

Qazi, Haroon M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reeder, Alton A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ritchie, Wallace P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rosenberg, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sadadah, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saenz, Enrique A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Santaella-Latimer, Luis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sawhill, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scavarda, Angelo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schneider, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schuchmann, George, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schulz, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schweers, Carl A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scully, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaw, Jon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shetler, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Siskind, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slaughter, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Solberg, Leif I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sopher, Irvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spicer, Melvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stabler, Carey V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stark, Fred R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strum, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taber, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tanghe, Jan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Teves, Leonides Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Theodore, Henri C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomason, Phillip R., xxx-xx-xxxx

Vagnini, Frederic J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Velez, Jorge, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vest, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Victor, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Olyn M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waltemath, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watring, Watson G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willhoite, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolfe, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yelland, Graham, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yuja, Raouf F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zajtchuk, Russ, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerly, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zuck, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

QUALITY MANAGEMENT IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
 Friday, January 21, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, as we advance toward establishing quality management in our national forests, the timber industry increasingly exerts pressure on the men who work in the woods, and those in the business communities which serve them, to resist that quality management to their own detriment.

If policies which allow overcutting in the woods are not reversed and soon, today's jobs will end in tomorrow's unemployment lines. Our forests are being overcut and the result can be only barren hills.

The most immediate victim of such overcutting will be the man who today earns his living in the woods, for there will be no further work at all.

However, it is not only in the woods that industries try to blackmail their employees into resisting environmental advances designed to protect the worker as much as to protect the overall environment. The fumes from a polluting factory affect the factory workers before the fumes affect others. Yet industries create the appearance that unless workers join with management in resisting attempts to protect the environment, their jobs will be eliminated.

Mr. Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers, discussed this industrial blackmail in a recent issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin. Portions of his remarks were published in the Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Woodcock's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLLUTION BLACKMAIL
 (By Leonard Woodcock)

A new environmental "game plan" is emerging in American industry.

Employers under notice to comply with governmental anti-pollution standards are seeking to enlist workers, their unions, and their communities in campaigns of resistance to the enforcement of these standards through overt or implied threats that such enforcement would result in loss of jobs and income through shutdowns and layoffs.

Our passage from a pollution-prone to a relatively pollution-free society, even under the best of circumstances is bound to be long and difficult.

But we can be sure that the best of circumstances will not prevail, if through inaction we tolerate an industrial strategy of playing on the economic fears of workers and communities to create widespread political opposition to cleaning up the environment. Giving workers the right to sue would not put an end to that strategy and, at the same time, would create a new and powerful financial incentive to induce polluting employers to step up to their environmental responsibilities.

Lacking such an incentive, employers will be strongly tempted to adhere to past and current practices. In that case, we may not make the passage at all, or not make it in time to avoid irreparable damage to the natural life-support systems that we have until very recently taken for granted.

CONFLICTING VIEWS

What we have today, is not an environmental policy, but environmental politics—and it is not even a new politics, merely the old politics of corporate irresponsibility, illustrated in classic perfection by Union Carbide's January 1971 announcement that it would have to lay off about 625 workers in order to comply with air-quality standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency. This, it should be noted, reportedly occurs after 15 years of negotiations with state and federal authorities!

It is not difficult to imagine the surprise and shock felt by the corporation's workers, particularly in a part of the country where some workers still refer to factory smoke as "gold dust." Outrage is mixed with great caution not to say fear, among Union Carbide workers.

A. F. Grospiro, president of the Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers, which represents some of the Union Carbide workers, stated: "We resent the fact that Union Carbide is using our members as pawns in its resistance to clean up the air around Marietta."

On the other hand, Elwood Moffett, president of District 50 of the Allied and Technical Workers, which also represents some Union Carbide workers, said: "It is going to take time to correct these problems, and the government ought to give the company more time."

When workers are torn by conflicting views of their economic situation, as in this case, opportunistic management can have a field day.

Management's readiness to exploit the insecurity of workers is dramatically evident in the Union Carbide case. But the situation is not unique. With or without drama, it exists or is implicit wherever there are workers whose major property is in their jobs, working for employers reluctant to face up to the costs of ending environmental pollution.

