M.A. degree from its School of Education; this university also conferred the Doctor of Philosophy degree upon her.

Since becoming a teacher in 1950, she has been active in educational, professional, cultural and civic affairs. She has been the guest speaker at numerous meetings in the fields of reading; the gifted, slow learning and bilingual Child; and the mass media. She has participated as a panelist at five annual Northwestern University Reading Conferences and as a speaker at five International Reading Association Conventions. As an appointed Illinois delegate, she attended the White House Conference on Children in Washington, D.C., in December, 1970.

Mary Ellen Batinich is the President of the Illinois State Reading Council and was chairman of its 1970 state conference held in Chicago. She was President of the Chicago Area Reading Association in 1968–69 and has been a member of its Board of Directors since 1966. She was President of the Gregorian Educator Association from 1965–1967, was one of its early organizers, and has been a member of its Board of Directors from 1964-1970.

Her publications include the following: "Invest in the Future: A College Education, 1969"; "Minnesota: Souvenir Coloring Book, 1965"; "Language Experience Activities," (Reading Teacher, 1970); "A 1967 Study of Televiewing" (with Paul A. Witty—Reading and Realism, International Reading Convention Proceedings, 1967); and "How the School Provides for the Abused Child," (Educational Forum, 1965 and Chicago Principal Club Reporter, 1964). In 1967–1968, she created a series of edu-car-toons, "Living Image," for Fra Noi, an Italo-American newspaper circulated in Chicago and suburbs. She has also written and illustrated the lives of six winners of the Gregorian "Man of the Year" Award.

A highlight of her musical career has been her appearance in a two-piano number (at the College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota) of Mozart's "Lodron Concerto" with Jozef Wagner, winner of the Bluethner Grand Piano Prize in Dresden, and the International Chopin Prize in Warsaw. She was presented in solo recital at the age of 15, has written many songs and lyrics, and continues to perform as a piano accompanist.

Mary Ellen (Mancina) Batinich is a member of the Board of Directors of the Women's Division of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans and was the chairman of its organizing committee in 1966; she was the sponsor of its first scholarship program in 1968. She organized the first Italian Folk Costume Committee for the Columbus Day Parade in 1965 and continued as this committee's annual chairman through 1970. She is also the Director of Library-Museum of the Italian Center in Stone Park.

She has been an Instructor at Northwestern University, Chicago Teachers College and Chicago State College. She is listed in "Who's Who in American Women"; "Who's Who in the Midwest"; "Illinois Lives"; and "Biography of International Information" (London).

Awards and Honors Received by Mary Ellen (Mancina) Batinich:

Leadership Award (1965)—Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, for "service rendered in relation to Authentic Italian Costume Contest for the Columbus Day Parade."

Gregorian Membership Drive Award (1966 and 1967)—Gregorian Educator Association, for "outstanding services in enrolling new members."

Special Citation in Reading (1967)—Chicago Area Reading Association, for "dedicated service rendered to the Chicago Area Reading Association during the years 1965–1967."

Gregorian Service Award (1967)—Gregorian Educators Association, for "outstanding efforts in behalf of the society."

Eighth Note Award (1968)—Mu Phi Epsilon Professional Music Society, for "outstanding service as Newsletter editor and her role in music therapy as a pianist from 1963–1968."

VICTOR A. ARRIGO

State Representative Victor A. Arrigo was born in Termini Imerese, Sicily, the son of American citizens who were on a prolonged return visit to their native city. He is a Chicago lawyer and a Veteran of World War II, with service in the United States Army as Prosecutor in the Allied Military Government Courts in Italy.

In February, 1944, he received honorary membership in the Bar Association in Messina, Sicily, in recognition for outstanding services in the administration of justice during the military occupation of that area. In August, 1944, he received a *Resolution of Commendation* from the Bar Association of the Province of Avellino for the equitable and objective manner in which he performed his duties as a Prosecutor.

Since discharge from military service in 1945, he has been active in civic, educational, cultural, professional and veterans' affairs. He is a charter member and chairman of the Mazzei Commemoration Committee of the Filippo Mazzei Post No. 1 (Illinois) of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States. For almost 20 years, Mr. Arrigo has been collecting material and doing extensive research on this neglected American patriot and fighter for American independence.

Victor A. Arrigo is a member of the Board of Directors of the Municipal Art League of Chicago; on the Board of Trustees of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans; *President of the Columbus Statue Committee*, responsible for the collection of funds to assure the upkeep and maintenance of the famous *Moses Ezekiel Columbian Exposition Statute of Christopher Columbus* which was unveiled at the dedication ceremonies of the Columbus Plaza on the near West Side of Chicago on October 12, 1966.

As a Member of the Illinois General Assembly, in 1967, his sponsorship of legislation resulted in the *Creation of Columbus Day* as a *Legal School Holiday* throughout the State of Illinois.

Victor A. Arrigo's dedicated service as a *Delegate* to the *Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention* culminating in the adoption of the *"Individual Dignity" section* of the Bill of Rights Article in the 1970 constitution of the State of Illinois.

His proposal, to the Legislative Committee of the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Conven-

tion, was adopted by the convention as Resolution #68, that the General Assembly of the State of Illinois be encouraged to make appropriate plans for the Celebration of the Discovery of America; and the members of the Illinois Congressional delegation in the United States Congress be encouraged to have the State of Illinois designated to Host the Official Celebration of the 500th Anniversary of the discovery of America.

Awards and Honors Received by Victor A. Arrigo:

Leadership Award Citations, 1961 and 1962—Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans;

Loyalty and Leadership Award, 1962, Filippo Mazzei Post, No. 1, for outstanding service to organization and Italian American Community;

Leadership Cup Award, 1964, Society of Italian American Musicians, for contributions to civic and cultural activities;

Special Citation of Merit, 1964, Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, for Development of theme and television narration of Columbus Day Parade for the last 12 years;

Special Citation of Merit, 1965, Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans for 15 lectures presented at Sojourn in Italy Programs, DePaul University—1963—1965;

Gregorian Award, 1965, for unusual contributions to education;

Key to City of Springfield Plaque, 1967, presented by the people of Springfield, Illinois, for outstanding civic leadership;

Humanitarian Award, 1969, Father Louis Pilgrimage to Mother Cabrini Shrine Society;

Member House of Representatives, 75th, 76th and 77th, Illinois General Assembly; Elected Delegate to the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention, 1969–1970; former columnist and writer of FRA-NOI "Our Legacy" column, 1960–1966; special lecturer Chicago Teachers College, Evanston Township High School and Concordia Teachers College and has appeared as commencement speaker at various graduation exercises in the Chicagoland area.

SAFE MEDICAL DEVICES

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress I introduced a Medical Device Safety Act which would have required premarket testing and clearance of electronic medical devices. The need for such legislation was supported by documentation of injuries and deaths resulting from faulty construction and improper handling of the technical equipment. The bill was never acted upon by either body of the Congress.

Now Ralph Nader has written an article in Ladies Home Journal of April 1971 in which he states:

> Too many hospitals are hazardous electrical horror chambers.

He estimates that at least 1,200 people a year are electrocuted and many more are killed or injured in needless electrical accidents. He reports that one medical engineer in New York, after testing thousands of medical instruments, found that 40 percent were defective.

We have given much attention in recent years to the problem of drug safety. The need for electrical device safety is equally important and has too long been overlooked. As our technology becomes more sophisticated, the danger increases. We must act to insure that the medical devises used in our hospitals are safe.

At this time I would like to place into the RECORD an article entitled "Ralph Nader's Most Shocking Exposé." I will shortly reintroduce legislation to remedy this most serious problem. I am hopeful that this time Congress will act.

RALPH NADER'S MOST SHOCKING EXPOSÉ

(By Ralph Nader)

Not long ago, a patient connected to an external heart pacemaker—an electronic device to help the heart function normally—was found dead, part of his body touching the metal frame of his electrically operated hospital bed.

In another hospital, a resident physician was discovered slumped lifeless beside a stainless steel table. He had been electrocuted when he touched an ungrounded oscilloscope (an instrument that monitors the heart pacemaker) and the table at the same time.

In yet another hospital, a patient suddenly became rigid during a routine diagnostic procedure, warning personnel to cut the electric power of an instrument that was sending potentially lethal currents into his heart. Fortunately, the patient survived.

In a fourth hospital, an electrical switch broke and a patient was crushed to death by a descending X-ray machine.

And in a speech last November 16, Roger O. Egeberg, M.D., Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, described another hospital tragedy: "Not long ago," Dr. Egeberg noted, "a woman in her midsixties entered a hospital in metropolitan Washington, D.C., for routine thyroid gland surgery. When the operation was completed and the patient was being sutured, the physician turned off the anesthesia machine. An explosion occurred, possibly caused by an electrical spark. Within four and a half hours the patient was dead as a result of the injuries she sustained in the blast."

Paradoxically, medical instruments that have brought hope of longer life to thousands of people have also increased a thousandfold the risks to hospital patients. "Lifesaving" electrical devices used in hospitals across the country electrocute an average of three patients a day, at the lowest estimate. Other patients die as a result of electrical burns, explosions or loss of instrument control. Since the advent of the heart pacemaker and cardiac catheterization—the insertion of a catheter, or tube, into the heart—the hospital environment has become so dangerous that today it is the site of more electrical accidents than any industry except mining.

Spectacular advances in medical technology have unquestionably opened new horizons for people suffering from heart and lung disorders and other diseases. Those who may benefit—for example, the 20,000 patients who receive implanted heart pacemakers each year—may understandably be willing to hazard risks in hope of staying alive. But the myths of the medical machine lead us to believe that most of these risks are unavoidable. The tragedy is that most are not.

Most electrical accidents in hospitals occur because safety measures that can reduce risks are grossly neglected or even unknown among hospital staffs; because complex and highly dangerous equipment is installed in hospitals that have primitive wiring systems, and the equipment is operated by untrained personnel; and because machines that reach inside a human being and touch his heart are less well tested than plumbing devices in our bathrooms.

These accidents often occur because manufacturers design dangerous devices without making them fail-safe against even the most common mistakes of operators. The real risk for a hospital patient may be considerably less than esotoric. It may be the risk that hospital staff will decide to use a frayed electrical cord one more time, or, for the heart patient with an external pacemaker, that he will be placed in an electrically operated bed—a highly dangerous but common occurrence. Or instead of employing a qualified biomedical engineer, a hospital administrator may ask the building electrician to install complex new equipment.

Most of these instances of negligence remain hidden by the fact that physicians and hospitals habitually report deaths by electrocution as "cardiac arrest."

Electrical gadgetry and the accompanying hazards of electric shock are everywhere in our environment—in our homes, schools and offices. When a young guitarist is electrocuted by his instrument, or when a priest is killed by an electrically operated weight reducer—two incidents recently reported in the press—we want to know what went wrong. Was the guitar defective? Was the wiring bad? Did the victim use the machine improperly? Unfortunately, these questions are not often asked in hospitals, where at the very least 1,200 Americans are electrocuted annually during routine diagnostic and therapeutic procedures.

We do not even have a clear idea of the number of hospital fatalities caused by electric shock. Medical engineers such as Professor Hans von der Mosel, co-chairman of the Subcommittee on Electrical Safety of the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation and safety consultant to New York City's Health Services Administration, believe that the number might be 10 times as high as the conservative estimate of 1,200. Yet most of these deaths could have been prevented by adequate safety measures.

For the patient whose heart is made accessible to electric current through electrodes and catheters, merely touching the frame of a hospital bed, especially an electrically operated bed, may prove fatal. This happened to a 52-year-old man who was connected to an external pacemaker by means of a catheter inserted into the heart itself. Someone had attached to the pacemaker an ungrounded extension cord that eliminated the instrument's grounding system. When a current leaked from the pacemaker, as it frequently does, it passed through the catheter electrode into the patient's heart, then through the part of his body in contact with the grounded electrically elevated bed.

The death could have been prevented in at least three ways: if hospital staff had not attached an ungrounded extension cord to the pacemaker (extension cords should never be used with such equipment): if the patient had not been placed in an electrically operated bed; if the pacemaker had carried a device that limited the current in the patient's circuit to a safe level.

This death was investigated because it was the third such fatality in less than two months at that hospital. It is possible, even likely, that the other deaths, which were not investigated, were also due to electrocution. But most such deaths are not reported. Almost invariably, when electrocutions happen during diagnostic procedures in which the patient is hooked up to electronic systems, the deaths are listed as cardiac arrests. Without engineering analysis, it is difficult to tell whether a patient died of his disease or of a shock caused by the equipment. To protect themselves against malpractice suits, physicians and

hospitals avoid such investigations, and many hazards go undetected and uncorrected. There have been few lawsuits over these deaths, and thus the hazards have been little publicized. Insurance companies that make studies of electrical hazards have not alerted the public to the dangers or to the incidence of death. Statistics have hidden the fact that a shock-hazard epidemic of critical proportions exists in our hospitals.

The hazards of electrical devices are not limited to delicate equipment such as the heart pacemaker. Routine electrical equipment may also cause death. Take the case of the patient who was squeezed to death when the switch controlling the X-ray machine's vertical movement failed while the machine was being lowered over him. He died before the technician could open the circuit breaker located some distance away.

What caused the switch to fail? A broken contact blade that shorted a circuit. The break had probably existed for some time. If the hospital had conducted regular equipment checks, the fault would probably have been discovered and corrected. In addition, precious time was lost because the main switch, which cuts all power to the instrument, was not easily accessible. Finally, the circuit breakers were not clearly marked, and the technician opened three different electrical circuits before he found the right one.

Nor are electrical accidents limited to patients. A young Canadian physician nearly died of electric shock when he pressed the discharge button on a defibrillator. This machine, used for correcting uncoordinated heartbeat, is inherently dangerous because it is designed to deliver a high-energy shock. Examination revealed that the ground wire in the three-prong plug had been broken, presumably when someone attempted to force the plug into a two-hole socket. Thus current was released—first into the chassis of the machine, then into the physician.

INEXCUSABLE NEGLIGENCE

Some fatalities are caused by inexcusable negligence. Many devices are used with adapter plugs that don't ensure grounding. That is what happened with the hospital doctor who was found dead, the metallic switch of the oscilloscope in his right hand, his left hand touching a metal drawer of the stainless steel table on which the instrument was standing. A device in the power supply circuit of the oscilloscope had shorted, shooting 300 volts into the cabinet of the instrument. The oscilloscope should have been grounded through the grounding prong of the three-prong connector, instead a three-to-two-prong adapter (called a "cheater adapter") was in use. In this case, the adapter was completely unnecessary to connect the instrument, but the instrument was not designed to prevent the mistake. Because it was ungrounded, and because the doctor was touching a grounded steel table, the current passed through his right arm, through his trunk, heart and left arm into the grounded table.

Physicians and hospital personnel have been aware for some time of the hazards of electrically ignited explosions and external electric shock.

Some progress has been made in reducing the danger of explosions in operating rooms by employing standard safety precautions and, in a few hospitals, by eliminating flammable anesthetics. But there is little if any protection against a newer hazard—internal shock. Catheters, electrodes and prones have opened pathways to the heart through which very small accidental currents can kill a patient. A shock of 20 microamps across the heart can cause fibrillation, which after one minute results in irreversible brain damage and after three minutes, in death. At the surface of the body, a shock must be a thousand times greater to produce fibrillation.

SIX WAYS TO MAKE YOUR HOSPITAL SAFER ELECTRICALLY

1. Organize a citizens' group to investigate the administrator of your community hospital's electrical safety system. If possible, take an electrical engineer with you, or have one brief you on important questions to ask. Does the hospital have proper wiring? Does the hospital utilize the services of biomedical engineers? Are devices and device systems tested before they are hooked up to a patient? What are the provisions for testing new equipment?

2. Citizens and community groups can demand investigation of hospital fatalities. Find out who monitors accidents in your community hospital. When accidents are attributed to "cardiac arrest," was that the real cause of death? Are electrical systems always tested after deaths and injuries occur that could be attributed to electrical or equipment failure?

3. Is there an electrical device safety committee at your hospital? Organize a group of concerned citizens to meet with hospital review committees to ask what precautions are taken in the use of electrical devices.

4. Ask the company that insures your community hospital for statistics on electrical accidents at the hospital.

5. Urge your newspaper to make a thorough investigation of electrical devices in local hospitals and to publicize any particular problems.

6. If you are a professional engineer, take the lead in exposing and correcting electrical problems in local hospitals.

If properly grounded, most devices are safe when used by themselves. But most of the time, the patient is connected not to one but to several electrical devices. In addition, he may touch any number of other electric appliances—bed, radio, television, clock, lamp. He may also come in contact with routine equipment, such as portable X-ray machines, physiotherapy apparatus and respirators. In such an environment, the risk is extremely great that a stray electrical current will complete a circuit to ground through the patient. Most electrocutions happen in just this way. Prevention of death or injury from internal shock requires expert planning, sophisticated wiring systems, and careful, constant testing.

Few hospitals, even the newer ones, have adequate electric wiring systems.

Most need extensive modernization to provide a safe environment for new electrical devices that are in wide-spread use. Electrical overloading is common. Many hospital outlets are incorrectly wired or provide no ground contact. In most cases these outlets were installed by hospital electricians when equipment appeared with three wires. As long as the plugs went in, the electrician believed his job was done.

Only three hospitals in the country have biomedical engineers on their staffs to supervise the operation and maintenance of complex machines: Downstate Medical Center in New York City; Sinai Hospital in Baltimore; and Charles S. Wilson Hospital in Johnson City, N.Y. Most hospitals simply turn over the apparatus to a staff physician who may have worked with electronic equipment. Hospitals do not yet have electrical device safety committees comparable to drug safety committees, although the two hazards are equally great. Few physicians who deal with these devices know as much about the concepts behind them or about their use as they know about pharmacology. Yet for years physicians operated these devices without recognizing either their potential hazards or the actual fatalities they caused. Countless deaths attributed to cardiac arrest are now believed to have been caused by internal electric shock. Even now that there is greater understanding of the risks posed by the new hospital environment, precautionary measures are inadequate.

While inadequate hospital facilities and errors in using the machines are leading causes of accidents, mechanical defects also play a part in imperiling patients' lives. One medical engineer, Seymour Ben-Zvi, tested several thousand instruments at Downstate Medical Center in New York City. He reported that 40 percent were defective. Every one of the 10 defibrillators he tested contained defects. One was capable of discharging high voltage into a patient before the physician signaled for it. Such a defect could kill both patient and physician. Another instrument had what the manufacturer thought was an insulator; it was actually a good conductor of electricity—a potentially fatal flaw that should have been discovered through testing. (The testing program at Downstate began in 1956, and Ben-Zvi states that most manufacturers now agree to correct defects found.)

C. W. Walter, a clinical professor of surgery at Harvard Medical School, has reported that two prominent firms are now selling highly dangerous machines. Poor circuit design is a common criticism, and many devices have problems stemming from high leakage of current, problems often revealed only through the death of a patient. Some manufacturers offer to replace equipment; they cannot replace a dead person.

TOILETS AND PACEMAKERS

Mrs. Virginia Knauer, President Nixon's Assistant for Consumer Affairs, has pointed out that toilet valves must pass several preclearance tests before they are installed in our bathrooms, but a pacemaker that is inserted into our hearts need not be tested at all. Heart pacemakers, artificial kidneys, hip pins and respirators—none are subject to standard inspection or regulation—as are drugs, for example.

Manufacturing of medical devices is a $500-million-a-year industry engaged in by more than 1,000 firms. Without regulations or standards, there has been little impetus for these firms to standardize their products. Manufacturers' resistance to standardization has created an unnecessary hazard, since each hospital must sort out discrepancies in connectors and devise a system to prevent hazardous currents from being applied to helpless patients. Generally, the manufacturer considers his product a separate unit rather than part of a total treatment system, although a device is rarely used by itself.

In designing instruments, manufacturers almost totally ignore the ease with which mistakes can be made in the hospital environment, where personnel are often hurried, strained or tired, and untrained in the use of the equipment. Fatal errors are made that could be prevented by safer design.

Often the grounding devices furnished with electrical equipment are weak, easily broken and not designed for rough handling. They are not remotely foolproof, not fail-safe and not even reliable. Cords and plugs, the most vulnerable part of the electrical safety system, are usually "totally inadequate," according to Professor Walter. On occasion, a complex and expensive piece of equipment is equipped with a cheap, inefficient plug.

Fatally for patients and staff, manufacturers often assume that users have technical competence, which they almost universally lack. Instruction booklets, labels, foolproofing and protection devices are far inferior to what is needed.

One respected independent testing agency that has begun to test and evaluate medical equipment reports an "appalling" number of defective instruments. Research at the Emergency Care Research Institute of Philadelphia revealed, for example, defective respirators that were "totally unable to support respiration." The Food and Drug Administration has recalled a number of these devices.

Dr. Joel J. Nobel, ECRI's director of research, says that "the number of life-threatening defects is truly appalling. Most are basic design deficiencies."

ECRI is a nonprofit organization supported by government agencies, hospitals and private contributions. No staff member receives consulting fees from the health devices industry. ECRI findings indicate that, in the absence of objective testing and evaluation, unsafe equipment is being used in hospitals that are unequipped to pretest it.

Hospital associations in three regions—California, Texas and New England—are in the process of setting up medical product information exchange systems. Central testing programs to serve all hospitals in a region are much more feasible than tests conducted in individual hospitals, but such programs have yet to get underway.

At present, there are no government regulations requiring premarket clearance or standards to ensure the safety and performance of certain medical devices, such as catheters, pacemakers, diathermy machines and bone pins. During the past several years, efforts to bring new devices under regulations have failed. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon have supported regulations and minimum standards for medical devices. In September 1970 a study group appointed by President Nixon and headed by Dr. Theodore Cooper, Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Institutes of Health, recommended legislation to regulate these devices.

A bill has been introduced by Congressman Thomas Foley (D., Wash.) to establish regulations and standards for devices not covered by present law. This bill was originally proposed in 1969, but no action has yet been taken. Legislation has been stymied in part by claims that standards for such instruments are difficult to set. But the failure of physicians to publicize the real extent of the hazards is the reason why the need for legislation has been unnoticed.

Pretesting of these devices by independent testing agencies and establishment of uniform government standards will help ensure that the instruments are safe, that they are fail-safe and that they assume much less knowledge and expertise on the part of the typical hospital employee who runs them.

But beyond government standards, what is needed is greater vigilance by hospitals and physicians. In the absence of trained personnel, adequate electrical systems and rigid inspection and testing, even the best designed machine may become a killer. Unfortunately, there is little indication, on a broad scale, that hospitals and physicians are prepared to make a major commitment to electrical safety. Instead, there is every indication that accidents are occurring more frequently. The public may well ask where the electric safety committees in hospitals are, or the services of biomedical engineers. Where are the research grants to study questions of safety? Where is the leadership of medical organizations that should be demanding safety from manufacturers and help in ensuring safety from governments? I do not believe the public should have to accept the response one physician made to the problem of hospital safety: that after all, most electrical accidents occur in the home.

It is true that there is too little understanding of electrical hazards. The use of two-prong plugs (without a third grounding wire) is a simple hazard that continues to exist in many homes and other buildings. The naïveté of physicians who use intricate devices is undoubtedly shared by many other people who do not understand when or why electrical devices can be hazardous. The housewife who simultaneously touches a toaster and a refrigerator handle and receives a shock usually lives to return the toaster, or change the wiring, or complain to the manufacturer. The heart patient who receives the same kind of shock is not so fortunate.

If we have the technology to stimulate the heart, to sustain life and to probe the innermost regions of the body, we also have the means to make devices that are safe from human error. The unprecedented hope offered by new medical technology does not need to be accompanied by unprecedented risk. Such avoidable tragedies in our hospitals will not be stopped until manufacturers recognize the limitations of the personnel who use their devices, and until users demand that safety be built into the devices. Dangers that have been veiled as unavoidable risks, or risks inherent in the condition of the patient, must be exposed. Until they are, new medical devices will continue their Jekyll-and-Hyde role—they are life-giving devices for some, but death machines for others.

PENSION PLAN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, last year the General Subcommittee on Labor on which I serve held hearings for more than 6 months on the vital matter of protecting the pensions of more than 30 million American workingmen and women. The testimony collected during these proceedings strongly indicated the need for legislation in this area.

It does not matter if the individual works in a plant, a factory or an office. It makes no difference if he or she goes to work dressed in grease spattered work clothes or is dressed in the latest fashion. If they are enrolled in a pension plan, they need some type of protection to assure them they will get that pension when the day of retirement arrives.

Pension plan contributions is big business today. There are more than 50,000 private pension plans now in operation with assets in excess of $130 billion and growing at the rate of $7 billion a year. Many of these plans are good and live up to the bargain made with the employee. But the tragic fact is many do not live up to the intent of the pension plan program; that is, to give the worker a source of income in his retirement years—a source of income which he has paid for, either in direct contributions or in deferred wages under a negotiated contract.

It is estimated there are 17,000 pension plans on file with the Labor Department involving 21 million workers. Yet it is also estimated only 6 million of these workers will ever draw a penny from their pension fund benefits.

There are, of course, numerous reasons for this and I do not mean to imply that all of them are cloaked in shadowy chicanery, aimed at bilking a worker. There are legitimate reasons whereby a worker could become the victim of circumstances resulting from the hazards of the competitive business world.

For instance, a company can go bankrupt, go down the drain and take its pension program with it. Depending on the provisions of its particular pension plan, a company might have the authority to arbitrarily dissolve the pension fund. Also, it is not unusual today to have a company gobbled up by a mammoth conglomerate and when this happens, the defunct company is relieved of its former pension responsibilities. It also is possible a sound pension fund can be wiped out through honest, but incompetent, management on the part of the trustees and administrators.

Many workers also forfeit their pension rights by leaving their jobs before becoming fully qualified for eligibility under a particular plan. Female secretaries often work for a company for several years but then leave to get married and raise families. This could cost them their pension benefits, depending on the company's plan. Sometimes a worker must leave his job for reasons of health before he is qualified for his plan's pension benefits. He or she may have to move to another part of the country and again he may not have worked long enough for his former company and now must start from scratch with a new employer under a new plan.

I believe it is grossly unfair for a person who has contributed toward a pension to help support him in his old age to lose that pension through loopholes in his company's program or for reasons not of his own doing or choice.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation in the 92d Congress to protect the pension rights of white- and blue-collar workers alike, to assure them of a source of income when they retire from the Nation's productive working force.

My employee benefit security bill would establish minimum standards of fiduciary conduct for trustees and administrators of pension plans and provide for enforcement of those standards through legal proceedings, both civil and criminal. My bill also would require expanded reporting of details of a plan's administrative and financial standing.

As proposed, the bill orders private pension plans to make irrevocable the accrued benefits of employees with significant periods of service with an employer; to set minimum standards of funding and to protect the vested rights of participants in the plan against losses due to essentially involuntary termination.

Pension fund administrators will be required to report annually the amount contributed by the employer, benefits paid, the number of employees covered, and a detailed statement of expenditures charged against the fund. The bill also makes the administrator furnish each year to members of the pension plan a statement indicating whether that individual has accrued vested rights to pension benefits and to what extent.

This legislation will prohibit trustees and administrators of pension programs from using the pension fund for personal gain. They will not be permitted to benefit, directly or indirectly, from any transaction involving the property of the pension fund. Willful violations of these provisions carry penalties ranging

from $1,000 to $10,000 fines; prison terms ranging from 1 to 5 years; or a combination of the two.

Pension protection of this type is long past due. The Federal Government has set a precedent in acting to protect the financial savings of its taxpayers. Through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, it protects the individual's bank savings account. The depositor knows when he puts money into that account it will be there when he needs it. But the worker has no such guarantee when he puts his dollars into a pension fund. If the Government can protect a bank account, can it do less in protecting the pension rights of the worker?

HON. A. A. BERLE, JR.

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, recently this Nation lost one of its ablest citizens of this century. I refer to my good friend and the friend of many of my colleagues in this Congress and previous Congresses. the honorable A. A. Berle, Jr., who was 76 years of age at the time of his death.

While I had read and heard of Mr. Berle as an author while I was a college student during the depression years of the 30's, I got to know him as a person during the post-World War II Truman years. I met him in the home of my good friends Herbert and Barbara Cummings. Herb Cummings was the young protege brought to Washington by Dr. Berle when he joined the State Department.

Mr. Berle had a basic and fundamental care for people as people and not just as a means to serve some economic goal. This intimate knowledge of Mr. Berle came about largely through my association with Herb Cummings. Mr. Cummings, now in the Office of Foreign Commercial Services, was kind enough to relate to me the following observations about Mr. Berle which I would like to share with my colleagues:

A. A. BERLE, JR.: THE COMBINATION OF BRAINS AND CONSCIENCE

(By Mr. Herbert Cummings)

My memories of Adolph Berle are both vivid and varied. They vary in time from Berle, the elder statesman who directed a task force on Latin America for President Kennedy, to Berle the child prodigy who had collected a B.A. and M.A. and an LL.B. from Harvard by the the time he was 21; who at 24 had resigned from the American Delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 on the grounds that he would not be a party to mandating certain islands in the Pacific to the Japanese Government because such action would pose a future security threat to the United States.

Our memories of his professional competence vary from his work as one of President Roosevelt's three original Brain Trusters in national and international finance and diplomacy to his well-merited reputation in the teaching and practice of corporation law and on to his searching and constructively critical analysis of our economic, social and political institutions in such books as *The Modern Corporation* and *Private Property;* the *Twentieth Century Capitalist Revolution;* and *Power*.

We shall also remember him for inspiring many younger men in government and out to use their talents and energy to shape our economic and social institutions to bring the promises of the founding fathers closer to fulfillment. His intellectual curiosity, his deep grounding in human institutional behavior from the ancient Greeks to modern Tammany, his ability to perform effectively *where the action was*—at the precinct, city, national or international level, set very high standards of public service in and out of government.

Those of us who were privileged to spend an occasional evening with him in wide-ranging and stimulating conversation were constantly as impressed with his compelling human decency as with his great mental prowess. It was this unique combination of conscience and brains that gave us in our period a man who would have been at ease in the company of Jefferson, Paine, Madison, Hamilton and Jay and who would serve as a great inspiration to future leaders of this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to complement these personal reflections of mine and Mr. Cummings with a fine article by Albin Krebs which appeared in the New York Times recently and appears below:

ADOLF A. BERLE JR. DIES AT AGE OF 76—LAWYER, ECONOMIST, LIBERAL LEADER AIDED PRESIDENTS

(By Albin Krebs)

Adolf A. Berle Jr., the lawyer, economist, law professor, diplomat and Liberal party leader who first came to prominence as one of the original members of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Brains Trust," died Wednesday at his home, 142 East 19th Street.

Mr. Berle, who was 76 years old, had been ill for two years. The immediate cause of his death was a massive stroke.

As counsel to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the New Deal, Mr. Berle had much to do with shaping legislation to reform banking, the stock market and railroading. At one point he was an Assistant Secretary of State, a position in which he became a leading authority on Latin-American affairs.

The multifaceted Mr. Berle (pronounced burly) also served as chamberlain of New York City in the administration of Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia, as a founder and chairman of the Liberal party and as a Latin-American affairs troubleshooter, for President John F. Kennedy.

All the while, he managed to juggle his several public careers with maintaining a law office and serving, from 1927 to 1964, as a professor of corporation law at Columbia University.

A short, intense, small-boned man with the energy of a dynamo, Mr. Berle had a brilliant mind and, according to some New Dealers whom he rubbed the wrong way, he knew it.

He came by his iconoclasm naturally. His mother, the former Augusta Wright, irked her well-to-do New England family by going out West while still in her teens to work as a missionary to the Sioux Indians.

Mr. Berle was born in Boston on Jan. 29, 1895. His father, the Rev. Dr. Adolf Augustus Berle, a Congregationalist minister, was one of the most controversial and forward-looking clergymen of his day, a benign autocrat who believed that there was "an appalling waste in elementary school education."

He himself looked after the early schooling of the young Adolf and the other Berle children, Rudolf, Miriam and Lina.

TAUGHT SEVERAL LANGUAGES

He taught them several languages and insisted that they memorize long passages from Virgil, Goethe, Homer and Dante even before they could read. Young Adolf was graduated from high school at age 12 and easily passed the entrance examinations for Harvard, although he was not allowed to begin his studies there until he was 14.

Harvard was a breeze. He received a bachelor's degree in 1913, when he was 18, and a master's degree the following year, and in 1916 he was graduated cum laude from the Harvard Law School.

After practicing law in Boston with Louis Brandeis's firm for a year, Mr. Berle joined the Army as a private. His noncombatant service was brief, and then, as a first lieutenant, he was a member of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace with Germany at Versailles.

"I didn't approve of the Treaty of Versailles that was finally signed, and resigned from the commission in disillusionment in 1919," Mr. Berle said in an interview for this article in 1970. "But I didn't lose my idealism and join the Lost Generation—the equivalent of today's young dropouts. I went to work."

With his brother, Rudolf, Mr. Berle set up law practice here in 1919. He remained active in the firm, Berle & Berle, at 70 Pine Street, until his death. For several years he was associated with the Henry Street Settlement, a pioneer organization formed to promote social justice. In 1927, the year he joined the Columbia law faculty, he married Beatrice Bend Bishop.

WORKED ON TREATISE

In collaboration with Gardiner E. Means, a Columbia colleague, Mr. Berle wrote "The Modern Corporation and Private Property," one of the most influential economic treatises of its time. Based on a massive study of American corporations in the nineteen-twenties, the book concluded that the modern corporation had become almost independent of its stockholders and that its managers could compete, in terms of power, with the modern state. The authors suggested a wide range of controls on corporations.

The work, published in 1932, brought Mr. Berle to the attention of Raymond Moley, who had been asked by the then Governor Roosevelt to gather a group of experts to advise him in his Presidential campaign on means of dealing with the issue of the nation's growing economic crisis. Mr. Moley recruited Rexford G. Tugwell, a professor of political science at Columbia, and Mr. Berle, who, together with former State Supreme Court Justice Samuel Rosenman and Basil O'Connor, Mr. Roosevelt's law partner, formed the original "Brains Trust."

"I felt caught up in a great moment in history," Mr. Berle recalled in the interview last year. "Roosevelt was an inspiring, vital man for whom I burned to do service."

From the first, Mr. Berle's often abrasive manner won him enemies in the Roosevelt inner circle. "He was capable, if necessary, of diplomacy," wrote Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "but, with his edgy manner and his intolerance of fools, he sometimes exploded in sarcasm and disgust."

(In 1970, it was revealed, in long-secret papers declassified by the British Foreign Office, that Mr. Berle also rubbed some foreigners the wrong way. Sir Ronald Lindsey, British Ambassador to Washington in 1939, characterized Mr. Berle as "100 per cent intellectual." But, Sir Ronald added in qualification, Mr. Berle was "a specialist in too many subjects to be quite convincing in any of them," and, further, he "had an academic career at Harvard of such distinction that he has never quite recovered from it.")

Early on, he got into a dispute with Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, a Roosevelt confidant who believed, in general, that big business would have to be broken up into small units. Mr. Berle took the view that big business was here to stay and could be dealt with by strong government regula-

tion, and he told Justice Frankfurter so in blistering terms. Roosevelt aides smoothed things over with the Justice by asking Mr. Berle to leave the train.

After the Roosevelt landslide, Mr. Berle turned down any major role in the Administration, but became counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the agency charged by the President with helping the nation's banks, railroads and insurance companies recover from the Depression.

For his part, Mr. Berle sought to give the New Deal the reasonable and moderate tone he believed Mr. Roosevelt wanted for it. "It is just possible," he said, "that all the social inventiveness of the world was not exploded between the two poles of Adam Smith and Karl Marx."

Mr. Berle helped draft Section 77B of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, designed to liberalize receiverships, and, as an adviser to the President, he suggested methods, later adopted, by which the securities and Exchange Commission controls stock transactions. He also served as a Roosevelt speech writer.

He remained a frequent consultant to the President from 1934 to 1938, a period in which he served Mayor La Guardia as city chamberlain. Part of his responsibility was municipal planning, but Mr. Berle came to look upon the chamberlain's job as obsolete and recommended that it be abolished. It was, later, with the chamberlain's office being absorbed into the office of City Controller.

In 1938 Mr. Roosevelt appointed Mr. Berle Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs. Mr. Berle prepared the President's position papers on dealings with Latin America during World War II and served as his delegate to several Pan American conferences. In 1945 he became Ambassador to Brazil, but left the State Department the following year after a quarrel with Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius.

During the next 15 years Mr. Berle devoted himself full time to his law practice and to teaching at the Columbia Law School, which made him professor emeritus in 1964. From 1952 to 1955 he served as chairman of the Liberal party, which he had helped to found.

In 1960 President Kennedy asked Mr. Berle to be chairman of a six-member task force to advise him on Latin-American affairs. In that capacity, Mr. Berle advocated creation of the Alliance for Progress. He also was among those who recommended to Mr. Kennedy United States support of the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles opposed to Premier Fidel Castro in 1961.

Mr. Berle considered himself "an old revolutionary" from the New Deal era, he said last year, but he maintained he had "not a damn bit of use for the New Leftists of today, who haven't the brains or patience to develop a program to substitute for the one they despise so."

He complained bitterly that "the New Left has embarked on a calculated campaign to discredit F.D.R. and downgrade his accomplishments—and those of us who worked with him."

"The New Left claims that Roosevelt didn't go far enough," he said, "but what they are incapable of seeing is that Roosevelt went as far as possible. The people didn't want full revolution; they wanted jobs and they wanted the government that they had to get to work, which it did."

Mr. Berle was particularly proud of his association since 1932 with the Twentieth Century Fund, a foundation that does research in economic and social questions. He was the fund's board chairman from 1951 until his death.

Among Mr. Berle's books were "New Directions in the New World" (1940), "The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution" (1954), "The American Economic Republic" (1963) and "Power" (1969), in which he summed up his views formed over a lifetime.

PREDICTION ON ECONOMY

"The United States does not prosper if only the rich grow richer," he wrote. "It can thrive only as poverty is progressively abolished . . . To contemporary American corporations, underpaid and starved labor means a shortage of customers to buy motorcars, television sets . . . not to mention the necessities of life. . ."

For more than 40 years, Mr. Berle maintained his home on East 19th Street, as well as a farmhouse at Great Barrington, Mass., where he liked to garden and fish for trout in Berkshire mountain streams.

Mr. Berle is survived by his widow, a physician who has been a pioneer in community medicine and recently has been active in the methadone maintenance program for the treatment of heroin addicts at Bronx State Hospital.

He also leaves a son, Peter A. A. Berle, who was elected to the State Assembly in 1968 as a Democrat-Liberal; two daughters, Mrs. Clan Crawford of Ann Arbor, Mich., and Mrs. Dean W. Meyerson of Washington; his two sisters, Lina W. Berle and Mrs. Miriam Clay; his brother, Rudolf, and 10 grandchildren.

A private family service will be held tomorrow in Great Barrington, and there will be a memorial service at 3 P.M. Monday in St. Paul's Chapel at Columbia University.

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, as the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War approaches, I would like to salute a man who had made tireless efforts to acquire the freedom of our men held in North Vietnam.

H. Ross Perot is a man whom it has been my pleasure to call a friend over the past years. This country has been good to him, and he has, in the words of the New York Times Magazine, "paid his dues." Unlike the stereotype of a Texas millionaire, he has maintained his modesty and sense of responsibility as a citizen of his country.

It is a tribute to the quality of this man that the New York Times, not noted for its kindness to Texans, has devoted an article to the story of H. Ross Perot which draws an accurate picture of this fine American.

I am pleased to share with you and our colleagues the text of this article:

H. ROSS PEROT PAYS HIS DUES

(By Fred Powledge)

DALLAS.—H. Ross Perot is a Texas millionaire (before the stock market got sick he was a Texas billionaire) who talks about patriotism and saving America and who, a year ago, tried to deliver 26 tons of Christmas packages to American prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

That's one way, maybe the prevailing way, of looking at it. There are lots of conclusions ready to be jumped to—for example, just another Texas millionaire, undoubtedly stridently right-wing, probably oppressively superpatriotic, more than likely the kind of man who gobbles up television stations and newspapers and publishes his own "newsletter" to force-feed his ideas to the rest of the nation. Unfortunately for the stereotypists, however, H. Ross Perot is none of that.

He is a surprisingly modest man who neither wears cowboy boots nor flies his own airplane; who dials his own telephone calls; who wears a G.I. haircut and jokes about it (it is an "extremist" fashion, he says, and for that reason he cannot worry about people with longer hair); who has never met H. L. Hunt, and whose only involvement with the petroleum business is putting oil into the crankcase of his 5-year-old car.

He has given millions to aid the underprivileged in Dallas, a town well known for the uninvolvement of its business leaders in the real plight of the common folk. He is a former computer salesman who has, in less than eight years, built a new company in a new industry—the computer service field—from a $1,000 personal investment into a $48-million-a-year pot of gold that has doubled in size and revenue annually. And, perhaps most amazingly, he has built that company on a philosophy that is almost unique—that ranks honesty and quality above profits, that insures room at the top for talented young people and strictly outlaws company politics.

Perot is also the man who somehow thinks that if enough American citizens can get themselves involved, they can bring home the 1,600 U.S. prisoners of war and men declared missing in action in Vietnam. And, not knowing that this last undertaking is impossible, he is having some success at it.

Ross Perot (the "H."—it stands for Henry—was never used until Perot—pronounced Puh-ROW—found that others wanted him to have something at the head of his name when he became important) is, in terms of the stereotypical successful Texas businessman, something of a paradox. When one considers his involvement in the prisoner-of-war effort, he appears to be more of a paradox. But even a brief examination of his background will show that he is neither fooling nor eccentric.

He was born 40 years ago in Texarkana, in East Texas. His father was a cotton broker whose sideline was trading in horses and cattle. Partly because the elder Perot's work was seasonal, he was able to spend a lot of time with young Ross, who remembers: "He worked hard from September through November, and he and I played the rest of the year. He was my best friend, and I was his."

Perot's father was also his best tutor in the arts of business: "I spent my entire boyhood involved in the very basic of what business is. My father dealt with the farmer who raised the cotton. He taught me as a small boy that buying cotton from a man once had very little value unless you developed a personal relationship with him, unless you treated him fairly, unless he trusted you. Otherwise, he won't come back to you next year."

Perot used his business sense in a series of small-boy enterprises—selling Christmas cards and magazine subscriptions door to door, delivering The Texarkana Gazette by horseback on a route that included a good number of low-income black subscribers. The paper had never bothered to establish the route until Perot suggested it, and the youngster soon learned what every newsboy knows: it is the well-to-do, the doctors and executives, on a newspaper route who are the terrible deadheads when it comes to paying a bill; the poor folk are far more conscientious.

"I found out that by giving these people good service," he recalls, "they paid promptly. I'd put the paper behind their door. That was kind of an interesting thing, for them to have a white boy on a horse, whether it was raining or not, bringing the paper to them and giving them the same service the

white people got. I had customer loyalty. I'll never have again."

Perot wanted to be a sailor, and he got his first glimpse of the ocean when he entered the U.S. Naval Academy in 1949. It was in the Navy, as fire-control officer on an aircraft carrier, that he first got involved in what computer people call "information systems"—the devices, rather crude by todays' standards, that took information from the ship's radar and used it to aim the guns. And it was on the carrier that Perot met a visiting V.I.P., an executive from International Business Machines Corporation, who was impressed with the sailor and said what V.I.P.'s say on such occasions: "Look me up when you get out."

Perot did just that. He became a computer salesman for I.B.M. in Dallas, and was so good at it that in his fifth year there he managed to sell his annual quota three weeks after the new year started. The prize for this feat was the right to sit around in an office staring at the THINK signs—a devastating reward for a man whose preoccupation was turning his thoughts as quickly as possible into action. While sitting around the office, Perot happened across the famous quotation from Thoreau's "Walden": "The mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation." If there was one thing Perot was not willing to accept, it was such a life. He seemed headed for it, so he resigned from I.B.M.

"I got out of the Navy for the same reason," he recalled years later. "I loved the Navy, loved the sea, loved ships. But I always find that whatever I'm doing, I'm thoroughly involved in it. In the Navy, the promotion system and the seniority system and the waiting-in-line concept were just sort of incompatible with my desire to be measured and judged by what I could produce."

On his 32d birthday, June 27, 1962, Perot founded Electronic Data Systems, Inc. It was relatively easy. Texas law required an initial investment of $1,000 and the naming of three charter directors. Perot wrote a personal check for the thousand (the canceled check is now framed in his office) and went looking for directors. "The only people in 1962 who had enough confidence to serve on my board," he says, "were my wife, my mother and my sister."

After the formalities were out of the way, Perot took his wife to Hawaii on a vacation (he sensed that it might be their last for some time) and started thinking about the sort of company he wanted to build. He knew that computers were hot; he had been selling them for the giant of the industry. He also knew that many businesses had the feeling that they needed computers, if only because everybody else had them, but that many didn't know what to do with the hardware once they had it.

There was a need for an electronic-data-service company that would design, install and operate information systems for large businesses. An information system, for a computer man, means just about everything that flows through a corporate mind and body. A public utility, for example, would use computers not only to produce its monthly bills, but also to forecast a variety of matters—what the industry is going to need in the way of personnel, its own payroll, what demand will be five years in the future. E.D.S. would contract with a business to handle the entire computer end, sending its employes to work on the client's premises to run the computers and train the client's employes in the methods of electronic data processing.

It was in Hawaii that he wrote, in longhand and on yellow paper, his ideas of what the company should and should not be. There was a lot of Texarkana and the U.S. Navy in the result.

First, he said, E.D.S. should be "the most respected e.d.p. service firm in the United States." Second, it would also become the largest, "provided that size does not adversely affect the quality of the work being done." Third, he would try to build the company without borrowing money or selling stock to outside investors; too many new concerns had been permanently weakened that way. Fourth, he would see to it that E.D.S. belonged to the people who built it; if a man or woman contributed to the growth of the company, he or she would be rewarded with a portion of its profits and promotion to the higher executive levels. (There are several men there now who have become millionaires.)

Further down the list, there was a rule about maintaining a "climate of complete intolerance toward company politics." (Perot had seen business operations, he said, in which the serious game of office politics was played full-time and with a vengeance. Invariably, he found, it sapped the strength of the company and wasted its corporate creativity.)

There was also a rule about efforts to keep E.D.S. from becoming a dull-gray business. As Perot later put it: "When you consider the impact that his work has on him and his family, the company has a moral obligation to be an exciting place for an employe."

Having written his philosophy, Perot set about putting the company together. He started by buying computer time wholesale and selling it retail, like cotton in Texarkana; this provided the money he needed to hire employes. The rule about not borrowing money or seeking outside investors was an easy one to obey; nobody had enough faith in the enterprise, what with its somewhat radical philosophy, to shower dollar bills on it.

"That's the story of my net worth," Perot said not long ago. "The idea was considered so bad, or so naive, that nobody would invest in it and I was stuck with it. People felt that if you dealt with people like I wanted to deal with people, you'd go broke."

One of the things Perot was stuck with was about 80 per cent of the stock, and when shares were first offered to the public in 1968 he found that he was suddenly worth about $300-million.

Perot's naive ideas about the need for a computer service company were apparently right on the button. After landing his initial client, Collins Radio, the former computer salesman brought in more and more big contracts; E.D.S.'s earnings grew, Wall Street started noticing its activities and soon the financial columns were referring to Texas Billionaire H. Ross Perot (it had become part of his name, like Strongman Joseph Mobutu or Tiny Oil-Rich Kuwait). He reverted to Texas Multimillionaire H. Ross Perot one day last April when, during one of the market's seizures, his stock fell $445-million. But even now, although Perot says he neither knows nor really cares exactly how much he's worth, his holdings are estimated at $700-million to $800-million.

E.D.S., meantime, just kept on growing. It now has 2,500 employes and offices in major cities all over the country. Its growth, Perot maintains, is based firmly on the philosophy he set down in Hawaii, plus the fact that he has surrounded himself with bright young men—their median age is something like 32—who do not write a lot of memos, do not ask a lot of consultants for their advice and are, in his words, "action-oriented" like himself.

"For about five years people were convinced that we had some secret. They thought we had all this programed on a computer in some way. They said it again after I got involved in the prisoner-of-war issue. They said I had sat down in the computer room for several weeks and programed it all out—sort of war-gamed the whole thing.

"We don't do that, and I laugh at people who do. It's easier to sit down and figure out what your strategies are, and what are your alternatives, then you start trying things."

That figuring out of strategies and alternatives, then trying things, is at the heart of Perot's campaign to bring the prisoners home.

The best place to talk to him about prisoners these days is on an airplane. He flies about the same way some people chew gum, crisscrossing the country to address and consult with local groups—there are 40 or 50 of them now—mounting their own efforts to bring the prisoners home. A typical local effort consists of, first, the establishment of a coordinating group; then lots of publicity, identifying the local men who are prisoners or missing in action and asking citizens to write letters calling for their release; a fund-raising campaign to provide the cash to fly a local delegation to Paris, and possibly other European cities where the North Vietnamese maintain embassies, to call on diplomats and express personally their desire for the return of the prisoners.