When General Motors came under pressure from a federal court action for discharging industrial wastes into the Hudson River from its Tarrytown plant, it shifted its off-fending operation from Tarrytown to Baltimore.

GENTLE HINT

A local newspaper commented: "This put several hundred local employees out of jobs—a gentle hint to the rest that they, too, might join the unemployed, if Hudson River valley residents push too hard for a quick cleanup of the river. In fact, GM was more blunt with the U.S. Attorney's office. At the March 20 appearance of opposing lawyers before Judge Motley in the case, Assistant U.S. Attorney Michael Hess told the judge: "We have been told by General Motors people that 'If we could not dump anything into the Hudson River, we would have to close down and thousands of people would lose their jobs.'"

American workers, perhaps more than the rest of the nation, have good reason to be foes of pollution. They have confronted it, resisted it, and to a dangerous degree have had to endure it over decades on the job. These in-plant hazards have increased with the proliferation of new toxic substances in recent years.

Moreover, workers and their families are most apt to be exposed to the pollution released by industry into the surrounding community, for they are less likely than executives and professional workers to live in residential suburbs.

The problem is not that they are advocates of pollution, but that their economic circumstances require them to think first of jobs, paychecks and bread on the table.

The Congress has no more serious challenge than that of taking specific actions which will assure American workers and their families of a valid alternative to paychecks earned through working and living in a polluted environment. That alternative, put simply, is the alternative of jobs, paychecks, bread on the table—and a clean environment.

Legislation to give workers the right to sue their employers for damages suffered in plant shutdowns or layoffs resulting from pollution of the environment would be a practical, substantial step toward the creation of such an alternative.

Such legislation should give all workers affected both directly, through loss of jobs, and indirectly, through downgrading, the right to sue in federal and state courts.

Where the employer is a corporation, there should be the right to sue the corporation, with the officers and directors joined as defendants.

This is essential, for in a situation where a corporation operates only one plant, if the shutdown were followed immediately by the dissolution of the corporation, the judgment would be meaningless.

The possibility of being held personally liable, would tend to make officers and direc-

tors of all corporations more vigilant and diligent in avoiding and promptly correcting pollution abuses.

Damages recoverable should include not only lost wages but the fringe benefits that the workers stand to lose as well as retraining and relocating costs.

It is a widely accepted principle—although one all too often ignored in practice—that the burdens and sacrifices required by an action taken in the service of the interests of the whole society should be shared equitably by all who benefit from that action and not allowed to fall disproportionately upon some who are innocent victims of it.

Certainly purification of the environment is in the interests of all citizens. All of them will ultimately pay in increased taxes and often, unfortunately, in higher prices for steps taken publicly and privately to avoid, eliminate or reduce pollution.

Increased taxes and higher prices will also be paid by the workers who stand to lose their jobs, temporarily or permanently, as a result of plant shutdowns resulting from environmental problems. They and their families should not be asked, in addition, to pay with loss of income and valuable fringe benefit protections.

If the legislation is to be effective, workers must be assured of prompt relief from any damages inflicted upon them by the actions of polluting employers. One of the main purposes of the legislation is to free workers from fear so that unscrupulous employers will no longer be able to hold them as hostages in order to continue polluting the environment.

That purpose obviously would be nullified if workers envisioned that they might have to wait years, with their families meanwhile subject to severe hardship, while employers take full advantage of all the opportunities for delay that our legal processes afford.

It is therefore imperative to assure workers that the protections will be available promptly. The Secretary of Labor should be empowered to join in the suit and to make payments, recoverable from the employer, to the workers in lieu of their lost wages.

Payment before judgment is issued, of course, raises the possibility that in some cases the Secretary of Labor might make payments to workers whose suits ultimately will be lost. The risk would be small because enactment of the proposed legislation would create a powerful deterrent to pollution-related plant shutdowns.

It would be far less costly to employers to eliminate or abate pollution than to pay damages and, as a result, few lawsuits would actually be initiated.