The entire idea is based on Perot's conviction that the North Vietnamese do not want the active hatred of the American people; that until now they have failed to understand that the American people really want the prisoners back (in North Vietnam, to be captured in battle is to suffer a great disgrace), and that if the American people continue putting pressure on the North Vietnamese the prisoners will eventually be released.

He talked about this one day recently as he settled down on a two-day trip that would take him from Dallas to Denver to San Francisco and back home. In Denver, Perot would meet with wives of Colorado men missing or held prisoner and he would speak at a luncheon which was part of the organizing drive there; in San Francisco he would visit E. D. S.'s offices and address a seminar E. D. S. recruiters had arranged for prospective employes.

It was perhaps inevitable, he acknowledged, that a lot of Americans should think of him, if they thought of him as anything but Texas Millionaire H. Ross Perot, as the man who tried to take the Christmas packages to Hanoi. "I'm the funny guy with the funny-colored airplanes," he joked, "a latter-day P. T. Barnum with no elephants." That was, after all, pretty much what a typical newspaper reader or television watcher might conclude from the coverage of his travels a year ago, trips that took him and prisoners' wives around the world in two of Braniff's brightly colored planes, one red and one green.

What really happened, he said, was this: In the fall of 1969, the wives of four prisoners came to his office in Dallas. They were asking for a donation—money to allow them to fly to Paris to ask the North Vietnamese for information about their husbands.

Perot's charitable impulses were well known in Dallas. Though a foundation that bore his name, he had given $2.5-million to the Dunbar Elementary School, which has a 99 per cent black enrollment, so that experimental curriculum and enrichment programs might be introduced, tested and possibly modified. He had given $1-million to the Boy Scouts of Dallas on the condition that scouting be extended into the ghetto areas, and a thousand acres of land to the Girl Scouts for a camp, on the condition that the camp also be used for the benefit of poor children. Perot, who is constantly besieged with requests for money, was especially touched by the wives' appeal. He bought the tickets to Paris. (He does not remember what the bill was—"whatever the air fare to Paris is, times four.")

When the wives returned from Paris, one of them came by to thank Perot for his help. She brought her 4½-year-old son. "This little boy had never seen his dad," said Perot. "He was born after his dad was missing in action.

When I was 4½ years old I had been with my dad several hours a day, every day of my life. He was my best friend. We had a particularly close association. So I was particularly sensitive to what that little boy was giving up. And I decided right then."

Perot saw that, first, he had to publicize the issue. He is essentially a private man, one who radiates none of the publicity seeker's usual vibrations, but as a successful businessman he recognizes the importance of getting a message across. He took his problem to an advertising agency, which wanted to spend a very long time perfecting an effective campaign. Perot went back to Dallas and turned his bright, young systems men loose on the idea. In three weeks they had formed an organization, named United We Stand, and had started spending about $1-million (on 300 newspaper ads, 30 million postcards and a half-hour television show) to publicize the plight of the prisoners and to call for support of the nation's Vietnam policies.

Within a few weeks of the campaign's start, Perot had collected 26 tons of mail, food, clothing and medicine and had chartered two planes to fly the cargo to Hanoi. They did not get through, nor was Perot successful this Christmas when he attempted to charter Soviet airliners to get similar shipments in. The result was, by one way of reckoning, a failure.

That business of supporting the nation's Vietnam policies, Perot acknowledges, is one of his trickiest problems, and it is the one that particularly angers other Americans who are in agony over the war and the prisoners but who feel that the only way to bring the men home is to end the war. Partly because Perot avoids such labels as "right" and "left," "hawk" and "dove," and partly because he avoids entanglements with recognized rightwing organizations and spokesmen, many of those on the left seem not to have developed particularly hard feelings toward him. He is a phenomenon, they feel; a not necessarily dangerous one.

Perot guards his credibility to the point of not discussing his political inclinations, although he has been a visitor to the White House. He is, he insists, a pragmatist above all, one who wants "to see war ended at the earliest possible time." As a pragmatist, he feels that unilateral United States withdrawal from Vietnam is "not in the cards." Therefore, he reasons, the best way to end the war is for the American people to clearly indicate that they are united behind their Government.

Some on the left, to be sure, regard Perot and his reasoning as distinct dangers. Mrs. Cora Weiss, a New Yorker whose Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam was involved in last Christmas's flurry over the release of prisoners' names—Perot called it an "old list" that was "strictly propaganda" and "a form of Oriental torture at Christmastime"—feels Perot is a "publicity hound" whose actions are "Government-inspired," "Government-rewarded" and, so far, unsuccessful. Mrs. Weiss, who has been active in liberal and civil-libertarian causes for years, adds: "He's trying to resolve an issue separately from the war when that issue is created because of the war and can only be resolved by the termination of the war. If Perot put his millions behind the campaign to end the war, the men would be home in a minute. And until he does, I have to doubt his sincerity."

Such critics have little difficulty believing that Perot is somebody's puppet—Mrs. Weiss points out that big data-processing clients are defense contractors—but hours of casual and not so casual conversation with the man are likely to lead one to the conclusion that he is exactly what he seems to be: a smart country boy who learned a lot from a father he loved, who ventured into the business world with a heavy social conscience, who thought up the right idea at the right time and who remains somewhat humbled by the experience. Given the circumstances of Perot's rise and the record of his actions, it is difficult to believe that he is motivated by greed, a taste for publicity, involvement in conspiracy, ambition or any of the other usual vices; it is easy to surmise that his motivation, in business and in the prisoner effort, is nothing more than what most of us would call good intentions.

His 5-foot, 6-inch frame almost swallowed up by the first-class seat on the plane to Denver, Perot successfully foiled a stewardess's second attempt to serve him some breakfast champagne (he neither smokes nor drinks nor curses with any conviction) and said: "The purpose of the Christmas trip was not to take packages to prisoners, but to put the North Vietnamese in the position where they had to talk. We wanted to create a pressure-cooker situation where they had to see us. They didn't have to love us, but they had to see us."

After he got involved in the prisoner issue, Perot said he naturally started thinking in terms of developing strategies; he was disappointed to find out that not many Americans knew very much about the North Vietnamese. "And most of what they knew," he added, "they'd gotten from books and gotten from one another. So our secondary purpose was to educate and inform the American people about the plight of these men. And then, thirdly, we hoped to get the goods to the men. It wasn't so much the Christmas packages as it was the medicine and clothing. We failed on Item 3, but we succeeded on Items 1 and 2. We made the contacts, we developed our strategy and the American people for the first time became aroused and informed."

At the luncheon in Denver, which was in the early stages of organizing a delegation to go to Paris, Perot told the story of the 4½-year-old boy. He also said that Hanoi, no matter how angry it might be at our national leaders, did not want the enmity of the American people.

"They're counting on millions of us to send our sons back over at some future point in time to protect North Vietnam from China," he said, and the ballroom of the Denver Hilton fell into a stunned silence. "That sounds almost ludicrous, but there are men sitting in this room today who, in 1945, would have said it was ludicrous to think that we'd ever be defending Japan and Germany."

Perot said the North Vietnamese are not sure Russia would help them. "Only one nation in the world sends its sons to help others. They think we might. That's the big reason they don't want you to hate them over a handful of men. It's an unacceptable risk."

For those who still doubted, Perot offered "tangible proof" that the Christmas trip in 1969 had not been in vain:

Seventy-five per cent of all the mail that has come out of the prison camps in the last seven years has come since the trip.

Prison brutality has decreased.

The North Vietnamese have increased the number and size of packages families in the States may send to men in prison.

North Vietnamese propaganda films, including one depicting a delayed Christmas party for the prisoners, have been released. The films provided the first proof for some families that their sons and husbands were alive; they demonstrated to others that the prisoners' health had improved.

While the prisoners were hardly an issue at the Paris peace talks a year before, now they were one of the top issues.

And there was another bit of "tangible proof," Perot told his audience in Denver. "This little 4½-year-old boy who got me involved and who didn't know whether he had a dad knows that he has a father today. They just got absolutely sick of this little boy's mother and me and all the others who were involved, and so they started to let that man write home.

"He's in good health; he's in good spirits. This little boy's dad is coming home. If I hadn't accomplished anything else, that would make the whole experience worthwhile. If you could just get that piece of information about one man from Denver, it would make the whole experience worthwhile."

Perot spoke for half an hour with three wives and one sister of men classified as prisoners or missing in action. They hung on Perot's every word, and it was obvious that he wanted to bring them good news but that he had little to offer. "The best sign I see," he told them, "is that—all those people who jump on the bandwagon at the last minute?—they're coming around now."

As he was leaving, one of the women said, "I'd love that man if he didn't have a penny."

Perot went to a television station to be interviewed and to tape a spot announcement on behalf of the local prisoner effort, which is called Colorado Cares. He did the 60 seconds faultlessly, but afterward said he had felt a little silly up there in front of the cameras.

Samir H. Zakhem, a political-science professor at Loretto Heights College in Denver, the director of Colorado Cares and a Lebanese who only a few weeks before had gained his United States citizenship, told Perot that he had been heartened by the willingness of young people to help in the prisoner effort. "Members of S.D.S. helped me get the signatures on the petitions to Hanoi," he said.

On the airplane to San Francisco, a bouncy stewardess with a cascade of blonde hair stopped to say hello. Within 30 seconds Perot had determined that she was from a small town in Iowa and had been active in the 4-H Club there. She mentioned that she would have a 15-hour layover in Las Vegas, and Perot gave her a dollar, saying, "Make me some money."

The other stewardess, a sincere, matter-of-fact brunette, came by a little later. She told Perot: "I just wanted to say thank you for everything you're doing."

"Have you got a boyfriend over there?" Perot asked.

"I've got a boyfriend, and he flies in the Air Force. He's based here now, but . . ." The stewardess did not finish; she made a gesture of helplessness.

In San Francisco, Perot visited with managerial employes at the E. D. S. office, and almost everything he told the two dozen young men—all of them in subdued business suits, none with hair or sideburns that wouldn't pass muster in the Army—was based on the philosophy he had written in Hawaii in the summer of 1962. He emphasized that E. D. S. was wide open for young people with talent; he had, in fact, given up the post of president and kicked himself upstairs to chairman of the board to make more room for young men on the way up. He repeated, several times, the admonition that if a company like E. D. S. is to be successful, its people must think and act as individuals.

Later that evening, when he addressed 150 young men from the Bay Area whom the E. D. S. recruiters had selected as potentially good material, Perot explained some of the company's policies (for instance, it pays all employe maternity bills because Perot, who has four children himself, thinks becoming a parent is one of the finest things that can happen to a man), but he also leaned heavily on the idea of individuality.

After the meeting, a young man asked Perot why, with all the talk of individuality, E. D. S. employees tended to look alike. "We want to be part of the scenery," Perot replied. He explained that E. D. S. people work

on the client's premises, and, running his fingers along the lapels of his off-the-rack suit, said: "You might call this camouflage in the corporate jungle."

That night in San Francisco, which is perhaps the American city that appeals most to the senses and which has an impressive selection of restaurants, Texas Millionaire H. Ross Perot dined out of a paper bag on a grilled-cheese sandwich and a chocolate shake. He was too busy to eat properly; he wanted to talk to the wives of San Francisco's prisoners of war.

And if his sense of taste fared poorly in San Francisco, Perot's sense of sight got equally short shrift on the flight back to Dallas. As the big plane floated over spectacular landscapes—the Painted Desert and the Grand Canyon, to name only two—Ross Perot ignored it all to talk about the prisoners. He was pleased that local independent committees had sprung up to carry on the effort. For one thing, it indicated that people weren't as apathetic as they sometimes seemed; for another, the North Vietnamese were becoming skeptical about anything that bore the Perot name, but they could not ignore the hometown delegations of teachers, doctors, laborers and city councilmen.

Is it a success?

"Only when we have the men," Perot answered.

He talked of another project, American Horizons, on which he and his bright young men are working now. It would consist of a series of television discussions of important issues keyed to computer-sized cards distributed with the weekly television guides in local newspapers. Perot explained that viewers would be asked to submit their opinions on the cards, and the results would be made available to anyone who wanted to know what Americans were thinking.

"It's an electronic town hall," said Perot. "We want to educate and inform; we don't want to propagandize. That's the tough part of all this, the balance; so that when it's all over, you may go one way and I may go another, but the exciting thing is that we're going *somewhere*."

All of this, of course, will cost money. But H. Ross Perot is used to spending money. He once told the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that he would be willing to use his own funds to build pilot models of social programs that H. E. W. couldn't afford to build, with H. E. W. as an adviser—a scheme pretty nearly opposite to the way the department has operated.

"I told them, 'We'd like to turn the role around. We'd like *you* as an adviser, and we'd use *our* money and know-how to build the programs,'" said Perot. "They've never come to grips with that proposal."

That a bureaucracy as vast and inbred as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may never come to grips with such an attractive proposal will not be a surprise to more cynical citizens. Nor may it be surprising to hear Ross Perot say that he has no political ambitions. The man says he would grow impatient and frustrated in such an environment as the United States Senate or the House of Representatives, and it is easy to believe him.

Whatever his political plans, though, it *would* be surprising if we were to hear less from H. Ross Perot in the future. If ever there was an evangel of the wealthy, a millionaire who thought he should pay his dues, Perot is it. But he does have one big headache—how to spend his money wisely.

As the plane approached Dallas, he pondered a question on how much he had spent in the prisoner-of-war campaign. About $2-million, he said. And other expenditures—the Dunbar School? the Scouts?

"I'd guess somewhere around $5-million or $6-million."

He mused a while. "The *problem*, though," he said, "is finding places where I can intelligently spend it." He thought a second more, then added: "Be careful how you write that, or I'll be deluged with opportunities." There was another pause, and then: "That's all right, though; that's why we're here."

WHY CONCERN OVER RUSSIA IN THE MEDITERRANEAN BUT NOT IN THE CARIBBEAN?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the threat to the security of the United States resulting from a Soviet military buildup on the island of Cuba was ignored in the Kissinger-Nixon state of the world report, more and more evidence is being revealed concerning the increasing seriousness of the threat.

Columnist Henry J. Taylor has produced information regarding a tripartite agreement among Russia, Venezuela, and Cuba whereby Russia will provide Castro with a fleet of tankers as well as providing Soviet industrial equipment to Venezuela.

According to Taylor's report, additional military aid being provided Cuba by the Soviets includes patrol boats with an action radius of 3,600 miles and outfitted with the Soviet's latest radar, communication, and gunnery equipment; Czechoslovakian antiaircraft guns, photographic reconnaissance planes, and Russian MIG jet search planes. The latter planes are capable of instant conversion into bombers capable of launching a larger and more devastating atomic missile than launched by a U.S. Polaris submarine.

While the U.S.S.R. builds an armed fortress just 80 miles off our mainland, Kissinger and Nixon and their accomplice supplement their talk of winning the "peace" and of the demise of war with aid to the U.S.S.R. and the Eastern Europe Communist bloc—sometimes referred to as the captive nations—in the form of sensitive computers, scientific and electronic equipment, construction and manufacturing equipment, chemicals, and many other items which would enhance their war-making capability. See 94th Quarterly Report on Export Control for fourth quarter of 1970 issued by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

We arm the enemy which supplies 80 percent of the materials of war to kill our servicemen in Vietnam and which is now arming the Cubans and building a base in Cuba from which to attack the United States.

Additional information concerning the Russian naval base comes from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance and has been provided by Mr. Manolo Reyes, a well-informed Cuban patriot of Miami, Fla.

Information provided by Miss Juanita Castro, Fidel's exiled sister, in a letter to the Latin American News, Post Office Box 2318, New York, N.Y., tells of the nuclear submarine base in Cienfuegos and the construction of still another nuclear base on the southern coast of Las Villas Province.

Mr. Speaker, the present policy of the Kissinger-Nixon administration regarding the Soviet threat in Cuba unless radically changed will end in disaster for this country. I simply fail to comprehend the administration's stance regarding Cuba and Latin America especially in comparison with the administration's concern over Russian action on the Middle East. Are we to understand that the administration considers Russian activity in the Mediterranean a greater threat to the U.S. security than Soviet activity in the Caribbean?

What is the solution to this grave menace to our country? First, we must distinguish friend from foe; then we must help our friends instead of our enemies. We can help our Cuban friends by reflecting upon the sagacious remarks about us and taking action on the recommendation of Mr. Humberto Medrano, Cuban patriot, who in a letter written over 6 years ago stated as follows:

> Communism does not intend to wage a declared war. Its aim is to suffocate you. Its tactics are to surround you with hostility, creating and extending all over the world zones of unfriendliness and disaffection; introducing mistrust and divisionism among your allies; undermining your rearguard through the subversion and control of Latin America.
>
> Communism knows that when you lose Latin America, you have lost America. Because, once fenced in within your vital space and overtaken, your last geopolitical bulwarks, your atomic powers will have been invalidated. You will then have to face surrender without firing a single shot— a defeat to which many of your "fifth columnists" with democratic credentials, will have contributed to from the inside with a cry of surrender, as they now cry for appeasement.
>
> To this purpose your enemies are progressing. But you seem not to realize it or to have fairly judged how far they have advanced. The fact that you are constantly losing the support of your allies, as well as zones of influence everywhere, should grant you the measure of your losses, or of their gains.
>
> You declared an economic embargo on Communist Cuba; yet Britain, France, Spain, Canada, Japan, Morocco, Sweden, and Mexico, all of which are your would-be allies, trade with Castro communism. We all know it displeases you. But they don't care. Why?
>
> One reason, Uncle Sam: They consider you weak and in retreat. Your associates no longer have faith in you and seem eager to dissolve the partnership. They believe that their political shares will be under better protection if they follow their own policies or merge with the rising stocks of socialism.
>
> Whether we like it or not, Uncle Sam, crowds always follow the stronger and prefer a winner. For quite some time these countries may have thought that while right is on your side, aggressiveness and power are on the side of Russia.

Mr. Medrano concludes his letter with this recommendation:

> In pursuit of such friendly collaboration, the only thing that we exiled Cubans wholeheartedly request from you is that you help us today. That you give us that help as openly and as decisively as Russia helps her followers.
>
> If you really help us, Uncle Sam, if you give us the green light now, allowing us to fight for our country—which is the least you can do for us—we will regain Cuba, not only

for the sake of Cuban liberation, but for the sake of continental solidarity.

When this comes to pass, you will have not only recovered a friendly nation, but you will have protected your front-door and your rearguard and you will hold the guarantee that even if Russia harasses you in Africa, America will be faithful. You will never attain such faithfulness as long as Cuba remains a military and political base of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet threat in Cuba has developed to such a critical stage that immediate positive leadership on our part is imperative in order to root out the Communist cancer which is spreading in Cuba. Because of conflicting information given by the Kissinger-Nixon administration on the one hand and by naval intelligence, Cuban underground, and some of the press on the other hand, I urge a congressional investigation to bring out the true facts as to the situation in Cuba today. I would also urge prompt action on my House Concurrent Resolution 65 and House Joint Resolution 160.

House Concurrent Resolution 65 would make it the sense of the Congress that the question of denial of right of self-determination and other human rights violations in Cuba be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

House Joint Resolution 160 would seek to prevent subversion of the United States, Central, and South America as proposed by Castro and would encourage—not hamper—Cubans in exile in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland.

The time has come to stop building bridges with our enemies and to start repairing bridges to our allies.

I insert a letter, appearing in Life Lines of February 22, 1971, of Mr. Humberto Medrano, former ex-subdirector of the Havana newspaper Prensa Libre; a letter of Miss Juanita Castro, a report of Dr. Manolo Reyes from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance, several newsclippings, House Concurrent Resolution 65, and House Joint Resolution 160:

[From Life Lines, Feb. 22, 1971]

DEAR UNCLE SAM: SIX MORE YEARS HAVE GONE BY

(NOTE.—This "letter to Uncle Sam" was written by Dr. Humberto Medrano, ex-subdirector of the Havana newspaper Prena Libre, and was read at the 1964 "Grito de Baire" celebration at San Juan, P.R., to Accion Civico-Economica Cubana, an organization of men who fled Cuba as Castro took over.)

UNCLE SAM: This is a letter from a real friend and sincere admirer.

Of my friendship there is written proof. Of my admiration there is an adequate record. I am an exiled Cuban.

My exile does not come from the fact that I was materially affected; rather, because my personal principles were betrayed. As it is, I chose to sacrifice material belongings in behalf of my principles.

Among my principles was my loyalty to your nation; a loyalty inspired mostly in what this nation means and represents as an image of my political creed and as a banner of my faith.

Let it then stand that whatever I may say herein arises from these ties that bind me to you and not from discrepancies between us. For none separate us. By your side I stood in my country when powerful pro-Soviet agents began to slander and curse you. I came to your country when I could no longer materially protect those ideals that strongly compose the historical foundation of our respective countries. And I came not seeking for a place to keep on living, but rather, for a beachhead to keep on fighting for those ideals.

I maintain my faith in you. In your people I can see unending sources of energy. To me, you are far from being a land of youthful gangsters or of hysterical teenagers. Yours is the land of the brave and I behold you as the birthplace of those who through concentrated effort and well-rooted heroism have built up a nation where all liberties exist and all rights are respected; even those of the young gangsters and of the hysterical teenagers.

However, I must sincerely advise you that this is an hour of receding tide for you. Perhaps you are not aware how fast the tide is receding, probably because your good judgment appears shadowed precisely by your unlimited resources at hand. Perhaps your own powers distract you and your overwhelming achievements have given you excessive confidence to the extent that they have softened you.

But there is an indisputable fact that stands above your accomplishments: those accomplishments and the authority that preserves them are today being threatened by communism.

In view of this menace you cling to your nuclear power. Some of your key policymakers believe that, in the last instance, "we have such a tremendous destructive power that it will force the enemy to hesitate before launching any attack on our country."

Wrong. communism does not intend to wage a declared war. Its aim is to suffocate you. Its tactics are to surround you with hostility, creating and extending all over the world zones of unfriendliness and disaffection; introducing mistrust and divisionism among your allies; undermining your rearguard through the subversion and control of Latin America.

Communism knows that when you lose Latin America, you have lost America. Because, once fenced in within your vital space and overtaken, your last geopolitical bulwarks, your atomic powers will have been invalidated. You will then have to face surrender without firing a single shot—a defeat to which many of your "fifth columnists" with democratic credentials, will have contributed to from the inside with a cry for surrender, as they now cry for appeasement.

To this purpose your enemies are progressing. But you seem not to realize it or to have fairly judged how far they have advanced. The fact that you are constantly losing the support of your allies, as well as zones of influence everywhere, should grant you the measure of your losses, or of their gains.

You declared an economic embargo on Communist Cuba; yet Britain, France, Spain, Canada, Japan, Morocco, Sweden, and Mexico, all of which are your would-be allies, trade with Castro communism. We all know it displeases you. But they don't care. Why?

One reason, Uncle Sam: They consider you weak and in retreat. Your associates no longer have faith in you and seem eager to dissolve the partnership. They believe that their political shares will be under better protection if they follow their own policies or merge with the rising stocks of socialism.

Whether we like it or not, Uncle Sam, crowds always follow the stronger and prefer a winner. For quite some time these countries may have thought that while right is on your side, aggressiveness and power are on the side of Russia.

Are they wrong? Yes, but it doesn't matter. You are strong, but look weak. Russia may be weak, but appears strong. And unfortunately, people are led by appearances. If it were not so, Fidel Castro would not be there now.

There is no doubt, Uncle Sam, that your atomic power is greater than Russia's, but Russia's power of motivated propaganda is greater than yours.[1] You know how to manufacture and sell refrigerators better than anyone else, but Russia knows how to convince those that lack refrigerators that you are to blame that they do not have them.

Russia has studied you for 40 years. During that period they have learned that due to your enormous productive capacity, they could not lick you face to face by force. Therefore, the Pavlov Institute arrived at the conclusion that they must face you through the psychological low blows of a cold war, which, after all is a war of propaganda.

In this sense they have a big advantage over you. Why? Because you are guided by good faith while Russia is not. You stand on truth which receives less dissemination. Whereas, Russia leans on spectacular lies, which, unfortunately, find greater echo.

In this manner they have been able to convince many that, in spite of your driving initiative, to side with you is to side with a declining world, while lining up with communism (which is a system of failures incapable of supporting itself) is like falling in line for the world of tomorrow.

To these contradictions are added others well elaborated and further broadcasted: That your liberties are unfair while Communist slavery is just; that you, paying the highest wages, exploit workers, while they, who pay least, redeem workers. That your magnanimous aid, even to non-Democratic countries, should be despised, and that they who despise everything non-Communist, should be aided.

They have pierced so deeply in this respect that even you are by now a victim of their propaganda. The proof is that while they emphasize the weakness of capitalism you help them make good their failures with wheat and rice from your reserves. While you respect their "vital space," they take a foothold on yours.

Why do you allow this, Uncle Sam? Why do you accept the stigma of imperialism which you do not deserve? Why don't you use your mighty strength to clean enemies out of your vital spaces?

If you did it, you would not only remove the sword from your back, but you would also recover your prestige, revitalize yourself, and regain authority at home and abroad. Should you do it you would end the numerous conflicts that beset you everywhere. Furthermore, you would regain the respect of the old nations and share it with the new ones. Your friends would stop flirting with your enemies and no one would dare dishonor your flag.

To counteract the corrosive action of communism within your vital space in America you have devised the Alliance for Progress, a wonderful project on a short-term basis. . . . when you will be convinced that loyalty has nothing to do with money? Hasn't history taught us that men are capable of selling themselves for money but that only for ideals will men stay loyal, fight and even die?

And when will you finally be convinced that as long as Fidel Castro exists in (Latin)

---

[1] Senor Medrano was more right than he knew in 1964. Since then: (A) According to the military experts of the American Security Council, Russia outguns the U.S. in nuclear megatonnage 6–1 (10,330 to 1,730) (B) Cuba is now a Russian nuclear arsenal (C) Cuba has trained American revolutionaries (D) Cuba has been joined by Chile as a second Marxist foothold in Latin America (E) several Latin American countries have regimes with friendly ideological and economic ties to Russia.

America, you will enjoy no loyalty, no respect, no truthfulness, no peace?

Yes Uncle Sam, as long as Fidel Castro tramps in Communist Cuba you will continue to go through a period of discredit. You may not think so because surrounded by your nuclear powers, you imagine that nothing can discredit you. But the rest of the world thinks differently. As long as Fidel Castro can slander you, confiscate your property without compensation; threaten you with rockets, cut your water supply from Guantanamo Naval Base, and shout insults at you at arms reach as Fidel has done, your capital stock as a world power deteriorates and your leadership becomes questionable.

Leadership is not attained by forbearance, but by the proper exercise of power. Real leadership implies recognition from those being led and such acknowledgement implies demonstration. You are a natural leader, Uncle Sam, and you have ample qualifications to be one and to act accordingly. But show it now; prove to the world and prove it to yourself as you have done so many times before. You will see how soon insults and disturbances will disappear and above all, how blackmailing from certain Latin American countries will end.

By no means think that the undersigned is asking you to send the "Marines" into Cuba for them to gift us with a free country. You would have to fight according to rules and the rules say that territories to be taken must be first bombarded. I do not want devastation nor occupation for my Cuba unless we Cubans are in the first fighting line. I do not want, dear Uncle Sam, any flag above my flag.

I want your friendship for Cuba and I want Cuba to be always a friendly territory to you. I want Cuba to be a fruitful land for your investments and a fraternal country for your ideals. But I also want a free and respected nation. I want you to respect our little island just as we respect your great United States. I want Cuba and the United States to have common interest and objectives and I do not want you ever to feel threatened or unsafe when you think of Cuba. As well, I want you to look to Cuba as a sister nation.

In pursuit of such friendly collaboration, the only thing that we exiled Cubans wholeheartedly request from you is that you help us today. That you give us that help as openly and as decisively as Russia helps her followers.

If you really help us, Uncle Sam, if you give us the green light now, allowing us to fight for our country—which is the least you can do for us—we will regain Cuba, not only for the sake of Cuban liberation, but for the sake of continental solidarity.

When this comes to pass, you will have not only recovered a friendly nation, but you will have protected your front-door and your rearguard and you will hold the guarantee that even if Russia harasses you in Africa, America will be faithful. You will never attain such faithfulness as long as Cuba remains a military and political base of the Soviet Union.

Fraternally yours,

HUMBERTO MEDRANO.

A REPORT FROM DR. MANOLO REYES

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 4¼ 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 Rusisan 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, also 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 there the largest information received from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance about Cienfuegos.

[From the Latin America News, February 1971]

THE SOVIET UNION WILL INCREASE ITS NUCLEAR BASES IN CUBA

The new Ambassador of the Soviet Union to Cuba, Nikita Pailovich Tolubeyev, is an expert in missile installations, a coordinator of guerrilla warfare, and, of course, an organizer of subversive intelligence net.

On the other hand, the Soviet Marshall Zacharov, Chief of the Soviet Air Forces, has planned a visit to Cuba in order to meet secretly with Latin and North American leaders, to whom he will give instructions concerning other guerrilla warfare plans for different nations in this continent.

Marshall Zacharov will inspect the nuclear submarine base built up in Cienfuegos Bay, and also the beginning of the construction of another nuclear base in the southern coast of Las Villas province, as well as other airports and a naval post with hidden missile platforms, will be built up in the Isle of Pines, south of Havana in the Caribbean Sea.

The Soviet Union will increase the number of nuclear bases in Cuba, in order to ridicule the defensive system of the United States, and also using Fidel in the extracontinental plan which has different ways of being carried out, to first impose itself upon and later take command of the Latin American countries.

This information I have just received from Cuba and which I pass to the world public opinion as a denounce of the new Soviet plan and that of the puppet regime of Fidel's proves that the danger faced by the nations in the Americas is critical each passing day, due to the policy of abandonment and indifference maintained regarding the problems of Communist Cuba.

Fidel is making his old ambitious dream come true, that is to say, making Cuba a powerful nuclear fortress in order to blackmail the rest of the nations in this Hemisphere, and to go ahead with his *continental plan*, which he has never given and will never give up: to create new fighting fronts to other nations.

On making this public denounce, which unfortunately time will surely confirm, as it has happened before, we hope that the Government of the different countries in the Americas will adopt a more strict and firmer attitude toward the evident danger represented by Communist Cuba.

The fact that the Soviet Union is sending, as its diplomatic representative to Cuba, an expert in nuclear installations and an organizer of urban and rural guerrillas, is evidence enough of the two-faced nature of the Soviet leaders, who speak of the reestablishment of "diplomatic" and "Friendly" relations with the American nations, and, on the other hand, keep on trying to seize them by means of deceitful agents like Fidel and other Communist leaders.

Besides, this information I have just received from Cuba also means that the Soviet Union is deceiving the United States again in regard to the problem of missile installations.

If the United States continues on with its hands tied up due to the treacherous Kennedy-Khrushchev "entente", and if the United States does not change its policy toward Communist Cuba—which is being progressively turned into a nuclear base for the Soviet Union in this Hemisphere—all the nations in the Americas will eventually fall, one by one, into the paws of the barbarian Soviet imperialism, including the United States itself, where the consequences of its lack of a stronger action toward the subversive activities and defiant attitude of international Communism are being felt already.

JUANITA CASTRO,
Exile, Miami, Florida.

(NOTE.—Miss Castro is a sister of Fidel Castro, Communist Cuba's Tyrant.)

RUSSIA AND HER CARIBBEAN ISLAND

(By Henry J. Taylor)

KEY WEST, FLA.—Here where Cuban underground heroes risk their lives going back and forth, the subject of a major Soviet naval facility at Cienfuegos, Cuba, simply will not down. And now a Soviet pitch involves Venezuela, where the U.S. stake is immense and Soviet intrusions grow daily.

Russia has been quietly providing Castro with a fleet of tankers. The Kremlin has delivered four. All are named for Red Cuban holidays. The flagship is the 22,000-ton Seventh of November. Castro is paying for this tanker fleet with sugar.

The Venezuelan who revealed the Kremlin plan is former Minister of Mines and Petroleum Manuel Egana. He did so at a conference in Caracas with two members of Castro's eight-man "Politburo," both military offi-

cers, and others that included two underground members who have penetrated Castro's hierarchy.

Egana stated that behind closed doors the Soviet has agreed to surrender its oil market in Cuba and hand this over to Venezuela. The Venezuelan government, in return, agreed to accept Soviet industrial equipment on terms advantageous to the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet provided Castro's petroleum needs from Baku on the Caspian Sea and the port of Novorossiisk on the Black Sea It has had on this long, vulnerable and expensive urn tankers like a 46,000-dwt vessel Russia bought in Japan.

In spite of the Soviet's massive seven-year shipbuilding program in its vast Kherson and Nikolaev shipyards, now approaching completion, the Kremlin sometimes has also had to meet Castro's needs by diverting two giant supertankers which supply Black Sea oil to Greece—the surprisingly named Leonardo da Vinci and the Gdynia.

Substituting nearby Venezuelan oil is obviously more economical but it also serves Russia's strategic purpose. It gives the Soviet short and protectable supply line—interior lines of communication, the military call this—to Russia's Caribbean lodgement inside our own U.S. defense perimeter, 90 miles off our shores.

Additionally, Soviet naval squadrons on their last "courtesy call" to Havana, delivered technicians to expand the Chullian shipyard on the Almendares river in Havana Province. The underground identified two top Soviet naval engineers, Eugen Klinko and Alexander Ismov. They are turning out Russian-designed patrol boats—six types ranging from the so-called Lambda-75 to the small, almost-silent Eta-25. A Lambda's 13.5-ton fuel capacity gives the fast boat an action radius of 3,600 miles.

The Soviet's latest radar, sonar, radio-telephone and gunnery equipment is being installed. The Russians are also training Cuban crews at Castro's Victoria de Playa Giron Naval School. Each Lambda requires 11 specialists abroad.

The armada's control will be at the heavily-armed, off-limits city of Remedios, now the headquarters of the Soviet High Command in Cuba. The Cuban underground works at penetrating Remedios information. Castro's executions are at 5 o'clock in the morning. Many imprisoned underground fighters say: "Don't ask me the day. I only know the hour." And Castro recently executed four of these heroes charged with Remedios intrusions. As usual, they were shot on Castro's old ruse, "la fuga"—charged with trying to escape.

Operational direction, however, is scheduled from Matazas, just 75 miles south of Key West, and from Caribarien, a port 190 miles east of Havana. Both are now receiving new Soviet electronically-controlled anti-aircraft installations, the guns chiefly Czechoslovakian.

These installations are combined with a special air cover which will fly from San Antonio de Los Banos and the Soviet air base at San Julian, 90 miles southeast of Havana, the island's largest air force station. This operation will be tied in with Castro's powerful Russian-built radio transmitter on the Cape Breton peninsula. It gives direct around-the-clock communication with Moscow, so powerful that it is nearly impossible to jam.

The Russians have sent in the equivalent to our successor of the U-2, the black, twin-engine, delta-wing SR-71, photographic reconnaissance marvel that flies at 80,000 feet and can film 60,000 square miles in one hour. But the Soviet aircraft deliveries concentrate on far-flying Russian MIG jet search planes.

These are lethal. They are capable of instant conversion into bombers merely by attaching the bomb rack. Our Office of Naval Intelligence knows each plane is capable of launching a larger and more devastating atomic missile than is launched by a U.S. Polaris submarine.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 1, 1971]

RED CRAFT NEAR CUBA IRK UNITED STATES

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

PANAMA CITY.—The return of Soviet naval craft last week to Cuban waters, including the rumored presence of a nuclear submarine, suggests that Washington may not be correct in assuming it has an "understanding" with the Soviet Union over the whole issue.

For five months, the presence of Soviet vessels in Cuban ports or cruising in the area has raised questions about Soviet intentions in and around the Caribbean. Moreover, the rumored building of a submarine base at the south Cuban port of Cienfuegos continues to be a major topic of speculation and discussion in United States circles in Panama and elsewhere.

But it is understood that whatever construction was under way in October at Cienfuegos has in fact now been stopped for four months.

THREE LEADING QUESTIONS

Officials here in Panama—where the United States has large military commitment, as well as the strategically important Panama Canal—worry about these questions:

With Soviet trading activities now increasing throughout Latin America and with Soviet merchant vessels regularly calling at Latin-American ports, is it not just a matter of time before Soviet naval vessels also make similar visits to these ports as do U.S. naval vessels from time to time?

In particular, how far off is a visit of Soviet naval craft to Chile where a Marxist-oriented government took office in November?

Finally, with the more modern techniques for berthing and supplying naval vessels, is construction of a base at Cienfuegos absolutely necessary for the Soviet Union if its vessels are to ply Caribbean waters?

It is on this last point that many observers here are devoting considerable speculation. In fact, it is assumed here that Cienfuegos would be more useful to Soviet naval craft as a rest and recuperation center for the crews of submarines who remain underwater for extensive periods and need an opportunity to get away from their tight and limited quarters.

In fact, it is generally assumed that Cienfuegos could become much like similar establishments used by the United States fleet in Scotland and in Spain.

Still, the presence of Soviet naval vessels, their possible use of Cienfuegos and the reported arrival now of a Soviet nuclear underwater craft are seen here as a Soviet probe of United States reactions.

In Washington, the current visit of Soviet ships—the fifth in two years and one which follows more closely on the heels of the prevous visit than those of the past—is viewed as a direct challenge to the Nixon administration's general attitude on the question.

HIGH-LEVEL HANDLING

President Nixon and his top national security adviser, Prof. Henry A. Kissinger, took the issue of Soviet vessels in Cuban waters out of State Department hands in September and all comments on the issue has come subsequently from the White House.

Mr. Nixon has indicated on several occasions that there is indeed an "understanding" on Soviet activities in the Caribbean based on the 1962 Cuban missile-crisis understanding between President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. In return for a United States promise not to seek the overthrow of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, the Soviets agreed not to reintroduce nuclear missiles into Cuba. The Nixon thesis is that this covers nuclear submarines in the Caribbean which must not be serviced "in or from" Cuban ports such as Cienfuegos.

If such an understanding in fact does exist—but there seems some doubt about the nuclear submarine aspect of it—then the presence of Soviet craft in Cuban waters could be construed as a violation of the terms of the understanding. And here in Panama, where U.S. fleet activities are often sizable, the Soviet presence is generally seen as a challenge "of major and immediate proportions" whether it is a violation or not.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 28, 1971]

CASTRO SHIFTS MISSILES TO WEST END OF CUBA

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

The government of Fidel Castro, for reasons that are unclear to U.S. officials, recently finished removing all of its antiaircraft missile batteries from eastern Cuba.

American U2 jets, which have maintained a regular surveillance of Cuba since the 1962 missile crisis, began detecting the shift in SAM sites from Oriente and the eastern provinces a year ago. Indications are that Castro's anti-aircraft missile strength is now concentrated in the western half of the island where Havana is located.

Officials of U.S. departments that keep watch on Cuban military and political developments are unable to explain why Castro has elected to leave Santiago and the eastern areas undefended.

Some speculate that Castro does not anticipate any attack from the U.S. at all. Others say he may not have enough missiles to defend all of the island and is simply concentrating what he does have in the west.

It was U-2 photo reconnaissance that first detected the ICBM buildup which led to the 1962 confrontation and subsequent Soviet removal of missiles that could have reached almost every American city.

There is no longer any question that Russian submarine crews intend to use the Cuban harbor at Cienfuegos as a regular port and for recreational facilities. Cienfuegos is still regarded by the United States as a facility rather than a base, in the full military sense, for submarine use.

Up to now, the Russians have not sent a Polaris-class submarine to the harbor. The most recent visitor was a nuclear-powered attack submarine armed with torpedoes rather than ballistic missiles.

The United States tracked the sub there during the last three weeks and at last report it was still in the harbor, lying alongside a Soviet tender. Two barges and several barracks now appear to be permanent installations at Cienfuegos.

Castro also has tightened the defense ring around the U.S. base at Guantanamo Bay on the eastern tip of Cuba. However, it appears that the ring is more devoted to keeping Cubans seeking asylum at the U.S. base than to protect against American attack.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1971]

16 CUBANS CHAIN SELVES TO TABLE AT UNITED NATIONS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Sixteen anti-Castro Cubans entered the empty chamber of the U.N. Security Council yesterday and chained themselves to the conference table, demanding human rights for political prisoners in Cuba.

After a 2½ hour sit-in, uniformed U.N. guards cut the chains and dragged or carried the protesters out. The young demonstrators—14 men and two women—cried "Free-

dom for Cuba" and "You're just like the Nazis."

The Cubans told the guards they belonged to an organization called Abdala and were protesting the detention of "40,000 political prisoners" in Cuba under the Communist regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

They joined a guided tour of the United Nations. When the group arrived at the public gallery of the Security Council chamber they climbed over a barrier and ran to the big, horseshoe-shaped delegates' table.

H. CON. RES. 65

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of denial of the right of self-determination and other human rights violations in Cuba on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

H.J. RES. 160

Joint resolution to prevent the subversion of the United States and the American continents as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba under Castro, and for other purposes

Whereas there have been many suggestions and several resolutions as to the procedure necessary to stop Cuba's Fidel Castro from subverting the American continents; and

Whereas Fidel Castro's Communist regime has, by its actions, merited the condemnation of the Organization of American States as an aggressor nation; and

Whereas the Castro government at the Tri-Continental Conference declared, openly for all to know, its intent to overthrow every legally constituted government on the American continent, including that of these United States; and whereas, it has already put into practice the revolutionary plans of the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana in Bolivia, Venezuela, and Guatemala; and

Whereas the citizens people of Cuba, terrorized by huge arms buildup and foreign mercenary troops, cannot regain control of their government without outside help from the nearly one million fellow countrymen in exile; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of these United States not to have an aggressive dictatorship, supported by foreign arms and troops, menacing our people with atomic missiles pointed at our cities; and

Whereas it is in the peaceful interest of the United States Government, as well as a moral obligation to all Americans, to prevent Latin America and the United States from becoming battlefields for guerrilla warfare, as planned by Castro at the Tri-Continental Conference of Havana; and

Whereas it would be a waste of the American taxpayers' dollars to donate funds for the Alliance for Progress in Latin America while Castro is at liberty to organize, finance, and direct guerrilla bands to attack and overthrow these same governments we are trying to help financially: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Government withdraw political recognition of Cuba's Communist government and thus encourage all Latin American countries to do likewise; and

That all governments who wish to participate in the Aliance for Progress must first withdraw political recognition of any Communist government in Cuba; and

That the United States State Department policy be clearly defined as no longer recognizing the Communist regime of Castro at Havana and that no reprisals will be taken against any Cuban in restoring freedom and constitutional government in their homeland Cuba; and

That any nation doing business with Cuba's Communist aggressor government of Fidel Castro will be subjected to an embargo by the United States in equal amounts to that country's imports to the United States; and

That the United States Government will recognize no government in Cuba until a truly constitutional government is established by free elections participated in by all Cubans.

NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO BUILD AN SST

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other voices here today in opposition to continued funding of the supersonic transport plane. We have heard numerous arguments against it ranging from damage to the ecology to poor economics, but for me the two overriding factors are the pressing needs in other areas of transportation and the never-ending demand for money with no predictable ceiling in sight.

Frankly it will do no good to get from New York to London 2 hours sooner if it takes 2 hours longer to get from one's home to the airport. Our cities—and particularly those in the New York metropolitan area—are choked with traffic. Subway and rail systems are breaking down because of the overload of passengers. Airports are tremendously overcrowded. The fact is we are moving people from point A to point B slower today than we did 10 years ago and with more inconvenience and discomfort.

Knowing of these problems, I cannot in good conscience support a project that would only add to the already critical transportation problem.

This country may reach a point sometime in the future when construction of an SST will be more feasible. But at this juncture in our national life we simply cannot afford to consider such an expenditure.

Beyond the scope of the transportation problems, there are many other priorities that should be considered before building an SST. The housing shortage has reached the critical stage. Many of our cities and States are on the brink of bankruptcy. Our citizens are crying for relief from taxes.

In the midst of all this there are some in this body who still are seeking to spend needed dollars on a luxury airplane. That is like the alcoholic husband who spends a big chunk of his paycheck for a good drunk rather than on food for his family.

Americans on the individual level have had to tighten their belts more than once in the past several years. Most families have had to go without some luxuries and items of convenience or prestige because of the high cost of necessities.

How many families do you know that have sacrificed buying a new or better car so that they could send a son or daughter to college? Can we do less at the Federal level than what we ask of the individual citizen?

Our college aid program has languished for the last couple of years because of lack of sufficient funds. Let us spend the millions planned for the SST on better education programs.

In addition to the questionable need for an SST at this time in light of other demands on the tax dollar, there are the many unanswered problems of air and noise pollution by a fleet of these planes.

Although some efforts have been made toward solving the noise problem, other questions have been raised that any solution would add so much equipment to the already heavy jet that it would be uneconomical to fly.

Also the question of upsetting the delicate balance in the upper atmosphere which controls temperature and weather is as yet unanswered.

We have heard numerous arguments about the economic need for this plane in terms of passenger traffic. I would point out that the 747's are currently running way under capacity and the airlines have experienced a drop in passenger traffic recently. It would appear that the projections of the plane's backers are way off.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this body can justify spending scarce tax dollars on the SST at this time. Perhaps in the future when some of our urgent problems have been solved, when some of the pollution controversies of the jet have been settled and when the need has been clearly demonstrated, then this body may well take a second look at the SST and decide to go ahead with it. However, today—in 1971—the American taxpayer deserves a better deal than higher taxes for a high-priced luxury plane.

A PEACE SETTLEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the statements made by Secretary of State Rogers at his recent news conference indicate to me that the United States is pursuing a dangerous, futile, and even mischievous policy in the Middle East.

The Secretary's statements had the effect of placing further pressure upon Israel to withdraw to its pre-1967 borders. In his opinion, the Secretary noted, geography is not "solely responsible for security or even to a large extent responsible for security."

Mr. Speaker, this statement betrays a painfully inadequate and incomplete understanding of the situation.

Israel has had a long and unfortunate experience with borders that were difficult if not impossible for her to defend. She has had experience with so-called international peace-keeping forces. She has suffered before from a failure of the United States to fulfill a clear and written American commitment to defend Israel's right to navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba.

This past experience has clearly demonstrated that Israel cannot rely upon international efforts to guarantee her right to survival. She must have borders she can defend herself, for no other country or international organization has thus far exhibited the reliability and strength necessary to prevent Israel's complete obliteration.

Mr. Speaker, if geography is not important why did the South Vietnamese and the United States invade Cambodia and Laos?

If geography is not important, why did the United States insist that Russia remove missiles from Cuba—90 miles from our shores?

If geography is not important, why did we fight in Korea—a country in close proximity to our ally Japan?

If geography is not important why did the Soviet Union annex part of Poland and insist upon establishing a buffer zone around her borders after the Second World War by insuring friendly regimes in east Europe?

If international guarantees are so important, how could the countries of Western Europe—including two of the Big Four who are now so ready to defend Israel—fail to defend Czechoslovakia in the 1930's?

Did the promises made to Poland during the 1930's prevent an invasion by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union?

What is to be made of the inability of the League of Nations to act to aid Ethiopia?

And what of the League's failure to stop Japanese aggression?

Mr. Speaker, Bismark once said that countries have neither friends nor enemies, only interests.

It is certainly possible that at times, American perceptions of U.S. interests in the Middle East will be different from and may in fact be opposed to Israel's perceptions of its interests. This is as it must be. How then can we expect Israel to stake its very survival upon an international guarantee given by the Big Four—which is dependent—realistically viewed—upon a complete coincidence at all times between their perceptions of their own interests and the interests of Israel.

Israel's own history and the history of the world clearly demonstrate that a country can only depend upon its own efforts when its very existence is at stake. Israel does not want to be defended by American troops or the troops of any other country. Any attempt to impose a settlement upon Israel which substitutes the chimera of a so-called international guarantee for boundaries that Israel can defend by itself, only makes possible involvement of American combat troops in the Middle East more likely.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State said, if a settlement is not achieved in the Middle East now, "we are going to plant seeds that will lead to future war." That may or may not be true.

A future war seems even more inevitable if a settlement which does not involve secure borders is imposed upon Israel.

THE FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House a bill intended to restore the U.S. fishing industry to its former level of economic strength and competitiveness. I believe that it is imperative that this act be passed by the Congress as early in this session as possible.

The fishing industry in the United States is in critical condition. We have dropped from second place to sixth in total world fish catch since 1956, trailing Peru, Japan, Red China, Russia, and Norway in that order. Our annual fish production has varied little in the past 25 years, yet total world fish catch has increased threefold.

The cause for the depressed condition of this industry obviously cannot be placed on a decreased market. This industry ought to be booming; instead, it is dying. In New England in 1960, 93 percent of the fish caught off the Continental Shelf were landed by New England fishermen. By 1965, the percentage had dropped to 35 percent. In the city of Gloucester in my district, the number of fishing vessels had been cut almost in half in the last 18 years. The number of crewmen on those vessels dropped from 1,643 in 1950 to 642 in 1968. In addition, the total value of fish caught has decreased from $11,235,000 to $5,715,000 in the past 20 years. I do not need to describe what these losses have meant to this once booming New England port.

Our fishing industry desperately needs the revitalization which only assistance from the Federal Government can provide. The bill which I am introducing today would be a step toward restoring the fishing industry to its former level of economic strength and competitiveness.