GOVERNMENT FAILURE

In any case, whatever small risk of unrecoverable payments might remain dwindles into insignificance by comparison with the potential dangers to all of us from continued and, in some cases, possibly irreversible pollution of the environment by corporations that hide behind the insecurity of their workers.

Ultimately, of course employers should bear the full cost of compensating their workers for economic harm done to the latter as a result of failure to avoid or correct pollution abuses. It is clear, however, that the government cannot be absolved of blame for its failure to come to grips earlier with the pollution problem.

The government's negligence in this matter does not excuse those employers who took advantage of it. But some of them, undoubtedly, will require time to correct what government permitted them to do in the past. Since responsibility in this matter is shared by government and industry it seems fair to ask them to share, during a transition period, the cost of repairing any damage their action or inaction caused to be inflicted upon the families of innocent workers.

While legislation along these lines is fo-

cused on protection of workers, it should be emphasized again that that would be but one of its socially desirable results.

By assuring workers such protection, it would remove what is perhaps the most serious political obstacle to vigorous and effective legislative and administrative action to minimize industrial pollution of the environment. It would end political blackmail of the kind attempted by Union Carbide because employers who threaten to lay off workers in order to evade their environmental responsibilities would thereby be establishing the right of their workers to obtain damage judgments. Employers resorting to such threats would, in effect, be providing additional evidence to support any suit their workers might bring.

At the same time the suggested legislation would provide a powerful financial incentive to industry to abate pollution. As a result, the proposed protective provisions for workers and the lawsuits required to bring them into play would rarely have to be invoked.

This country is racing against a number of clocks that keep ticking whether we are listening or not. The clock of unfilled democratic promises will tick us into a slow decline and exhaustion of democratic conviction and solidarity. The environmental clock will tick us into a slow but steady deterioration of the natural environment and the resource base that make life and democracy possible. These clocks will tick on unless we manage to assert the preeminence of a social and environmental ethic over the cold calculus of private corporate power and irresponsibility.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS, SYMPTOMS OF FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, informed Americans across the Nation generally recognize that the principal problem confronting the country today is the state of the economy—the continued inflationary spiral and rising cost of living with no relief in sight.

Too often the primary cause of this inflationary spiral is overlooked or ignored as the administration seeks vainly for a scapegoat, never acknowledging that Government overspending is itself the primary cause of our economic problems.

Mr. Nixon, when campaigning for the office he now holds, told the American people that the primary problem causing inflation was undisciplined Government overspending which could not be corrected by wage-price controls. Candidate Nixon's other positions on the economy included:

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

The imposition of price and wage controls during peacetime is an abdication of fiscal responsibility. Such controls treat symptoms and not causes. Experience has indicated that they do not work, can never be administered equitably and are not compatible with a free economy.

GUIDEPOSTS

Excessive price and wage increases are the symptoms of economic mismanagement. Guideposts merely focus on these symptoms, rather than on causes of the problem. They tend to divert policymakers' attention from coming to grips with the fundamental causes

of inflation—namely, budget deficits at a time of full employment and increases of the money supply that outrun the Nation's physical capacity to produce goods and services.

INFLATION

The accelerated rise in prices in recent years has resulted primarily from an excessively expanding money supply which in turn has been fed by the monetization of federal government deficits. The way to stop the inflation is to reverse the irresponsible fiscal policies which produce it.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Perhaps, the current Administration's greatest failure has been its disinclination or inability to take on the hardest job in government—the setting of priorities. As a result, the aggregate size of the Federal Budget has risen to unacceptable levels. The problem is, as always, to separate the necessary from the merely desirable, to do the former and stockpile the latter, and ruthlessly eliminate the inefficient and unnecessary.

In this disciplined context, the entire budget needs exhaustive review from which major expenditure savings and revised emphases will surely follow. Some programs like post-Apollo space, highways, public works, the SST—must accept less than maximum funding; non-essentials like beautification must await easier times, every major program, defense, included, must be scoured for economies, and the relentless search for new approaches such as private enterprise attacks on ghetto problems, must be pursued. It is clear that every federal activity is—and must be—a candidate for expenditure control, and that every existing federal function must be reassessed or else we will bankrupt America. (From Nixon on the Issues, published by Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee, October 17, 1968.)