What is needed in the fishing industry is greater cooperation between the fishermen themselves. Heretofore, because of provisions of the antitrust laws, our fishermen have been unable to form cooperatives and marketing associations.

By establishing cooperative associations, the fishermen will be better able to consolidate their resources and direct their diverse talents toward buying, selling, processing, and handling the fish and providing the cooperative's members with equipment and supplies.

Section 108 of this bill would authorize $3 million for the next 3 years for grants to cooperatives to finance purchases of fish and shellfish and the cost of storing them; provide operating capital needed to supplement that of the association; finance or refinance the acquisition of land, buildings, and equipment related to the construction or reconstruction of buildings or other improvements by the association related solely to storage processing and preparation for marketing or handling of the fish.

The cooperative approach to the problems of the industry will be of benefit to everyone. It will permit fishermen to make better use of their existing facilities, and with consolidation of resources costs will drop. The consumer will thus benefit from lower prices.

Sixty percent of America's fishing boats are over 16 years old. Many of our fishing vessels are too antiquated and ill-equipped to compete adequately with those of other countries. For instance, the Russians often use a very fine net which permits them to fish for several species at once. American boats usually fish for one species at a time. Russian trawlers are large enough to use two sets of nets enabling them to double their catch. Our fishing boats, for the most part, are not strong or well-equipped enough to perform such technological feats and can therefore do only half the work of the Russian boats. Many of our boats are not even equipped with conventional sonar gear which would enable them to go directly to the site of the fish and cut down on the cost of cruising the waters in search of a catch.

In addition, most fishermen at this time plow their profits back into repairs of existing equipment on their boats. To take care of the boat requires almost all money earned. An individual owning his own vessel finds it difficult, if not impossible, to buy the more modern equipment which would increase his profits. Yet, the fisherman cannot save his money for the new equipment because the old is in constant need of repair. A vicious circle is thus established. Banks will not lend him the money because his collateral is poor, and the Bureau of Fisheries loan program simply does not have adequate funds to underwrite enough loans.

Most fishermen are small businessmen who cannot afford the large initial capital outlay necessary to modernize their boats. They must receive Federal assistance if they are to be able to prevent the other nations of the world from decimating our industry.

Section 103 is an important step toward solving these problems. These actions would give grants to fishermen to improve their equipment. This section provides technical assistance grants on a demonstration basis to cooperatives or other associations or organizations to pay in part or wholly the costs of technological improvements in the fisheries.

Under section 104, the Secretary of the Interior may make grants for the necessary conversion of fishing vessels, including acquisition of equipment, to permit the vessels to expand into unexploited or underexploited species; $5 million would be authorized for this purpose for the next 3 years. At the present time, overexploitation of certain species threatens their survival and the survival of the fishermen who depend on them. By expanding the number of species being fished, we will achieve a better balanced market and provide greater economic stability to our industry.

One of the most essential sections of this bill concerns the establishment of marketing associations. I do not believe that it will be possible for us in the near

future to catch up with the more technologically advanced nations who are presently leading us in the amount of fish caught. Too much money and planning are presently required to overcome their lead. I believe, however, that our industry could become economically viable by utilizing the abilities and talents of its members to carve out a market in the fresh fish area. I do not mean that we should ignore the tremendous potentials of frozen foods or give up our attempts to regain our world leadership in fishing. Pragmatically speaking, however, I do believe that we must concentrate on our strengths, thereby achieving the economic stability that will better enable us to tackle our weaknesses.

Section 203 permits the establishment of marketing associations, usually groups of individuals, to regulate marketing of products, conduct marketing research and conduct advertising campaigns. One of the fish industry's major problems has been the lack of public knowledge of the health benefits of fish. The marketing association concept will enable the industry to expand its markets by increasing public awareness of the nutritional and culinary benefits of fish. By permitting the industry to regulate the marketing of its products, the consumer will be much better protected against price fluctuations and against shortages of certain species.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to reiterate my support of this bill. There are many other deserving sections which I have not discussed. Nevertheless, let me make it clear that I support each and every suggested portion of this bill.

Many cities and towns along our seacoasts have had to bear the burden of the decline of this vital industry—a decline that can be arrested if we act quickly. The unemployment caused by this decline alone in the city of Gloucester has led to increased welfare costs and a loss of trade in all sectors of the business area.

The deterioration of the fishing industry is at the heart of Gloucester's problem. Gloucester is but one example of the problems besetting so many of our seaports. I urge immediate action to correct this situation.

LAOS: WHAT NIXON IS UP TO

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion just prior to the publication of the following article by Daniel Ellsberg, in the March 11 New York Review of Books, to invite Mr. Ellsberg to a reception where he addressed a number of Congressmen. His views expressed in the article were and are now of great concern to the American people, and make it apparent that President Nixon's policy will not bring peace to Indochina. It is essential that Congress act immediately to end the conflict by withdrawing all troops, whether land, sea, or air, no later than December 31, 1971. For these reasons I insert at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Ellsberg's article:

LAOS: WHAT NIXON IS UP TO

(By Daniel Ellsberg)

As though driven by Che's curse, Richard Nixon seems compelled to create "two, three . . . many Vietnams" in Southeast Asia.

The pace of invasion is quickening. On the first evening of the invasion of Laos, Vice President Ky pointed to what could be the next. South Vietnamese ground forces, he said, might have to cross the 17th parallel into North Vietnam to hit supply bases above the DMZ. It was six years since South Vietnamese forces had first done that, in the air, with Ky himself leading the attack. In fact, Ky was speaking at a dinner marking the anniversary, largely unnoticed in the US, of those raids of February 7 and 8, 1965, which "retaliated" for the death of eight Americans in an NLF attack on Pleiku and led to a three-year bombing campaign against the North. Ky's warning, coinciding with the new offensive in Laos, linked the past, present, and future of a fundamentally unchanging US strategy in Indochina.

In the US itself, not even the Orwellian communiqués seem to have altered. On February 7, 1965, the White House chose the occasion of its announcement that US bombers were crossing the borders of North Vietnam to repeat its past assurances to the American public: "As the US Government has frequently stated, we seek no wider war." On February 9, 1971, as US bombers and helicopters were for the first time accompanying South Vietnamese forces—paid, equipped, and supported by the US—into Laos, Secretary Laird told the nation: "We have not widened the war." He added: "To the contrary, we have shortened it."

To the contrary—as all can see—we have widened it. Why? When and why will we do it again? There is, in truth, a coherent inner logic to the policy that contains answers to these questions. It is a logic that has pointed for at least the last year to the invasion of Laos—and beyond.

For twenty years—since the "fall of China" and the rise of * * * of Indochina policy for an American President has been: Do not lose the rest of Vietnam to communism before the next election. But there was also Rule 2, learned shortly thereafter, in Korea: Do not fight a land war in Asia with US ground troops either. Three Presidents, starting with Truman, managed to satisfy both constraints during their terms and passed the challenge on to their successors. The problem grew, and Lyndon Johnson's Presidency was crushed in its first full term by the impossibility of fulfilling both requirements. But Johnson's foundering on Rule 2 did not repeal Ruel 1 for his successor: even in 1969, even for a Republican, even for Richard Nixon.

Like Kennedy and Johnson before him, Richard Nixon believes he cannot hold the White House for a second term unless he holds Saigon through his first.

His two predecessors had seen the leaders of the previous Democratic administration driven from office after they had been charged with having "lost China." More specifically, they were accused of losing China without trying, without making use of full US airpower or advisers, without giving full support to an anticommunist Asian ally: omissions pointing to weakness or treason. Kennedy and Johnson both feared that the accusation of "losing Vietnam"—or simply "losing a war"—could rally again the hounds of McCarthyism against their party.

Nixon does not feel immune just because he once was one of the leaders of that pack. On the contrary, he knows better than anyone else just what *he* would try to do with such an issue if he were on the outside seeking power, even against a Republican President. He is determined not to have to suffer from it in 1972, either from Reagan summoning away his supporters in the convention or from Wallace calling to his voters in the election. (Whether the fears shared by Nixon and his predecessors of a threat from the right are based on political reality, or on a specter of their own making, is not the issue here. What matters is that four of the last five Presidents have felt compelled to take such a threat seriously and Nixon still does.)

No doubt there are other and perhaps even stronger motives that influence Mr. Nixon's decisions but they point in the same direction. There is good evidence that the President is, even more than his predecessors, a "true believer" in the cold war premises they all shared, including that of the importance of maintaining US power in Asia, showing strength to the Russians and Chinese, containing communism—monolithic or not—and avoiding the reverberating damage of a US failure or humiliation.

Which of these instincts is the stronger matters little in this case, for they reinforce each other in Vietnam policy: Saigon must not "fall" . . . above all, not too soon or too suddenly. Those who imagine otherwise, who suppose that Nixon's views on domestic politics conflict with his notions of US interests abroad, and that his instincts for political survival inexorably urge him toward total withdrawal "no matter what," are almost surely wrong.

During 1968 Henry Kissinger frequently said in private talks that the appropriate goal of US policy was a "decent interval"—two to three years—between the withdrawal of US troops and a Communist takeover in Vietnam. In that year, an aim so modest had almost a radical ring; no major public figure, in fact, dared openly to endorse it. But in 1969, when Kissinger moved to the White House, his notion took on a sharper meaning and new urgency. It became not a goal but a requirement; and the "interval," it became evident, could not end before November, 1972. In its new, tougher form, the doctrine had practical implications for policy well beyond 1972. In effect, it meant acting immediately and over the next several years to achieve both an indefinite fighting stalemate in Vietnam and support for such a stalemate in the U.S. And that aim had implications for the prospects of renewed escalation of the air war in Indochina.

To begin with, it was evident in Paris by the spring of 1969 that Hanoi and the NLF would not accept terms that would meet the Administration's needs for assuring non-Communist control in Saigon through at least 1972. Nor would the Russians intervene to achieve this, as Nixon had hoped. So the war had to go on.

Total Vietnamization? US military advisers held out no hope whatever that Saigon could be held with any assurance for three years, or even one year, if *no* US military personnel remained in South Vietnam. No foreseeable improvement in ARVN, or amount of US aid, including air support, would prop up Saigon reliably in the face of North Vietnamese forces if all our troops came home. *Both* US troops and airpower were needed in sizable amounts, for years, perhaps indefinitely.

In fact, through 1969 and, so far as is known, today, the highest military leaders have never judged officially that the job of holding Saigon could be done, with reasonable assurance and with adequate safety for remaining US troops, with fewer than 200,000 military personnel in the country to provide air support, logistics, communications, intelligence, self-defense, and strategic reserve. That figure, Nixon probably thinks, and with reason, is inflated; but there are limits to what the Joint Chiefs of Staff will certify as "militarily acceptable," and the semi-permanent minimum may well turn out to be not much lower than 100,000 for the end of

1972 and after. It is more likely to prove higher; and it will almost certainly not be less than half that figure, long after 1972.

With the military floor somewhere between 50 and 150,000 troops, the political ceiling is surely not very much higher. LBJ's strategy, putting half a million US troops in the South, met the goal he defined in his first week in office; he left the White House five years later accused of many things, but not of being the first President to lose a war. Yet his approach was, obviously, only a partial success; it saved Saigon but lost the White House. As would anyone determined to hold both, Nixon drew an immediate lesson: US troop levels and budget costs must go down, and casualties, draft calls, and news space must go down even more sharply. In fact, even 50,000 troops—still twice as many as LBJ had in Vietnam at the onset of the bombing—could be acceptable to the public or, better, ignored by it, only if US casualties were very low indeed and newsworthy North Vietnamese successes anywhere in Indochina almost nonexistent.

Thus Nixon's practical goal—a "Korean solution," as officials began to call it—became clear: to make Indochina safe for an indefinite presence of 50,000 U.S. troops or more in South Vietnam. The key to a solution, Nixon and Kissinger concluded, was to expand the role of airpower, and in particular, to restore and increase the threat of bombing the North.

How else, they reasoned, could Nixon ever compel successful negotiations? How could he induce the Russians to use their leverage for a settlement, unless the Russians were made to fear—in Laos, say, or in Haiphong—that they would become more directly involved?

How else could Nixon deter the North Vietnamese forces, once they recovered from the 1968 losses, from making embarrassing gains at will in Laos; or worse, from coming south to overpower ARVN; or worst of all, attacking the reduced U.S. units, either destroying them or forcing them home?

"Vietnamization," if confined to the borders of South Vietnam and with the threat of escalation excluded, had no persuasive long-run answers to these threats. That, in the minds of some in Washington, in view of the unpromising prospects in Paris, was an argument for total, prompt U.S. extrication from Vietnam. To Nixon and Kissinger, it meant instead that a credible bombing threat was essential to their program.

The policy they decided on was in many ways a familiar one, especially for Republicans. Its main ingredients were precisely those prescribed twenty years ago by the "Asia-first" right-wing Republicans in Congress for preventing the "fall of China" and, later, by MacArthur and others, for winning "victory" in Korea—the threat and, if necessary, use of U.S. strategic airpower and allied Asian troops under a U.S.-approved, authoritarian, and anti-communist regime, financed and equipped by the U.S. and using American advisers and logistical and air support. (Vice President Nixon had been willing to add some U.S. ground combat troops to that package to save North Vietnam in 1954, before the fall of Dienbienphu, but this was considered an aberration at the time.)

If one adds the threat of nuclear weapons—a threat used privately, Nixon believes, by Eisenhower to settle the Korean War, and later used publicly by Secretary Dulles to influence the First Indochina War—one has all the elements underlying Dulles's doctrine of "massive retaliation" and the "New Look" defense posture of the Eisenhower Administration. This was the policy that enabled Republicans to combine aggressive rhetoric with a limited defense budget throughout the years when Nixon was Vice President. As an academic strategist during the period, Henry Kissinger dissented from this formula mainly by stressing the role of "tactical" nuclear weapons (in the book, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, which made his reputation). But in Nixon's Administration, the threat of nuclear weapons in Indochina is not—as yet, at least—an essential part of the strategy of Kissinger and Nixon (except, as usual, to deter Chinese intervention)—though they have pointedly refused explicitly to foreclose their use. The new strategy differs from the old mainly in relying on the strategic threat of non-nuclear bombing.

But how could Nixon and Kissinger believe, after the experience of the Sixties, that threats of massive bombing could solve their problems in Indochina? What could new threats promise now, when the *practice* of sustained bombing under Johnson had in fact failed to deter or physically to prevent even the Tet offensive?

Nixon's answer was that the Democrats had moved too gradually and too predictably, and had never threatened or used *heavy enough* bombing. This is what the Joint Chiefs had been saying all along, though Nixon had no need to take instruction from them. He was using a language he shares with the generals when he explained after the Cambodian invasion that, whereas Johnson had moved "step by step."

This action is a decisive move, and this action also puts the enemy on warning that if it escalates while we are trying to deescalate, we will move decisively and not step by step.

What he was then threatening, as he had done before the election, was "decisive" bombing of targets long proposed by some US military chiefs and their political spokesmen: Haiphong, "military targets" in Hanoi and unrestrictedly throughout the North, the dikes, the communications with China.[1]

This discussion owes a great deal to the thinking of these former colleagues, Halperin in particular—though they are in no way responsible for any of the interpretations presented here—as it does to a number of others with comparable governmental experience who cannot be named.

Second, Nixon believed the threat would be newly credible and effective because he would demonstrate to Hanoi that it could be carried out without destroying his own political base or ability to govern the US. Johnson had lost these, in Nixon's view, because he had combined inadequate air attacks with excessive numbers of ground troops, US casualties, and draft calls. Once those numbers were diminished, Nixon believed, the American public and its representatives in Congress would accept even a semi-permanent and geographically extended war, financed by America but with direct American combat action limited primarily to airpower.

That was a bold judgment to make in 1969. Yet the North Vietnamese had to be forced to accept this judgment if Nixon's threat of bombing were to deter them from challenging a protracted American presence, or bring them, ultimately, to accept his terms for a "just peace." Only convincing *demonstrations* of his willingness and ability to escalate could bring that about.

The notion of "warning demonstrations" has thus been central to the tactics of Nixon and Kissinger, and it explains the sequence of political threats and offensive actions they have taken over the last two years. As early as the spring of 1969, our first air attacks on Cambodia—not officially announced and little noticed in the US—were soon followed by a warning to Hanoi which was inserted in an otherwise moderate speech by Nixon on a Vietnam settlement.

At the same time the bombing expanded in Laos, and a series of bombing raids began on North Vietnam. As these raids continued, Administration officials gradually dismantled Johnson's 1968 "understanding" which had strictly limited the justification for such raids. Finally, in his televised interview with the press on January 5, 1971, the President virtually abandoned this "understanding."[2]

The ground invasion of Cambodia took place in spring, 1970; in the fall, troops landed in North Vietnam; now we are supporting an invasion of Laos. In each case the White House has conveyed unmistakable warnings to Hanoi that more such action was to come.

All of these actions could be, and were, defended as tactics necessary to delay enemy build-ups or "spoil" enemy offensives. Indeed, all of them may keep things quieter in South Vietnam, in the short run. They make offensive action difficult and costly for the North Vietnamese, thus delaying a new offensive until Hanoi once again faces the inescapable need to make the necessary sacrifices. They do, in short, buy time, with US airpower and thousands of Asian lives. The airpower, especially the lavish use of armed helicopters, substitutes for US troops. The fewer American troops in Vietnam, the more need for US airpower throughout Indochina, if US losses are to be cut and the North Vietnamese prevented from taking the initiative.

Of course this view can be challenged on tactical grounds as well. By expanding the war, the US commanders are multiplying their risks and committing themselves to protracted war in three countries, for only limited gains. In Laos, for example, US helicopter losses and South Vietnamese casualties may turn out to be sizable. A right-wing coup may follow our interventions—reversing the order of events in Cambodia—with complex repercussions, possibly including an increased Chinese combat presence, which would automatically cause US nuclear contingency plans to be presented for consideration to the Secretary of Defense, if not to the President. And the North Vietnamese have considerable ability, as in Cambodia, to respond to our moves in the border areas by enlarging their control elsewhere.

But, as the White House planners see it, none of this tactical argument really matters. The domestic risks, in their view, are not great ones, even in the worst circumstances. After an unpopular beginning, the operation in Cambodia showed to Nixon's satisfaction that the war can be reduced in visibility while expanding geographically, so long as US ground units are not involved.

In fact, tactical success is not what these initiatives are all about. Their real significance, in every case, is that they are concrete *warnings* to the Hanoi leadership, and to their Soviet and Chinese allies—violent warnings to back up verbal threats.

They warn, first, of what Nixon is willing

---

[1] See Les Gelb and Morton H. Halperin, "Only a Timetable Can Extricate Nixon," Washington *Post* Outlook section, May 24, 1970; and Halperin, "Vietnam: Options," *New York Times*, Op-Ed page, November 7, 1970. The press has oddly failed to take account of these two remarkable "inside" pieces on White House threats and intentions, warning of further escalation by Nixon; or to explore the views of these two analysts, each of whom served both Johnson and Nixon in highly sensitive positions dealing with Vietnam policy, Halperin having served until September, 1969, as assistant to Henry Kissinger in the White House.

[2] Nixon claimed that the North Vietnamese had violated another understanding that our "unarmed reconnaissance planes could fly over North Vietnam with impunity," although former high officials in the Johnson Administration have denied that there was any such understanding. Nixon went on to state that "if they say there is no understanding in that respect"—as Hanoi leaders do say—"then there are no restraints whatever on us."

to do and feels free to do without consulting Congress or feeling limited by Johnson's precedent. Each one of the measures listed above broke a restraint maintained or eventually imposed by Lyndon Johnson in his campaign to bring "pressures on Hanoi." There were, after all, some good reasons for observing those limitations, and many of those reasons are still plausible. Nixon's actions thus serve all the more forcefully as deliberate signals to his opponents that he will not be bound by earlier constraints.

His actions demonstrate, furthermore, how far Nixon thinks he can go by using the rationale of "protecting the lives of American troops" and the formula of "limited-duration interdiction operations, to permit continuation of the withdrawal of US forces." These terms—Hanoi is meant to notice—could be used just as well for the "limited" ground invasion of North Vietnam to destroy depots and bases above the DMZ that has been mentioned by General Ky. The same language could be used to justify the mining and aerial destruction of the port of Haiphong; or full-scale attacks on the land and water links to China and on military targets throughout the North including Hanoi. All of these could be described as "limited in time and space."

In fact, each one of these moves could be presented as a logical progression in a series of "interdictions" running from south to north, just as the present attacks in Laos "logically" followed the closing of the port of Sihanoukville by the Lon Nol government, and the invasion of Cambodia. Each step could be explained as "closing" a remaining door in the channel of war materiel to North Vietnamese and NLF forces in South Vietnam.

To be sure, none of these steps could reliably close off that necessary trickle of supplies from the North, even if they were all taken together. But Nixon has been told this; again, that is not what such threatened moves are about. They point, rather, toward the program that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff have urged *over the last decade* in the absence of a permanent and "acceptable" settlement by Hanoi: the final destruction of "the will and capability of North Vietnam to wage war." Or to survive.

Not that Nixon hopes or expects this ultimate escalation will be necessary; his threats and commitments make it contingent on North Vietnamese behavior. Hanoi's leadership is left two options for avoiding this punishment. It can, tacitly but permanently, accept things pretty much as they are in the South, without initiating heavy combat, or with no more than can be handily contained by South Vietnamese ground forces with U.S. air support. The war would continue but military action would taper off and U.S. casualties would virtually cease. Or else, bowing to the conclusion that the American people will support a low-level or airpower war indefinitely, and that the American President will meet any attempt to convert it to a high-cost war by burning North Vietnam to the ground, the Hanoi leaders can seek to conclude a formal settlement on U.S. terms.

U.S. officers choose to call the first possibility a "Korean solution"—though it could mean permanent war and permanent U.S. air operations—because it combines a permanent U.S. presence with very low U.S. casualties. The second possibility, which defines Nixon's aim of "winning a just peace," would more truly be a "Korean solution," especially in view of Nixon's conviction that settlement in Korea was based on the threat of massive bombings. Faith in either possibility permits Nixon to deny charges that he has chosen a "no-win" strategy.

So Che's prescription, finally, is turned around to Nixon's ends. Not only did the short-run problem of lowering US casualties during a gradual and limited reduction of strength—the problem of "getting through '72"—invite a broadening of the battleground to include the border bases and supply routes in Laos and Cambodia. Far more important, the symbolism of such widening—the dramatic crossing of frontiers in defiance of domestic protest and contrary expectations—was uniquely suited to making credible Nixon's crucial threat: to extend the battleground to all of North Vietnam. From the moment that Sihanouk's ouster cleared the way, it was almost inevitable that the search for a second "Korea" would lead the President to institute a second and a third "Vietnam"—to warn the North he could create a fourth.

In Laos the Administration in showing that it has learned its "lessons from Cambodia." No American rifle units in action, crossing borders or shooting white college students. No promises, no bulletins, no news at all, in fact. No statement on the operation by the President. Instead, on the afternoon of the day the helicopters and antracs moved across the border, Nixon went before the TV cameras with a brief message on ecology, beginning (according to the White House press release):

In his Tragedy, *Murder in the Cathedral*, T. S. Elliott [*sic*] wrote, "Clean the air. Clean the sky. Wash the wind." [*sic*]

I have proposed to the Congress a sweeping and comprehensive program to do just that, and more—to end the plunder of America's natural heritage.

No TV or news photos of the invasion were permitted; cameramen were barred from recording what we and our allies were doing to the natural heritage of their neighbors. (The Vietnamese were struck, a *New York Times* account reported, by the lushness of the yet undefoliated jungle they were entering). Instead viewers were offered pictures of the moon and of the staging areas at Khe Sanh: an uncanny juxtaposition, the war-created moonscapes near the DMZ compensating for the lack of live coverage of the lunarization of Laos.

What will this new invasion mean to the people of Laos? War is not new to them, nor are foreign soldiers or American bombers; yet they are now feeling the impact of all these in a new and terrible way. As in Cambodia, the first operations are in relatively unpopulated areas; and as in Cambodia, the North Vietnamese forces will most likely fight back in more heavily populated lowlands and against towns, where our bombers and armed helicopters will seek them out. Then the refugees will come—many of them from areas where they have lived for years in the vicinity of Pathet Lao or North Vietnamese troops—to the fetid enclosures on the outskirts of towns that are not being bombed, leaving their dead behind them.

"We have learned one thing in Laos and Cambodia" the counsel for the Kennedy Subcommittee points out. "The mere presence of enemy forces does not lead to refugees. Heavy battles do; US bombing does."

As an essential part of Nixon's "winding down the war" for American troops in South Vietnam, American pilots were sent to inflict the war more heavily on Laos and Cambodia. In the fall of 1969, more than 600 sorties a day were being flown over Laos; some of the heaviest months of bombing in the war occured in that year, and again in 1970. The number of refugees in Laos had already risen sharply in 1968, after American bombers were shifted in late March from North Vietnamese targets to areas in both northern and southern Laos.

But in the first twelve months of the Nixon Administration, the number of refugees nearly doubled. The official estimate for the end of 1969—certainly a low one—was at least 240,000 (in a population of under three million). In the first eighteen months there were at least 30,000 civilian casualties, including more than 9,000 killed. The number of refugees continued to rise in 1970; by the fall it was almost three times the estimate for February, 1968.[3] Then in November of last year, U.S. bombing escalated sharply in Laos.

Whatever the impact of recent events on the flight of people within Laos, it is likely soon to be magnified by the effects of operations similar to those in Cambodia, where *well over a million* refugees have been "generated" during the last nine months (in a population of about 6.7 million). There is no available estimate for the number of civilian deaths in Cambodia since last spring's invasion.

How many will die in Laos?

What is Richard Nixon's best estimate of the number of Laotian people—"enemy" and "non-enemy"—that U.S. firepower will kill in the next twelve months?

He does not have an estimate. He has not asked Henry Kissinger for one, and Kissinger has not asked the Pentagon; and none of these officials has ever seen an answer, to this or any comparable question on the expected impact of war policy on human life. And none of them differs in this from his predecessors. (Systems analysts in the bureaucracy make estimates as best they can of factors judged pertinent to policy: "costs" or "benefits," "inputs" or "outputs." The deaths of "non-combatant people" have never been regarded by officials as being relevant to any of these categories.)

Officials would, however, have an answer of some sort if other parts of the government or the press or the public had ever demanded one. Were it not for the Kennedy Subcommittee there would be no over-all official calculations of *past* casualties in Vietnam—not even the underestimated figures that have been made available. But as a result of that questioning and the subcommittee's own surveys and analyses, we now know that at least 300,000 civilians have been killed in South Vietnam—mostly by US firepower—between 1965 and 1970, out of at least one million casualties. Of these, the subcommittee's calculations indicate that about 50,000 civilians were killed in Nixon's first year in office, about 35,000 in the first half of his second, and more than that in the second half. (So the war is not "winding down" for the people of South Vietnam any more than for their neighbors; as would be apparent to the American public if such figures were flashed on the evening TV news along with US and "enemy" casualties.)

But even the Kennedy Subcommittee has made no efforts to calculate deaths and injuries from American bombing in North Vietnam; or to elicit estimates of future victims throughout Indochina. Nor have the press and television. Nor has there been any public demand for this information.

It is against this background of two decades of American official and public ignorance about and indifference to our impact upon the people of Indochina that one must understand the ease with which the Nixon Administration has sold the slogan: "The war is trending down." To agree with that proposition—and it is scarcely questioned—is to *define* "' the war" narrowly as "what is trending down": US ground troops, US casualties, budget costs. It is simply to ignore those aspects of the war what are "trending *up*": US air operations and ground fighting outside South Vietnam, and the resulting deaths and casualties we are sponsoring in Laos and Cambodia. But it cannot really be

[3] See the Kennedy Subcommittee Staff Report, "Refugee and Civilian War Casualty Problems in Indochina." (Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, September 28, 1970.) Also see Senator Kennedy's "sanitized" summary of two classified reports on war victims in Laos, released February 7, 1971.

said that this narrowed perception is simply a hallucinatory trick played by the Nixon Administration on the public. Americans have always seen the Indochina war this way.

US military officers are sometimes better at perceiving things clearly. "War is killing people," a RAND physicist was once instructed by General Curtis LeMay, one of history's "terrible simplifiers." "When you kill enough people, the other side quits."

But the new Administration is abandoning the previous crude strategy of ground combat "attrition," with its bloody-minded calculus of "body counts" and abstruse models of the birth rate of young "enemy males" to be killed in the future. Most of the victims that the new strategy kills as a result of its "warning demonstrations" have no place in bureaucratic calculations. The same is true of the vast numbers of North Vietnamese people who will be threatened if their leaders, continuing thirty years of armed struggle, decide to fight against a "Korean solution." The plans for air war designed by General LeMay may then be carried out by the Nixon Administration.

Joseph Alsop, whose column noting the "cool courage" of the President in Laos had been distributed widely by the White House, wrote several days after the Laos invasion: "As of now, Richard M. Nixon is beginning to appear as one of our better war presidents."

The passage our war President chose to recall to the American people that Monday afternoon of the invasion does not have to do with air pollution, or with any ordinary defilement. It speaks of murder. It is a chorus of horror chanted as murder is being done, in full view, at the wishes of a ruler, for reasons of state.

Clear the air! clean the sky! wash the wind!
take stone from stone and wash them.
The land is foul, the water is foul, our beasts
and ourselves defiled with blood.
A rain of blood has blinded my eyes. . . .

How how can I ever return, to the soft quiet
seasons?
Night stay with us, stop sun, hold season, let
the day not come, let the spring not
come.
Can I look again at the day and its common
things, and see them all smeared with
blood, through a curtain of falling
blood?
We did not wish anything to happen. . . .

In life there is not time to grieve long.
But this, this is out of life, this is out of
time,
An instant eternity of evil and wrong. . . .

These lines are almost unbearable for an American to read, in the year 1971, after the other years. If we are ever to return to the soft quiet seasons and we have not earned an easy passage enough Americans must look past options, briefings, pros and cons, to see what is being done in their name, and to refuse to be accomplices. They must recognize, and force the Congress and President to act upon, the *moral* proposition that the U.S. must stop killing people in Indochina: that neither the lives we have lost, nor the lives we have taken, give the U.S. any right to determine by fire and airpower who shall govern or who shall die in Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos.

MARIHUANA—"INNOCENT" DRUG

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, many of today's problems are often glamorized in the news media. However, while we are quick to criticize the news media we, at the same time, fail to recognize and appreciate the many fine public services they actually perform.

I refer to the editorial from the Laurens County News of Dublin in the First District of Georgia written by the Dublin Chief of Police Vernon DeLoach, entitled, "Parents Know the Drug Threat—The Child You Save May Be Your Own."

This editorial is not intended to be pleasurable reading—nor is it intended to make for provocative and spicy reading—however, it does what it is intended to do—it provides good knowledge on a subject we should certainly know as much as possible about—marihuana, the so-called "innocent" drug.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Special Drug Subcommittee in the last Congress, I have seen abundant evidence that marihuana is the stepping stone to hard drug addiction.

The interest of a community in being educated in all the aspects of the drug problem is greatly demonstrated and helped by the knowledgeable presentation presently appearing in Chief DeLoach's good columns. Both Chief DeLoach and the Laurens County News are to be commended for such public service efforts:

[From the Laurens County (Ga.) News, March 10, 1971]

PARENTS KNOW THE DRUG THREAT—THE CHILD YOU SAVE MAY BE YOUR OWN

(By Vernon Deloach)

THIS WEEK'S SUBJECT: MARIJUANA—THE "INNOCENT" DRUG

Marijuana is probably the best known drug to most parents because for years we have been hearing about it. Marijuana has long been in use in what we now term minority groups, but now it has spread across the land like cancer. Its manufacture and distribution is, of course, prohibited by law except for approved research purposes.

Marijuana is the dried flowering or fruiting top of the plant Cannabis Sativa, L., commonly called Indian Hemp. Usually it looks like fine, green tobacco. It is smoked in pipes or cigarette form. Hashish, also a preparation from Cannabis, is taken orally in many forms, and infrequently it is made into candy, sniffed in powder form, mixed with honey for drinking or with butter to spread on bread. The primary effect is a feeling of great perceptiveness and pleasure and an exaggerated sense of ability, resulting from even small doses. Erratic behavior, loss of memory, distortion of time and spatial perceptions, and hilarity without apparent cause occur. There is a marked unpredictability of effect.

Of course, these reactions are usual in the user of alcohol, too, but with the drug user there is no alcoholic breath odor. Breath odor though is most always unpleasant.

Because of the visions and exhilaration which result from the use of Marijuana, abusers may lose all restraint and act in a manner dangerous to themselves and others. User is usually accident prone because of his time and space sense upheaval. Dependence leads to anti-social behavior and could be the forerunner to use of other, far more deadly drugs.

Street terms (names) for Marijuana are: joints, sticks, reefers, weed, grass, pot, muggles, mooters, Indian hay, locoweed, Mu, giggle-smoke, Griffo, Mohasky and Mary Jane.

By the millions, and rightfully so, parents are more and more concerned or even panicked about drug use. Most disturbing is that drugs, especially Marijuana, are becoming popular even among junior high and high school students. One 37-year-old father said in a recent interview, "My seven-year-old daughter can spell Marijuana. I never heard of it until I was in college."

On and near by high school and college grounds, raids and arrests for possession of Marijuana and other drugs are increasing across the country. Simple possession of Marijuana is a felony—rightly or wrongly—that can be punished by jail terms of 2 to 10 years or more. Drug use is, without doubt, becoming a way of life for some young people—and, for an untold but large, if not larger number of adults also. And so, think about these things, my friends—we are all in this together. As adults, it is up to US to head this thing off in our community. To do this we most all know more about drugs, their use and misuse. Will you be with me next week? I hope so. What we are studying is for a very worthwhile cause!

BILINGUAL EDUCATION—WHERE IS THE MONEY?

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the bilingual education program has received $25 million for fiscal year 1971. This is $55 million below the amount which could be appropriated, were the Congress to meet the fully authorized amount—an action it can take by passage of my bill H.R. 1589.

For fiscal year 1972, the Administration has requested $25 million again, for the program. Since $100 million is authorized for the program for fiscal year 1972, this marks a gap of $75 million between the rhetoric of authorization levels and the reality of actual moneys appropriated.

Some measure of this failure to provide sufficient funds can be found in the words of the just published study by the Committee for Economic Development, entitled "Education for the Urban Disadvantaged," in which it is stated:

> While the American schools have generally provided middle and upper income youth with the intellectual tools necessary for success in our society, they have commonly failed to cope effectively with the task of educating the disadvantaged youth in our urban centers. To an alarming extent they have simply swept disadvantaged youth under the educational rug.

The bilingual education program is part of the answer to this devastating accurate indictment. Why then is there so little money for the program? How many times do we have to hear of the sorry state of education and of the tragic plight of our disadvantaged children before action will be taken?

At this point, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the March 17, 1971, edition of the New York Times, entitled "Bilingual Schools Flourishing Here," by Alfonso A. Narvaez. Mr. Narvaez's story presents an excellent account of the bilingual education program operating in New York City, and is one more bit of evidence warranting action on my bill H.R. 1589, which appropriates an additional $55 million for fiscal year 1971 for the bilingual education program.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1971]

BILINGUAL SCHOOLS FLOURISHING HERE

(By Alfonso A. Narvaez)

When kindergarten children at P.S. 25 in the Bronx play musical chairs, their teacher, Maria Acevedo, holds a card on which is printed the word "Martes." Then, to the accompainment of piano music Mrs. Acevedo recites the days of the week in Spanish. When she reaches "Martes" (Tuesday), the children scramble for their chairs.

The children are predominantly English-speaking, and the game is part of their introduction to the Spanish language.

In classrooms throughout the building, at 311 East 149th Street, children who are fluent in English receive part of their instruction in Spanish. Other children who are fluent in Spanish are taught mostly in Spanish, but with increasing emphasis on English.

P.S. 25 and another Bronx school, Community School 211 at 560 East 179th Street, are bilingual schools where 1,500 children are being taught to speak, read and write in both Spanish and English.

REQUESTED BY PARENTS

The bilingual schools, as well as bilingual programs at about 40 other elementary schools throughout the city, are the result of community pressure. Parents of Spanish-speaking children found that their children were becoming increasingly retarded in English and had no way of learning in their native language.

The parents were helped by recognition from the Federal Government—through enactment of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides funds for bilingual programs.

Many English-speaking parents wanted their children to learn Spanish, and the district superintendents in both areas—District 7 and District 12—wanted to experiment, to see if children would be able to learn better than in conventional school environment.

"Although we had many good teachers and programs in the schools of the district, Dr. Bernard Friedman, superintendent of District 7 said, "we found that virtually thousands of children were just sitting in classrooms with no real accumulation of sequential structured instruction, because they did not understand English. We had to get the bilingual concept."

CHANGE IN LAW NEEDED

Dr. Friedman said that a 1917 law that forbade teaching in any other language except English had to be changed, and that many persons at the central Board of Education, who took a dim view of the proposal, had to be convinced that the program could work.

He said that prior to the law, which was the outgrowth of anti-German sentiment here during World War I, children in some public schools were taught in their native tongue.

In June, 1968, the decision was made to try the experiment and P.S. 25 in the Bronx seemed like the best place. The 72-year-old building had recently been vacated by its students, who had moved to a new building nearby.

"Over the summer we had to do everything," noted Hernan La Fontaine, who was named to head the school. We had to recruit students, put together a staff, develop materials and implement the program.

"We went to all the schools in the district and asked parents if they wanted their children to come here, and asked teachers if they wanted to teach here. Once they understood what we were trying to do, the response was overwhelming."

APPLICANTS TURNED AWAY

Mr. La Fontaine said that the 50 teachers in the school were hand-picked from scores of volunteers and that when the limit of 850 students had been reached, others had to be turned away.

The majority of the students—85 per cent—and teachers—60 per cent—are of Puerto Rican background, with the remainder black. The teachers also come from other Latin American countries or have had Peace Corps experience there. The main criterion was that they speak Spanish well enough to be able to teach in the language.

Mr. La Fontaine said that while there were no standardized tests that could be given to the children to compare their reading levels with children in other schools, those children who were tested in Spanish were significantly above their grade levels in reading. Those tested in English came out pretty much the same as in other schools, he said.

At P.S. 211 there is an experiment going on in addition to the bilingual instruction. From the outside, the four-story, red-brick building looks much like a prison, with metal screens across all the windows and bars on the windows of the principal's office.

Inside the converted factory building, however, the brightly colored walls are adorned with scenes of Puerto Rico and with handlettered signs in Spanish and English. Green carpets cover the floor, and acoustical tile ceilings muffle the shouts of the children.

CONTROLLED CONFUSION

To the casual visitor, who is used to a conventional teaching environment, the scene on each of the three teaching floors is one of pandemonium. No walls separate the four classes in each of two sections of the floor, and the voices of teachers and children, sometimes in Spanish and other times in English, spread from one class to another. Clusters of children recite answers to teachers' questions, and some youngsters lie on the floor at the feet of their teacher.

The children, however, almost completely ignore the visitor. They remain intent on what the teacher is saying and appear to have tuned out any noises from the other classes in the room.

"This is a more relaxed atmosphere for the children," noted Ida Echevaria Gustafson, an assistant principal at the school. "Once you are in the situation, you notice that nobody pays attention to visitors. The children and the teachers just go on with their work."

Peter J. Negroni, another assistant principal, said that the reason there were no interior walls was that when the building was being renovated, there was not enough money to put them up. This permitted a chance to experiment with an open-wall situation.

He added that the setup made teaching more flexible, because with four homeroom teachers, an area leader and other teaching help, classes could be broken into small groups for more individualized instruction.

The area leader, with the help of paraprofessionals and a bilingual professional assistant—usually a teacher whose command of English does not qualify her for a New York City license—give extra help to the students in Spanish and allow the regular teachers extra time for preparation periods.

Mr. Negroni said that this also helped to group the children according to ability. He added that 12 of the classes were nongraded and that the aim, in addition to making the child fluent in two languages, was to have a completely nongraded school, with children advancing at their own pace.

The 34 teachers at P.S. 211, which opened Oct. 6, 1969, were selected from a list of 150 who had applied. About half of the 640 children in the school are black, with children of Puerto Rican origin making up the bulk of the remainder.

ARE BERRIGANS PROPHETS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the rash of publicity concerning the Berrigan brothers, many have hailed them as prophets, who are generating a new vitality into the Catholic religion.

Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., disagrees, and, in an article in the February 7, 1971, National Catholic Register, he rebutted this concept. I share Father Lyons' views regarding the recent actions of the Berrigan brothers and submit his statement for my colleagues' inspection:

ARE BERRIGANS PROPHETS?

(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Did you know that "Stalin was right" after all? Did you know that the Soviet Union would have been fair and square, if only the United States had not been so unfair after World War II? Did you know that the Church could get along behind the Iron Curtain if it were not for such "deadbeats" as Cardinal Mindszenty? Did you know that the people in South Vietnam do not care if the Communists take over their country?

None of these things is true and they are just part of the nonsense peddled by Fathers Dan and Phil Berrigan in recent years. "Time" magazine, in its cover story (Jan. 25) hails them as "prophets" and warns us that "it is the business of prophets to prick the human conscience." But they are "unprophetable servants as far as I am concerned. They are like the many false prophets of old.

We live in an age when misfits are honored and heroes are ignored. Father Dan Berrigan will not debate in public, but I have debated with Father Phil many times. I have always found it hopeless trying to keep him on the subject. When we debated at the University of Cincinnati, for example, he kept attacking the Church for its alleged wealth, instead of sticking to the subject of war and Southeast Asia.

It was the same when I debated Father Phil at Purdue and Notre Dame: he got off the subject of Southeast Asia in a hurry, apparently because he knew so little about it. Yet "Time" magazine described him as "an able political polemicist and "a voracious gatherer of facts." "Time" also referred to his books as "well-argued," but they are not. They are as full of mish-mash as the poetry of Father Dan. The "New York Post" columnist Mary McGrory referred to the Barrigan brothers as "brilliant," a charge that will never be made against Mary.

After visiting the Soviet Union a few years ago, Father Dan announced that the Church could get along if it were not for such diehards as Cardinal Mindszenty. Father Dan criticized Cardinal Mindszenty, but he never criticized his captors. When he returned from his visit to Hanoi he had plenty of criticism for the people fighting to defend their freedom in the South, but none for the leaders in Hanoi. Lets not pretend he is brilliant. He is not even balanced.

Father Phil Berrigan, like his brother Dan, is all against the Establishment, except in Communist countries. It is not at all difficult to debate with him, though it is wearisome to refute his misstatements with scholarly sources, only to have him crank them out again, undaunted, on the next campus. He deals, not in discourse but in diatribe.

Is there any way in which the position of the two brothers differs from that of Hanoi? No there is not. Do Fathers Phil and Dan

have any sympathy for the people in South Vietnam who want to stay free? No they do not. They are patsys for the Communist line.

They are a strange mixture of exhibitionism and anti-Americanism. But how can priests be so indifferent to the takeover of one-third of the world by militant atheism? Democracy is bad, they say, but Communism—well, its not so bad. It is only if you agree with them on that issue that you can understand their pacifism.

MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT IN THE MID-20TH CENTURY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, from 1776 to 1940, the National Government used the draft for a total of less than 5 years. The tradition of compulsory military service dates only from the Second World War.

As I noted in a previous speech, the draft has been used during this period to depress the level of compensation for the first-term serviceman. At the same time, the growth of the manpower pool in the postwar era has caused the draft to become increasingly selective. One critic of the draft has noted the dilemma facing policymakers who tried to create equity in an inherently inequitable institution:

To lend any semblance of justice to their choices, they had to first shunt most of the male population off into acceptable deferment categories. There were not enough deferment categories to soak up the surplus. So Selective Service, with the aid of the Defense Department and other national leaders, set about creating them, and continues to do so when the supply becomes unmanageable.

In a study prepared for the Gates Commission, Jack Rafuse notes that—

Overall, the number of exemptions proves only that the Selective Service function has become less important to military manpower procurement than ever. The manpower it selects is a minority of those reaching 19, which means that the draft is now less democratic. The tradition of the draft in America, has, then, reached its logical conclusion. The majority of men between the so-called draftable ages of 18 and 35 are now deferred or exempted, and never serve. From the brief moments of earliest colonial history when almost every man had to bear arms in certain crises, we have reached a point where a diminishing minority serves, part of which minority is drafted.

In recognition of the gross inequities, a lottery has been established, occupational deferments eliminated, and the termination of student deferments has been proposed. Still, the affluent and educated, with greater access to medical exemptions and legal counsel, can avoid the draft if they so choose—and others receive high lottery numbers which exempt them from service.

So long as we retain the draft, a minority of our young men will be forced to bear a disproportionate share of the defense burden through the regressive tax of compulsory service. I commend this item for your attention:

U.S. EXPERIENCE WITH VOLUNTEER AND CONSCRIPT FORCES

(By John L. Rafuse)

PART FIVE: THE MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY

Between the wars

American attitudes and treaty commitments after World War I again saw the armed forces shrink in numbers, but at the same time the National Guard was drawn more closely into association with the Regulars. A 1933 amendment to the 1916 National Defense Act made the Guard more truly a reserve component: units which met all federal requirements on drill, discipline, and training were redesignated units of the National Guard of the United States. This is noteworthy, for it meant that the old militia had been officially brought under the fiscal control of the federal government for the first time in American history. The distinctions so carefully debated and drawn in the *Federalist* Papers and the Constitution were blurred completely and the most efficient Guard units were removed from state control. "Technically the Guard had entered federal service in 1917 through the drafting of its members as individuals, a system which might permit dispersing the individuals to every corner of the Army."[1] The Constitutionality of the 1933 amendment to the 1916 Act has never been ruled upon by the Supreme Court.

World War II

Even combined numbers of Regulars and National Guard units were not enough to meet the manpower demands in 1940, however. While the world was at war, the United States remained officially neutral. It was a Presidential election year when the first "peace-time" draft was proposed for the United States. The proposal was intertwined with party-politics to a greater extent than in either Civil War or World War I. In addition, it has been said that "Never since Jefferson's time had America, and never in recorded history had England, been in so pacifist a mood as in 1933–39. . . ."[2]

On June 20, 1940, the draft bill was introduced in Congress. On August 2nd FDR gave public support to the draft. On September 14th the bill was passed, and it was signed into law on September 16th. Once the U.S. entered the war, the draft was used extensively and provided more than 10 million men. The total personnel who served in battle areas numbered almost 12 million, and the battle deaths numbered 291,557, or 2.442 percent; this percentage is lower than either the Civil War or World War I and more men served overseas than ever before. One of the factors which helps to explain such a decline is the increasing percentage of troops in non-military occupations. This trend means that relatively fewer troops actually engage in combat, and so the changes of per capita battle casualties are lower. Table 8 illustrates the trend.

TABLE 8.—ARMY PERSONNEL OCCUPATIONS BY PERCENT AND WAR

Occupation of enlisted army personnel percentages	Civil War (Union only)	Spanish American War	World War I	World War II	Korea	Vietnam (Dec. 31, 1968)
Technical and scientific	0.2	0.5	3.7	10.4	12.7	6.2
Administrative and clerical	.7	3.1	8.0	12.6	18.1	20.1
Mechanics and repairmen	.1	1.0	8.5	16.6	15.3	23.6
Craftsmen	.5	.1	13.0	5.9	4.7	5.2
Service workers	2.4	6.5	12.5	9.6	12.4 }	12.3
Operators and laborers	2.9	2.2	20.2	6.1	6.5 }	
Military type occupations—not elsewhere classified	93.2	86.6	34.1	38.8	30.3	32.6

Note: The Vietnam figures are based upon army categories which have been changed somewhat since Korea, so the arrangement within categories is different.

The war began on September 1, 1939, when Germany attached Poland. England and France immediately declared war on Germany. Plans had long existed in the United States to increase the Regular Army to its full authorized strength (280,000) in such a contingency, and on September 8th FDR declared a national emergency, directed increases to both Regular Army and the National Guard, and placed reserve officers on extended active duty. Planning continued after these steps had been taken, but with the fall of France (May–June, 1940) planning and action had to follow a more unified direction.

The War Department and the President had been treading lightly around the issue of a military draft. Instead, civilians began to lay plans which led rapidly and directly to the passage of the 1940 Conscription Law.[3] Greenville Clark and others including Henry L. Stimson and Robert P. Patterson, soon to be Secretary and Under Secretary of War; and General John McAuley Palmer, adviser to General Pershing, are credited by historians with responsibility for the 1940 Draft Act.

The original proposals of the Clark group were not accepted *in toto*. Under these proposals, all males 18 to 65 would have been required to register for the draft, with those between 18 and 45 liable for induction for six (later eight) months. Deferments would have been strictly occupational and inductees paid $5.00 per month. Compromises were worked out, however, by the time Congress saw the bill. Length of service was to be one year, draftees were to receive pay equal to enlistees, and 18–45 was to be the age range for registration. The question of deferments was put off pending the formulation of selective service regulations. The bill also specifically forbade enlistment bounties or substitutes. The compromise assured the bill the support of Clark's group and the War Department, and on August 2nd, Roosevelt gave his public support. He reiterated his position on August 23rd. His opponent in the presidential campaign also favored the draft, so Congressional opposition faltered. On September 14th Congress passed the bill, and two days later Roosevelt signed it into law.

The Act was to remain in force for one year and it restricted the total number of draftees to 900,000 21- to 36-year-olds, to serve for one year, only within the Western Hemisphere or American territories and possessions. This condition was reminiscent of the colonial militia area of defense. At the end of the 12 months of service, the inductee would be transferred to the reserves for ten years. Those exempted from the "obligations and privileges of military training" were: vice president, military personnel, or diplomatic representatives of the U.S.; veterans of Regular Army, National Guard or Reserves; governors; U.S. or state legislators or judges; ministers or students of the ministry; and office-holders whose jobs were deemed by the President to be necessary to the public health, safety or interest. College students were to be deferred to the end of the academic year, and conscientious objector status was recognized.

The following August the draftee's liability was extended by six months,[4] and with Pearl Harbor the restrictions contained in the draft law were dropped. The term of service for inductees was extended to the duration of the war plus six months. During the war, more than 10,000,000 of the 16,000,000 men

Footnotes at end of article.

who served were draftees, out of a total of about 36,600,000 registered and classified. Basically, the draft extends from that day to this.

Throughout the war, as today, one of the most serious arguments against the draft was the equity. Manpower procurement planners had assumed that Negroes should be represented in the armed forces in the same proportion as in the population at large. The draft act forbade racial discrimination, yet the Army like the civil sector, was segregated. The Navy and Air Corps accepted only insignificant numbers of non-whites. Census figures placed the Negro population at 10 percent of the United States total, and that number became the Army quota.

But, lacking segregated facilities, the Army began to refuse drafted Negroes. Local draft boards sent Negroes "notices of selection" rather than draft notices. By February, 1943, fewer than 6 percent of the armed forces personnel were Negro—at a time when the manpower squeeze was worsening. During 1943 the rejection rate for Negro registrants reached 53 percent, compared to 33 percent for whites. The percentage of Negroes drafted (or selected) was 10.6 [5] during the war, according to one source. Blum,[6] on the other hand, sets the number actually serving much lower, and says:

"One fact is clear: the unwillingness or the inability of the Army to fill its quota of Negroes caused a greater pressure to draft skilled whites. At its peak, only 8.75 per cent of the Army, instead of the planned 10 per cent, was Negro. Since industry often discriminated in employing Negroes, Negro citizens had fewer skilled jobs that enabled them to be deferred. Moreover, Negroes found it difficult to enlist and much easier to be discharged than whites. If the Army had taken its full quota of Negroes, about 150,000 more unskilled Negroes could have been drafted, and 150,000 more skilled workers might have been deferred. In industry as well as in the Army, then, Negro manpower remained the 'under-used part' of our total tight labor supply."

Other groups were under-utilized by Selective Service. A Presidential order on December 5, 1942, effectively ended conscription of men over 38. Local draft board practices protected the farmers during the entire war. Blum states ". . . without questioning the patriotic motives of the farmer and the agricultural bloc, the farm became a much safer (from the draft) place than the factory for an American during the Second World War." [7] At a time when far more people were engaged in industry than agriculture, deferments favored the more politically powerful agricultural minority.

Another interesting result of the industrial manpower squeeze during World War II was the "furlough" in inductees of 1944. Furloughed soldiers remained subject to military rules and discipline and could wear uniforms at work, but were paid industrial salaries in addition to their military wage.

"Since the soldiers collected double pay and did not lose their reemployment rights, the War Department no longer had any difficulty in finding enough men to ship to plants. In fact, prior to the furlough program, the Army could not fill quotas for the heavy tire, and the foundry and forge programs. When furloughs started, more men volunteered than were required." [8]

The economic incentives were high, so the supply of volunteers was more than adequate. The furloughed soldier received about $2 per day as a soldier, and $1 per hour for working in the factory.

Postwar period

When the war ended, the draft did not. The basic criterion in draft classification during World War II had been the individual's contribution to the war effort. Selective Service structures deferments as if that criterion remains basically unchanged to this day (September 1969). Neither the Korean nor the Vietnamese war has made manpower demands comparable to those of World War II, but the same deferments persist.

Since the end of World War II, the draft was allowed to lapse once (March 31, 1947) and was revived a year later. Some have claimed that the one draft-free year proved that voluntarism would not work. But, military wages, already lagging behind industrial wages, remained unchanged. No patriotic cause provided the recruits with non-pecuniary incentive. The army was looking back to a job well-done—World War II—not looking ahead. There was no way that the army could have maintained manning levels in 1947 while maintaining pay levels and recruiting standards.

In spite of insufficient enlistments, Negro manpower utilization did not increase appreciably. One reason is that qualification standards for Negroes had been set markedly higher than for Caucasians. Brigadier General A. G. Trudeau, the Chief of the Manpower Control Group, discussed this fact:

"Have no fear that we would open the doors and let in an undue flood. We do propose, however, under this plan to lower the AGCT score for Negroes to that which is standard for white troops. What that would mean would be AGCT-80 in Ground, and AGCT-90 in Air." [9]

If voluntarism failed during that period, it was because compensation was not increased. Those whose economic alternatives were fewest were still excluded by standards which also did not change.

President Truman eventually became convinced of the need for reinstitution of the draft as well as universal military training. Congress passed the draft bill on June 12, 1948, and it was signed into law by the President on June 24th. True peacetime conscription became a fact, then, in 1948. The period of service was set at 21 months with a maximum reserve commitment of 5 years after discharge, and (up to 161,000) 18 year-olds were allowed to enlist for one year. Exemptions were provided for veterans, ministers, divinity students, conscientious objectors, and sole surviving sons of families who had lost one or more sons or daughters to service connected action or disease. Other deferments followed World War II lines and the duration of the law was set for two years.

Korean war

From February, 1949, until the outbreak of the Korean War there were no draft calls, and the debate on extension or alteration of the laws was still going on when the expiration date for the law arrived. The law was extended for fifteen days by President Truman on June 23, 1950, and immediately thereafter North Korea invaded South Korea. In connection with the Korean War, it has been stated that:

"The reinstatement of Selective Service came too late. The outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950, found our military forces far below authorized strength. In the Army, few if any Divisions, were fully manned, equipment and combat ready. Many Regiments were reduced to two undermanned Battalions, and Battalions reduced to undermanned Companies.

"It became necessary to call to active duty thousands of reserve veterans of World War II because there was no time to train men in the number immediately needed to fight the rapidly increasing enemy forces in Korea. Our lack of preparedness resulted in our being driven back to the Pusan Perimeter before we could accumulate sufficient strength to launch an offensive." [10]

But, in fact, the draft existed for two years before the Korean War. It had not been used to build strength because of budget constraints, and because the Korean outbreak surprised everyone. Further, the authorized strength of the army had been cut by Congress to 630,000 men, and by June, 1950, the actual strength was only 591,487 men.[11]

As in other wars, manpower was only one of the problems. Budgets had been cut lower and lower, the army still was equipped with World War II (or older) weapons. Manpower was reduced for economy, not for lack of volunteers. As soon as the North Korean invasion began, Congress extended the 1948 law until July 9, 1951. At the same time, Congress authorized the "Doctor Draft" and the student deferment testing program. The following year, the Universal Military Training and Service Act was passed.

The law extended the draftee's term of service to 24 months for 18 to 35 year-olds, and made the functions of the Selective Service organization permanent. Since that time the law has changed little. It is again called Selective Service, and it has been extended for four years with only token debate whenever it was up for renewal.

The "universal military training" provisions of the 1951 Act were never applied, so the law was selective in all but name. The size of the manpower pool increased rapidly while the military requirements for manpower remained relatively stable. This meant that the country's manpower was only partly mobilized for Korea. Of the Army's total mobilized force of 2,834,000 men and twenty divisions, only eight divisions and one Marine Corps division were committed to Korea. The rest served as a reserve against the possibility that the Soviets might take advantage of American preoccupation with Korea to make trouble elsewhere.

Obviously such a mobilization of American manpower did not approach total mobilization or the dimensions of World War II. But herein lay much of the perplexity. The Army faced larger responsibilities than could be borne by Regulars alone. Citizen soldiers had to be called on and citizens' lives disrupted, in considerable numbers. Yet since there was no need for all the country's manpower, who was to be called? How could the burdens of the war be distributed fairly? How could they be distributed and not cause a political outcry that might undermine the Truman administration and the whole war effort with it?

These questions were never answered satisfactorily. The distribution of the burdens of the war was hardly fair, and consequent dissatisfaction not only contributed to the political undoing of the administration but at least complicated and confused the waging of the war.[12]

The Army found it did not need all the forces the President was empowered to activate, so a process of selection and juggling began. Discussing the mobilization and the 1951 draft law, one historian says:

"Hundreds of thousands of men became selectees, but still more of the same ages avoided service through various deferments, exemptions, and disabilities—essentially because the armed services would not have known what to do with all of them. Some National Guardsmen continued on federal service while others escaped, with the very geography of Guard unit distribution adding to the inequities. Since the Regulars and the Guard afforded sufficient organized units, Reserves were called to federal service largely from the inactive Reservists, officers and men who had not been undergoing unit training. These men were especially apt to wonder why they should be in Korea while thousands of active Reservists were still at home; but the Army wanted individual replacements for units already mobilized, while units still in America remained there as a strategic reserve against a bigger war that might come." [13]

Since the Korean War the draft has become a part of the *status quo*. In that war militiamen (Guardsmen) were used to fight a foreign war while Reservists stayed home.

The draft remains unchanged since 1951. One outspoken critic has stated:

"The integrity of Selective Service crumbled

with the reinstatement of the draft in 1948. Congress may not have perceived the grave implications nor difficulties of reviving Selective Service. But the problems of peacetime mobilization became immediately apparent to General Hershey and his staff. They were charged with drafting 250,000 men in fiscal year 1949 out of a manpower pool of 7.9 million. As General Hershey noted, they had to be more "selective" than during the war when 16.5 million men were taken into the armed forces. To lend any semblance of justice to their choices, they had to first shunt most of the male population off into acceptable deferment categories. There were not enough deferment categories to soak up the surplus. So Selective Service, with the aid of the Defense Department and other national leaders, set about creating them, and continues to do so when the supply becomes unmanageable."

This leads to a high rejection rate, as does the military requirement that every inductee must be physically capable of becoming an infantry combat soldier.

In general, the provisions of the 1951 Act survive with only minor changes. The role of Selective Service has become more of "channeling" civilians than of providing the military. The manpower pool has grown to such size now that about 95 percent are excluded from the I-A or I-A-O pool. A large part, but not a majority, are excluded because they have already served. Selective Service calls only a minority of the 18-35 year-olds in the country, and defers all the rest.

As the population has expanded, fewer draftees were needed, and fewer were called from the pool. The average age of inductees rose to almost 23 years for the 1961-1963 period. On the other hand, the increase in the size of the army relative to the temporary unchanged manpower pool reversed this trend in 1965 and after. This change reflects the number of exemptions, however, and not a manpower crisis. Selective Service reports, ignoring the percentage of exemptions, state ". . . the continuing decrease in the System's supply of available manpower, accelerated by the Vietnam situation, brought the average age of regular inductees to below age 20 by December 1965." [14]

The "Channelling" function of the Selective Service system is antithetical to individual liberty, even if the individual is never drafted. It is also based upon raw political power rather than national interest, as is borne out by the fact that agricultural deferments continue at a time when farmers are paid not to produce food.

"But every thorough study indicated that if conditions remained unchanged, every available and acceptable man must continue to expect to enter military service either on his own initiative or by induction." [15]

Overall, the number of exemptions proves only that the Selective Service function has become less important to military manpower procurement than ever. The manpower it selects is a minority of those reaching 19, which means that the draft is now less democratic. The "tradition" of the draft in American history has, then, reached its logical conclusion. The majority of men between the so-called draftable ages of 18 and 35 are now deferred or exempted, and never serve. From the brief moments of earliest colonial history when almost every man had to bear arms in certain crises, we have reached a point where a diminishing minority serves, part of which minority is drafted.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Weigley, *op. cit.*, p. 401.

[2] Morrison, *Oxford History*, p. 988.

[3] Blum, Albert A., *Drafted or Deferred*, Chapter I tells the story of the meeting and the passage of the law.

[4] It is a popular misconception that the Act itself was extended in 1941, a mere six months before Pearl Harbor. This misconception is now a part of tradition also. Actually, it was not due to lapse, so the famous "Extension Debate" and the 202-201 vote in the House did not center about the continuation or lapse of conscription, but only about the term for which a man was to be drafted.

[5] Kreidberg, *History of Military Mobilization*, p. 644.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 169 contains both quotations cited on this page.

[9] *Transcription*, Personnel Conference, June 24-26, 1947, War Department, page 11.

[10] *Report of the Select Committee on Manpower*, American Legion, Washington, 1969, p. 7.

[11] Weigley, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 508.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 509-510.

[14] *Outline of Historical Background of Selective Service and Chronology* (Revised, 1965 edition), p. 27.

[15] *Ibid.*

THE CASE AGAINST THE SST

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today Congress is being asked to approve the Nixon administration's request for the full $290 million for the fiscal year to continue the financing of the SST—to spend more of the taxpayers' money on what Paul Samuelson, winner of the Nobel Prize for economics, has referred to as a "colossal economic folly." Surely there are better, more responsible, ways for the elected representatives of the American people to spend taxpayers' money.

The decision we should be making today is not whether Congress should be appropriating more funds for this program, but how we can disengage the Federal Government's involvement from this program completely. This Nation simply has too many urgent needs and priorities to be spending its money on a supersonic aircraft at this time.

Yet, during the past months and weeks, Congress and the American public have been literally besieged with a flurry of propaganda and distorted facts concerning this issue. The Nixon administration has deliberately concealed some of the more pertinent facts which it has available, and there are now reports that the administration has attempted to gag a Government scientist who was scheduled to testify as to the possible increase in the number of persons who would suffer from skin cancer as a result of the development of the SST.

In spite of all this, it is quite apparent that most of the arguments with which Congress and the American people have been bombarded are unsound. We have been told that America needs the SST to compete with the British-French Concorde, yet not one airline has placed a firm order for the Concorde, and a hold has been recently placed on its production.

A prominent member of the French National Assembly, recently referred to the French version of the SST—the Concorde—as "France's industrial Vietnam." Describing the state of the European SST project, he continued:

> Every single cost analysis from the beginning has proved to be wrong. The cost of the SST has multiplied here, as it will everywhere, four times the initial evaluations. By all normal decision-making systems, it should have been cancelled long ago, but the debate and cost have for years been kept from the public.

We have been told that the SST would not produce excessive noise or shock waves, yet the aircraft industry itself has admitted that the SST would be able to meet current FAA noise standards only by creating a significantly adverse impact on the economic aspects of the program. Furthermore, it is estimated that when flying at supersonic speeds, the SST would create a continuous shock wave moving across the land surface, 50 miles wide.

Proponents of the SST have claimed that the aircraft would be the "fastest and cleanest transportation device ever designed by mankind." Yet not one competent scientific authority has been willing to come forward and assert that the SST would not have a deleterious impact on our environment. Even the Department of Transportation has recognized the need for further study of environmental issues and has announced a $27 million research study of environmental problems of the SST. I have been assured that this grant of funds for environmental research will not be effected by a vote for the Yates amendment today.

In fact, the environmental research grant to the Department of Transportation and the noise abatement grant to the FAA will not be effected and this important research can and should continue without appropriation of more tax money to build the SST at this time.

Perhaps most absurd of all the arguments in favor of this "economic folly" is the economic argument itself. The Nixon administration has argued that building the SST would create as many as 200,000 jobs and help our country's international balance of payments. Yet nearly every one of the Nation's leading economists, ranging from the most liberal to the most conservative, has agreed that the balance of trade argument is irrelevant.

Milton Friedman, the noted professor of economics at the University of Chicago, referring to the economic arguments of the Nixon administration, finds it "disgraceful that knowledgeable government officials should use arguments—such as the balance of payments arguments, the jobs arguments, and the claims of additional taxes from jobs—that are demonstrable fallacies and have been so demonstrated."

A former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller, asks:

> If the SST is such a profitable undertaking, why does the U.S. Government, i.e., the taxpayer, have to put up 80-90% of the cost?

In noting that as of March 30, 1971, the U.S. Government will have put $864 million, or 86 percent of the $1.009 billion total thus far invested in this program, Mr. Heller points out that—

If private industry can't even take it from here—one can only conclude that the SST dismally fails the fundamental test of the marketplace.

In spite of all this, the economic argument continues to be used by SST proponents. In their attempts to enlist my support for this program, they have urged me to help keep the State of Michigan from losing potential subcontract money. However, what they have failed to point out is that the Federal money is not free; it comes, of course, right from the taxpayers' pockets.

And when this very important factor is taken into consideration, it becomes apparent that the SST program is not good for the State of Michigan, nor is it good for 43 other States. When we compare the figure which the taxpayers of Michigan would pay for the SST with the figure which Michigan would receive in potential subcontracts, Michigan would actually lose more than $37 million. At the peak labor subcontracting date it is estimated that Michigan, the Nation's seventh largest State in terms of population, would receive less than 4 percent of the jobs which would supposedly result from the continuation of this project. Of the total amount already spent on this project, Michigan's share amounted to only .0172 percent.

As for the argument that the SST program would create more jobs, there are certainly much better ways to create jobs with this money, and ways that will result in things that all Americans need and want, rather than subsidizing a supersonic aircraft which will be used by a relatively miniscule portion of the population. America needs housing, and manpower programs in the areas of public service employment and public works. This huge sum of money would be much more wisely spent in areas such as this. In addition, the 200,000 job figure which is used by the administration is in reference to a potential peak employment period for the production phase of this program, which is at this juncture mere speculation, and at least 8 years into the future. The number of employees actually employed by Boeing in the prototype program is only 4,800.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue of commonsense as to what is right for the American people. Although he is not a member of my political party, the Governor of the State of Michigan is in agreement with me on the issue and supports my intention to vote for the Yates amendment today. I am sure that a majority of my colleagues in the Michigan delegation from both sides of the aisle will oppose a continuation of funding for the SST, as well. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of a communication which I received from the Governor of Michigan only yesterday:

Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand the debate and vote on the supersonic transport will be coming up shortly in Congress. Although many of the environmental questions now appear to have answers, most will take large additional sums of money and research. The SST program is clearly one of misplaced priorities for limited tax dollars. There is a much greater need for research and development on short take-off and landing aircraft and rapid transit systems which would provide an equal number of jobs in our economy. I am opposed to further spending for SST development at this time and therefore urge you to vote yes on the Yates amendment.

Gov. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments against the SST are virtually endless; the arguments for have been repudiated. For these reasons I would urge all my colleagues today to vote against any further funding of the supersonic transport.

JAY SYKES WRITES ON THE POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, March 14, 1971, Jay Sykes has provided clear support of his thesis that public opinion is a key element in shaping U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Sykes, a lecturer in the department of mass communications, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, is past chairman of the Wisconsin branch of the American Civil Liberties Union. A graduate of Rutgers and the University of Washington Law School, he is a former editorial writer on the Milwaukee Sentinel. His thoughtful piece follows.

"POWER TO THE PEOPLE": A REALITY

(By Jay G. Sykes)

(Towering over presidents and state governors, over Congress and state legislatures, over conventions and the vast machinery of party, public opinion stands, in the United States, as the great source of power, the master of servants who tremble before it.—James Bryce, "The American Commonwealth," 1891.)

There is, of course, a theory contrary to Bryce's—that critical decisions, particularly those involving foreign policy, are made by an oligarchial power elite, without regard to public opinion. Foreign policy is conceived and executed, according to this conspiratorial view, by the president of the United States, the military-industrial complex and occasionally, in the stereotype of villainy, by imperialist warmongers, economic royalists, munition makers.

In the contemporary vernacular, decisions of war and peace are made by a monolithic "power structure"—the Establishment—while The People, virtuous, peace-loving and selfless, are ignored or manipulated into supporting their government.

Bryce's view of the dominance of the will of the public, although his rhetoric is overblown, is not far from the reality of 1971, and is certainly closer to fact than the simplistic mythology of those who cling to the devil theory of government.

One can make a case for the proposition that no major foreign policy decision has been made by the United States government, at least in the 20th century, that was not approved by a substantial majority of the American people. Lester Markel, a New York Times editor, has written: "No American program, no plan for world order, can succeed unless it has the full support of public opinion, both at home and abroad." The evidence of history supports Markel.

The majority of the American people supported our entry into World War I, then demanded rejection of American participation in the League of Nations.

That public opinion can force a reluctant government into taking positive action was demonstrated by the Senate's ratification of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which seemed at the time to hold out hope of permanent world peace. Many senators sneered at the treaty, and one likened it to "throwing peace paper wads at the dogs of war" (a judgment vindicated by events). But the public demand for approval was so great that the Senate ratified the treaty with only one dissenting vote.

The conscience of the Senate is responsive to the pressure of large numbers; legislators, like presidents, can be persuaded by public opinion to rise above their principles.

The official neutrality of the United States government in the 1930s in the face of totalitarian aggressions was a reflection of the nation's recurrent isolationism. Given the mood of the American public, weary of war and burdened by the Great Depression, the Roosevelt administration, whatever its inclinations, could not have committed this nation to intervention when the Italians invaded Ethiopia, when the Japanese attacked China, or when Spain was torn by civil war; we could not have deterred Nazi Germany, however shocked we might have been, when it reoccupied the Rhineland in 1936 or when it annexed Austria in 1938. President Roosevelt recognized the constraints of public opinion on governmental policy when in 1937 he was compelled to retreat from the warnings in his "Quarantine the Aggressors" speech.

Only when the Nazis overran France in 1940 and the possibility of the defeat of Great Britain appeared imminent, with the attendant peril to the United States, did public opinion shift in favor of aid to the Allies and Roosevelt was thus given the political leverage to offer the Lend-Lease program and the Congress the courage to approve it. The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, by mobilizing public opinion, is generally credited with giving Roosevelt the support he needed to execute the momentous destroyers-for-bases deal with Great Britain in 1940.

Yet the American people, while sympathizing with the victims of the Axis aggressors, remained adamant about staying out of war. Reflecting that public attitude, Congress, in the summer of 1941, extended the compulsory draft by a margin of only one vote. Several weeks before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, public opinion polls showed that 80% of the American people were against going to war with that country. (On Dec. 10, 1941, according to an opinion poll, 98% approved the declaration of war by Congress two days earlier.)

The parallel between public opinion and decision making in foreign policy is too exact to be concidence. The American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was approved after the fact by a substantial majority of the American people. Two months after the bombings, only 4% of those polled said that atomic weapons should not have been used on populated areas under any circumstances, 54% approved the bombing as carried out; and 23% thought we should have bombed many more enemy cities (which would seem to refute the theory that The People are inherently more peace-loving than the leaders.)

Major governmental foreign policy decisions after the war—as the precipitous demobilization of our armed forces, the Marshall Plan, American Intervention in Korea—were supported by a substantially united public opinion. The ratification of the United Nations Charter (by a vote of 89–2) by a Senate which still included many isolationists reflected the public turn toward internationalism.

There can be no doubt that those holding governmental power in this country fear and

respect the force of public opinion. To rouse popular support for the League of Nations, and thus to pressure Congress to favorable action, President Wilson undertook a grueling nationwide speaking tour, ultimately futile.

Almost 45 years later, President Kennedy felt constrained by his interpretation of public opinion to maintain an American military presence in Vietnam in spite of his apparent conviction of the attendant dangers. Kennedy had in 1963 made up his mind (according to the version of presidential aide Kenneth O'Donnell writing in 1971) to withdraw all American troops from Southeast Asia, but said that he wouldn't dare to so until after his re-election in 1964. If he announced the withdrawal before the election, Kennedy told Sen. Mansfield (O'Donnell writes) there would would be a "wild conservative outcry" and his attendant defeat at the polls.

Those who doubt the influence of public opinion in the making of foreign policy disregard the evidence of history. Those who protest that the System does not respond to the public really mean that the government is not responsive to their demands.

So sensitive, in fact, are the highest reaches of the government that during World War II, at a time when there appeared no need to counter public opinion, the State Department established a Division of Public Liaison to analyze public opinion polls and to monitor newspaper editorials and other expressions of the public will.

The conclusion is inescapable that the people of the United States can compel their government to do their bidding. Public pressure can force a policy on an unwilling administration, but the reverse is not possible. A government policy needs public support, or at least acquiesence, for execution. By defiance of their government, American citizens have, in effect, overruled official decisions and have turned treaties into dead letters. During the Canadian rebellion of 1837 and the Texas revolution of 1835–37, public sympathy for the rebels was so great that federal officials found it impossible to enforce the nation's neutrality laws.

To affect the making of foreign policy, however, public opinion must be expressed with some intensity. If the people favor a specific policy by a provably large majority but with relatively feeble energy, the public view may be disregarded and the government may feel free to act, unimpeded by majority sentiment.

Thus in 1939, although a public opinion poll found 90% sympathizing with the Chinese (and only 2% with the Japanese in the war between the two nations) and favoring an embargo on arms to Japan, the administration felt no compulsion to respond, for the demand for an embargo was gentle and undemonstrative.

Public opinion, while it occasionally forces governmental action, more often sets the outer limits within which a president, or Congress, may act and beyond which they may not dare go. Conversely, when the public is indifferent, the government has full freedom of movement.

IF PUBLIC IS UNAWARE

Nor can the public influence foreign policy when it is unaware of an issue in the decision making stage or when it learns of those decisions only after they have been carried out. Thus, public opinion played no part in the decision to land Marines in Lebanon, to invade Cuba's Bay of Pigs, to dispatch troops to the Dominican Republic. The missile crisis of 1962 was joined and resolved before the public really knew of the crisis and certainly before it had a chance to mount support or opposition to the action of the Kennedy administration in meeting that crisis.

But such instances are merely exceptions to the rule that public opinion controls foreign policy in the United States. Many voices in and out of Congress are asserting that a democratic nation should reduce to an inescapable minimum the power of the executive branch of government to commit its people to military conflicts without Legislative approval and public debate. Public opinion in the United States ought to restrict the president's power to take military action, they believe, except in truly emergency situations.

The question should no longer be whether public opinion can control foreign policy, but how best to bring that opinion to bear on those who make decisions. In our pluralistic society public opinion has a vast multitude of voices and the pressure points are many.

There are the voices of elected public officials. Because they are "newsmakers," their pronouncements, however illogical or inconsequential, are likely to be conveyed through the press, radio and television, and the force of their opinions thus amplified.

Expressions of dissent from—or support of—the nation's foreign policy by officials and organizations receive the most respectful attention of those who formulate that policy, for it is presumed that they are speaking not only for themselves but for their constituencies.

The channels of dissent in the United States are many: public opinion polls; criticisms in and by the press; delegations sent to Washington; testimony before Congressional committees; formation of ad hoc committees; protest meetings and less peaceful demonstrations. Letters and telegrams also are effective instruments of public opinion. President Nixon said last May that he would not be influenced by any public outcry against his decision to dispatch American troops into Cambodia. But next day he proudly displayed a stack of telegrams supporting that decision.

And, finally, there is the most sensitive of all pressure points—election day. The passion of an incumbent to remain in office, or of a challenger to capture office, provides the people with a mighty weapon for translating their opinions into national policy. There seems little doubt now that the decision to disengage militarily from Vietnam was a result of the expression of popular opinion in the elections of 1968.

FOR MORE DEMOCRACY

Individual citizens, aldermen, county supervisors, state assemblymen, governors must act upon the realization that our nation's atomic policy is as vital to us as the rate of a local sales tax; that an effective disarmament treaty with Russia is at least as important as a decision on disposing of a city's garbage and trash; that the question of the admission of Red China to the United Nations is surely as critical to the citizens of Milwaukee or Eau Claire as is the debate on whether to legalize bingo in Wisconsin.

For more democracy in decision making, then, state and local governments ought to take positions on foreign policy issues, although the resolution of those issues is admittedly outside the legal jurisdiction of those governments, undissuaded by the argument that it is none of their business.

The people of the United States can—and usually do—get the kind of foreign policy they want. If occasionally they do not, they have no standing to complain. The opportunity and the democratic means are available.

TRIBUTE TO A MARINE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, like all Members I am especially proud of, and interested in, the accomplishments of individual constituents. In addition, I have long felt that our men in the military service are very typical Americans who consistently demonstrate the goodwill and true spirit of our country.

This point that I have made can be clearly seen in a column by Bob Cromie in the Monday, March 8 Chicago Tribune which is based on the actions of a constituent of mine, Marine Corp. Richard W. DeRobertis of South Holland, in providing gifts to Vietnamese youngsters in an orphanage in Hue.

Incidentally, this record of such a wonderful personal service comes as no surprise to anyone who knows the DeRobertis family since they are a family in which civic activities have always been an obligation willingly undertaken.

The article follows:

FAVORITE MARINE

(By Bob Cromie)

My favorite Marine at the moment is Corp. Richard W. DeRobertis of South Holland, former captain of the track and cross-country teams at Thornridge High School, now stationed somewhere in the vicinity of Hue, South Viet Nam. A story about DeRobertis recently in the suburban newspaper, The Pointer, took at least some of the bitter taste of My Lai from my mouth.

DeRobertis, who will be 22 years old this week, somehow came across an orphanage in Hue housing 22 youngsters of all ages, and discovering that most of them had no possessions at all but a single pair of all-purpose pajamas, sent $100 of his own money to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richard DeRobertis Sr., with instructions to get some sort of outfit for each child in the orphanage and mail it in time for Christmas.

"We had to laugh when we got the list," his mother said. "It contained shoulder-length, waist measurements, full height, but no sizes. They're very small, you know, one 8-year-old boy took size three pants."

Corp. DeRobertis and a friend, a Corp. Jerome, whose last name Mrs. DeRobertis doesn't know, visited the orphanage Chrstmas Day and distributed the gifts. The South Holland Marine wrote to describe the children's happiness [the packages also included toothbrushes, toothpaste, tablets, pencils and candy] and said he and his friend both had tears in their eyes as they watched the packages being opened.

Mrs. DeRobertis made it plain that without help from neighbors and other friends the project would have been difficult to accomplish, since postage alone was $80. But people donated good clothing, a woman on Social Security gave $5, one of DeRobertis' sisters handed over a favorite doll, and on Halloween many of the youngsters living in the block turned in their trick-or-treat loot to be shipped to the orphans.

DeRobertis, who comes from a family of eight children, uses all of his off-base time to journey to Hue, often accompanied by Jerome and a lieutenant whose name also is not known here. His mother reports that DeRobertis admits to a special fondness for a tiny little orphan girl named Nam, and says she wouldn't be surprised if he shows up in South Holland, when his Viet Nam tour ends in April, with Nam in tow.

"I know he will continue to send money back there," she says, "and that he and his friends are hoping to raise enough to send one bright 15-year-old to school in the city so that the boy can become self-supporting."

At the moment Mrs. DeRobertis is readying a birthday gift for her son. But she and several neighbors also are preparing 22 packages of clothing, toys and candy which will be mailed in time for the orphans to have something for Easter.

Nobody suggested it, but if anyone wants to cut in on the Easter caper, the DeRobertis address in 15662 Rose Dr., South Holland.

And even a very good Marine can use a little help sometimes.

POW'S—A NATIONAL PRIORITY FOR ACTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the history of our country, American men have fought many wars and, as a consequence of battle, many fighting men have been captured and held prisoners of war. But in every past war that was fought for freedom and not for peace, these captured fighting men were freed or released on orders of the Commander in Chief because the war was either won or the men were rescued by military force. The exceptions to this rule started with the United Nations peacekeeping mission in Korea which, because it was not ended, continues to this day.

The war in Vietnam has been accompanied by another first in the history of our Nation. Never before have we Americans had to sit back and watch in disgust and utter disbelief as the wives, children, mothers, sweethearts, and loved ones are urged if not forced to enter into international negotiations on behalf of their sons, fathers, brothers, and sweethearts who are held prisoners of war in Vietnam.

Never before in the history of our country have so much public opinion and interest been unleashed upon such a disgrace and travesty against the American people when they have paid for and still enjoy the prestige of being the world's strongest and most powerful people.

The President of the United States as Commander in Chief, has made numerous overtures of conciliation to pacify the affected Americans, but otherwise has done little or nothing to end the war in such a manner as to assure the release and recovery of our captured fighting men.

Many well-meaning people seeking worthwhile causes have accepted the prisoner-of-war relief leadership because of the vacuum existing due to inaction by our own elected leader. In fact, the present resident of the White House seems most satisfied to have someone else carrying the ball, thus taking the pressure off his inactive leadership and unproductive policy.

Foremost in such people-mobilization projects is the program to encourage American citizens to write to Communist dictators in Russia, North Vietnam, and even the Secretary of the United Nations, appealing in a courteous, nonpolitical manner for humane treatment of our captured fighting men in Vietnam. Frequently, from the American friends of Hanoi, as reported in the media, these activists even take strength in the thought that the Communist prison-keepers might be making some slight concession as a result of the outpouring of deep sympathy and compassion by Americans over their fellow countrymen who suffer in a stinking Red prison.

But the great weight of the evidence is that the tons of letters and tremendous activity by concerned Americans can never accomplish anything because Americans do not understand the thinking of Communists and they refuse to understand Communist goals.

Any understanding of the Oriental personality would convince our fellow countrymen that, to the Oriental, weakness is to be treated only with contempt and scorn. Therefore, at most, the Communist dictators who have already been assured that our military does not seek an end to the war in conventional methods can but consider the millions of letters and direct appeals from our well-meaning citizens as a sign of national weakness—a loss of control by those in positions of authority in our country. As such, contrary to accounts in the news media, we but encourage the government of North Vietnam to forever delay any formal peace talks. We but reassured Hanoi that our Nation is now weak, divided, and leaderless. All that remains is to wait for the masses to demand that the weak leader remove all U.S. troops and support. Then the Communist goals are satisfied.

History is replete that a nation which does not win its wars loses its captured fighting men—all the proposed peace talks, well intentioned correspondence and POW publicity programs notwithstanding. We are reaching our people but not the enemy.

The men held prisoners in North Vietnam, estimated as high as 1,600, are Americans who have risked their lives while we have enjoyed peace and prospered. These are men who were willing to sacrifice for a progressive nation that now appears to be unwilling to risk anything in order to regain for them their freedom. If we as a people will not fight for them and make the POW issue one of the top priorities in our national goals we are undeserving of the freedm we so take for granted. If we ever do regain our POW's, it will only be after they have suffered the deadly rot of mind, body, and soul—that indescribable diseased condition of a living death known only by saddened and broken men who have experienced being abandoned by their country.

There is but one person in our entire government who holds the authority as well as the responsibility for regaining the freedom of our captured prisoners of war. He is the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, under whose orders these military men went into battle, were engaged when captured, and under whose orders they remain even as prisoners.

If the American people want to regain our prisoners of war, they would have far greater effect and success if they would direct their appeals not to the unresponsive Communist dictators, but to Hon. Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of all U.S. military forces.

I think that the President's inept position on the POW situation may best be described by a recent comment by the State Department press officer, Robert J. McCloskey when he said:

> Our position is that the release of prisoners or war is a humane question which should be settled on the basis of the Geneva Convention and not on the basis of ransom.

If so, then in the name of humanity, Mr. President, and for the sake of the American people, do something besides fraternize, compromise, and negotiate with the Communists. You and you alone can give the orders to free U.S. POW's in North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, an article which appeared in the Reader's Digest for April of 1971 entitled, "Inside the Prisons of Hanoi" and a recent newsclipping:

[From the Reader's Digest, April 1971]

INSIDE THE PRISONS OF HANOI

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

(The following report on the shocking conditions within the prisoner-of-war camps of North Vietnam, and on the threat these conditions pose to the survival of hundreds of U.S. citizens, has been drawn from lengthy interviews with some of the men who have been released, and from informed sources in Washington, Saigon and Paris.)

The truck lurches forward with thrashing gears. On the rough truck bed, an American lies on his back, blindfolded, hands and feet bound. He is jolted by each bump, jarred by thrusts of pain. Hearing clattering street noises and strident automobile horns, he knows they have entered Hanoi. Soon he will be prodded to his feet and led into one of North Vietnam's dread prisoner-of-war camps.

For almost two months, since his capture, the American has been herded from village to village. He is rarely fed. His captors double-time him, on foot, moving steadily northward. In each village, they tether or cage him like an animal so that villagers can file past to strike him or urinate on his body. He is constantly hungry; his weight drops steadily, and nausea and fever plague him.

Eventually, his captors transfer him to a small hut with 12 bamboo cages, force him onto his stomach, thrust his feet into wooden stocks and tie his arms behind his back with wet rope. For 29 days they keep him in this position, freeing him only long enough to gobble a daily bowl of rice and to relieve himself. His face is obscured by a scraggly beard, his eyes burn from sunken sockets. Then he is told that he is to be moved to Hanoi.

Now, three days later, a truck deposits him at the looming triangular mass of the "Hanoi Hilton," an old French penitentiary covering approximately a city block and surrounded by glass-studded concrete walls. Within, two separate sections are reserved exclusively for U.S. prisoners-of-war. As in other POW camps in North Vietnam,[1] its tiny cells are cement-walled and heavily barred; bunks are either cement slabs or rough boards stretched across sawhorses. The only other furnishing is a toilet bucket. Terrazzo-like floors slope away from a central corridor toward open drains where rats enter and leave. Doors are thick teak, with peepholes.

NIGHT WATCH

The misery and demoralization that American POWs experience in this subhuman environment can best be understood by looking at a typical prison day. Above the prisoner's hard, narrow bunk, with its paper-thin straw mat, a bare light bulb burns day and night. On the bunk he tosses and frets, searching vainly for a comfortable position for his calloused hips and thighs, relief for his pain-ridden body. He sleeps little, thinking day-light will never come, that the hated light bulb will never fade. There is no clock; the hours drag on.

---

[1] There are two other prisons within the city, one called the "Zoo," the other the "Country Club." If there are others—and there probably are—the U.S. government, to safeguard security, cannot talk about them.

Now it is winter, bringing the cold he detests and fears most. He has wadded a mosquito net around his frigid feet, wrapped one of his two flimsy blankets around the net, and covered his legs and torso as best he can with the other. He still wears his coarse pajama-like shirt and trousers. But the cold penetrates everything, numbing and taunting him. His empty stomach rumbles, and now he is shaking convulsively, uncontrollably.

He will have to get up. He swings his stiffened legs to the floor, stands with great effort, slaps at his skinny legs, wasted backside and bony chest. The flesh feels dead. Sometimes he hears the muffled movements of another prisoner also fighting the cold. In a nearby cell a man cries out, "Oh, God. Oh, God!" He repeats the words to himself, only vaguely aware that the cry has nudged him into prayer.

How many hundreds of nights like this has he endured? He can no longer remember.

GONGS AND JUDAS HOLES

Finally daylight comes, and he watches the gray light filter slowly through the exposed portion of the small window far up the wall of his cell. He waits. He listens. He has learned to segment the days into sounds. The first one, at 5:30 a.m., is the harsh, reverberating jangle of the "gongs," a metal ring periodically assaulted by a metal rod. It echoes and reechoes. And as it fades, he strains to hear the bolt being withdrawn on a distant door. He knows the guard is starting along the cells, slapping open the "Judas Hole" in each door to make certain the man inside is on his feet. Stiffly, the prisoner rises and begins to fold his "bedding." The sounds of the opening and closing of the peepholes come steadily closer until the guard peers into his own cell and passes on.

A loudspeaker over the door squawks to life. The voice of Hanoi Hannah enters his cell, seeking to "re-educate" him about the war. She tells him that the United States is suffering disastrous defeat, and that the American people couldn't care less. She frequently quotes American critics of the war. Her flow of bad "news" is salted with reports on riots and racial problems in the States. The half-hour monologue drones on like a funeral dirge. Then the loudspeaker dies. But he knows Hannah will be back in the evening with more cheerless news. She visits him twice a day, every day.

Now he hears the guard taking one of the men outside to empty his toilet bucket; the man is then returned and locked back up. He listens to a repetition of the same sounds, slowly passing from cell to cell. Soon, he too is taken out to the cesspool and then brought back to await the next event. If it is a washday, he will be allowed to wash. For him, this is the week's highlight. But he must await his turn. Precautions are always taken to prevent him from seeing or talking with other prisoners.

He is taken into one of several cubicles, each with a small tub of icy water. The guard locks the door. In the five minutes allotted him, he quickly strips, braces himself and begins sloshing the freezing water onto his body. If there is soap, he lathers and scrubs his skin. But, he must rinse thoroughly, for he knows that any trace of the abrasive, lye-like soap will produce a painful rash. He dresses rapidly and rinses his other suit of "pajamas." The guard returns and marches him back to his cell, allowing him to hang his laundry alongside the dripping clothing of other prisoners.

It is almost noon, time to be fed. He never thinks of the bread and watery soup as food. But he relishes the thought of having something—anything—in his stomach.

As the food is dispensed, each cell door is unlocked and locked in the familiar pattern. When the guard opens the door, the prisoner reaches down for the bowl and bread placed on the threshold. Anything he is given is placed on the floor so that he must always bend down in front of his captor. In appearance, if not in spirit, he must always display humility. (He wryly remembers the staggering blow from the rifle butt when he once, "disrespectfully," crossed his legs in the presence of an interrogating officer.) As he rises with the food, he must come to attention. And so he stands as the guard shuts the door.

Then he eats, forcing himself to chew the bread with great care, watchful for the small stones sometimes embedded in the dough. He has disciplined himself to eat every crumb, every drop. With the last of the bread, he mops the bowl.

He waits again. Soon another "gong" sounds, instructing him to lie down. The room is still cold, but his shrunken stomach is temporarily pacified. Now, more often than not, he is finally able to doze. But the fitful sleep ends abruptly, torn apart by another gong. It is two o'clock. For the next seven hours he can only pace or sit. He is not permitted to lie on his bunk again until 9 p.m. Periodically, unexpectedly, a guard slams open the Judas Hole to check.

BODY AND SOUL

As the prisoner paces, he gropes for something to occupy his thoughts. He has recited the names of the states forward and backward, the names of all the U.S. Presidents he can remember. He has built boats and houses in his mind, gone on imaginary walking tours, retraced most of the memorable events of his life, the plots of books and movies. But the monotony of these efforts has made it increasingly difficult to concentrate. His thoughts skitter away to questions he would prefer to avoid, to a maze of anxieties.

He thinks about the war. Can Hanoi Hannah be right? Has America given in to defeatist views? If so, what will happen to him? He worries about his health. He is half-starved, ridden with tiny things that crawl in his stomach. He has grown steadily weaker.

The question he dreads most, and that now recurs with frightening frequency, is: *Can I last?* And what about my family? Will my wife wait forever? Is she well? Will the children remember me? How do they manage without a father? Sadness overwhelms him.

Occasionally he gets a letter, but this is a recent development. And the six-line note that is permitted can never answer the hundreds of questions that roam his mind. Still, other prisoners have received nothing, so he must be considered fortunate.

At 4:30 he is fed the same food he received earlier, the same that he will also get twice tomorrow, and the next day and the next. There is no meat, nothing green, nothing sweet—always the same tasteless soup and bread. After this second feeding, he will wait 18 hours to be fed again.

It is dark now, and at 8:30 Hanoi Hannah is back. She stays until 9, and as the loudspeaker clicks off, the last "gong" rings out. He must crawl back onto his bunk to face the cold, and his lonely thoughts, until morning. He pleads with his body and soul for strength to survive yet another night under the light bulb.

SHATTERED RULES

How long this man and his fellow captives can last is anyone's guess. But their lives are more gravely threatened with each passing day. Some of the POWs have already died.[2] Others face almost certain death unless their treatment is drastically improved. One careful study of available information, compiled by Lt. Col. Joseph R. Cataldo, a doctor with the Green Berets, indicates that the POWs not only are severely malnourished, but that 80 percent have skin diseases, at least half suffer from intestinal worms, a quarter may have active tuberculosis, and many are afflicted with serious vitamin deficiencies, mental disorientation and muscular wastage.

Hanoi also has weakened men by systematic torture. Prisoners have been denied food or water for long periods, suspended from ceilings by their arms, burned with cigarettes, clubbed with rifle butts and physically beaten. In numerous cases, their captors have refused them adequate medical care, and have neglected to attend to major injuries.

Small wonder, then, that North Vietnam forbids inspection of the camps by the International Red Cross—in direct violation of the Geneva Conventions. Instead, "showcase" prisoners are paraded in propaganda films. When anti-war groups or friendly foreign journalists are selected to talk with or film small groups of prisoners, only the healthiest men, barbered and freshly clothed, are trotted into public view to parrot carefully rehearsed information. What the public never sees are the hidden cells, the men on crutches, those who can walk only with the aid of another prisoner, those with deformities, the badly emaciated, the sick in bed.

The Geneva Conventions require repatriation of the sick and wounded, as well as the release or transfer to a neutral nation of men whose long confinement jeopardizes their health. Yet Hanoi, which is a signatory to the Conventions, has ignored these rules as they apply to the 781 captured and missing in North Vietnam. And the enemy has made no effort to persuade the Vietcong and communist forces in South Vietnam and Laos even to identify the almost 800 other Americans captured or missing in these areas.

For the prisoners, meanwhile, years pile on lonely years. The first men captured are nearing their seventh year in captivity. More than 300 others soon face their fourth, fifth and sixth anniversaries in enemy hands.

Unless help is forthcoming, these men will continue to rot and die.

Here at home, private citizens and concerned organizations are reacting with growing impatience to North Vietnam's inhumane treatment of our prisoners. Public denouncements, mounting press attention, resolutions in the U.S. Congress and the United Nations, letter-writing campaigns and many similar efforts are beginning to have an effect. There is evidence that Hanoi is smarting under the attack.

In the past year North Vietnam's leaders have tried to muffle criticism by easing a few of the harsh restrictions imposed on the prisoners. Hanoi has, for example, permitted an increase in mail between some of the men and their families, authorized more packages for the captives, boosted the weight-limitation on Christmas parcels and permitted families to mail previously forbidden items such as small games, medicines and vitamins.

But conditions are still deplorable.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1971]

STATE DEPARTMENT IS SKEPTICAL: CROSBY SEEKING TO RANSOM POW'S

Larry Crosby initially indicated yesterday that the Nixon administration had encouraged the idea. State Department officials immediately denied that.

"Our position is that the release of prisoners of war is a humane question which should be settled on the basis of the Geneva convention" and "not on the basis of ransom," said State Department Press Officer Robert J. McCloskey.

---

[2] North Vietnam has told U.S. anti-war groups and Senators that 23 prisoners have died. But the lists cannot be regarded as completely accurate: all of the deaths were reported long after they supposedly occurred, and after a number of the men had been held captive up to five years.

Larry Crosby said he was undeterred. "What can they do about it?" he asked. "They'd look pretty funny if we accomplished something, wouldn't they?"

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has acted to increase social security benefits by 10 percent retroactive to January 1, 1971. This emergency action is an important first step in meeting our obligations to older Americans living on fixed incomes.

But our actions fall short of providing all of the reforms which need to be incorporated into our social security system. It is encouraging that the House Ways and Means Committee has agreed to continue consideration of my bill along with others which would provide a new monthly minimum benefit of $100, increase to $2,400 from $1,680 the permissible outside income allowed without a cut in benefits and permit for the first time automatic cost-of-living benefit increases.

There has been a great deal of justifiable concern expressed here that social security benefits keep pace with the rising cost of living. Yet the necessity for having to again take emergency action should demonstrate to us all that we are unable under the present system to accomplish this objective. Last year the House adopted benefit increases in May but the Senate stalled for another 7 months until it was too late for final action. Such delays are totally unacceptable. If our older Americans have a right to expect that their retirement income will keep pace with the cost of living, and I believe they do, then the increases should come automatically, free from the vagaries of the congressional process.

I will continue to press for early consideration of these essential reforms in our social security system.

SENATE—*Friday, March 19, 1971*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O God, for Thy goodness and mercy which hath watched over us and brought us to this place. Give us hearts to love Thee, minds to know Thee, and voices to utter Thy truth. In moments great and small preside over the affairs of this Nation. Be Thou the unseen but ever-real guide to every decision in this place. Beyond this Chamber and throughout all the world grant, O Lord, that all men may come to serve Thee, to wage peace instead of war, to express love instead of hate, and to strive only for that justice and concord that belongs to Thy kingdom.

O Lord, Thou knowest us better than we know ourselves. Be Thou our strength and aid while we work. Be with us in our going out and our coming in from this time forth—even forevermore. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GRAVEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 16, 1971, messages from the President of the United States were received, as follows:

On March 17, 1971:

A message withdrawing the nomination of Chester L. Mize, of Kansas, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

On March 18, 1971:

A message relating to growing transportation systems and growing problems.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 16, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 17, 1971, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 4690. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1971 for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

The above enrolled bill and joint resolution were signed by the President pro tempore on March 17, 1971.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HAYS, chairman, Mr. RODINO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. CORBETT, and Mr. MATHIAS members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Assembly, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER, chairman, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. NIX, chairman, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WIGGINS, and Mr. LUJAN members of the U.S. Delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 468) making certain further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 16, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar, Calendar Nos. 43 and 44.