The local news of January 20 carried a story headlined "Three Economists Testify: U.S. Policies Seen Increasing Prices." This testimony is interesting and quite relevant to the proposed devaluation of the dollar and questions the effect of wage and price controls.

More important, this testimony indicates to the American people that President Nixon's practices do not live up to his commitments—he has done exactly what he promised the American people that he would not do.

The candidate Nixon said that "the imposition of price and wage controls during peacetime is an abdication of fiscal responsibility."

President Nixon, in a radio and television address on Economic Policy and Productivity on June 17, 1970, said:

A third choice was the route of wage and price controls. That would lead to rationing, black marketing, total Federal bureaucratic domination, and it would never get at the real causes of inflation.

I will not take this nation down the road of wage and price controls, however, politically expedient they may seem.

Controls and rationing may seem like an easy way out, but they are really an easy way in to more trouble—to the explosion that follows when you try to clamp a lid on a rising head of steam without turning down the fire under the pot.

Wage and price controls only postpone a day of reckoning, and in so doing they rob every American of an important part of his freedom.

Nor am I starting to use controls in disguise. By that I mean the kind of policy whereby government makes executive pronouncements to enforce "guidelines" in an

attempt to dictate specific prices and wages without authority of law.

This is not the time for the Congress to play politics with inflation by passing legislation granting me standby powers to impose controls on wages and prices. The Congress knows I will not impose controls because they would do far more harm than good.

The only reasonable conclusion is that the President of the United States has admitted to his own irresponsibility in this most important arena of public trust and confidence.

So that our colleagues might have the benefit of testimony delivered before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I include this material, along with a related newsclipping, in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1972]

THREE ECONOMISTS TESTIFY: U.S. POLICIES SEEN INCREASING PRICES

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Three economists yesterday told a Senate subcommittee that the government's own policies promote higher prices in everything from construction costs to medical expenses.

"The government ought to put its own house in order," Murray L. Weidenbaum, former assistant secretary of the Treasury and now professor of economics at St. Louis University, told the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

Testifying with Weidenbaum were Charles L. Schultze, director of the former Bureau of the Budget under President Johnson, and Allan H. Meltzer, professor of economics at the Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh.

The economists singled out three areas for quick remedial action:

Medical Costs: Schultze said that the government's insurance payments under Medicare and Medicaid simply reimburse doctors and hospitals for all their costs (including fees). By not exercising more control over expenses, he said, the government encourages doctors to overuse hospitals and other medical facilities. "You get the business of let's have 16 different tests (and use) 16 different machines."

Construction Costs: The three economists attacked the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires that the government pay "prevailing wage rates" on its major construction projects. In practice, Weidenbaum said, the "prevailing wage rate" is determined to be the rate paid to union workers, which is considerably higher than the average of union and non-union wages. Construction costs are inflated, Meltzer said and Davis-Bacon frustrates the government's efforts to provide inexpensive housing.

Shipping Protection: The economists urged repeal of the Jones Act, which requires that all commerce between U.S. ports travel in ships built, owned and manned by Americans. In the Northwest, Weidenbaum said, this restriction actually helped Canadian lumber dealers in competition with Americans. "The Canadian lumber industry, not being limited in choice of vessels, could often deliver the product to the important Southern California market more cheaply than our own industry," he said. "What ostensibly was an effort to help one industry (shipping) merely turned out to hurt another (lumber), with the benefits all going to companies in other nations."

Confronted with the economists' criticism of these and other longstanding government policies—such as agricultural price supports, oil quotas, import quotas, and regulation of transportation industries—held out little hope of any major changes.

"You can't correct the programs that no longer serve any useful purpose in one fell swoop," he said. "Who is asked to surrender

first: Is it the merchant marine? Is it the beneficiaries of agricultural price supports? Is it the oil industry? Is it labor?"

Sen. — had some harsh words for the economists about price supports and import quotas.

Corn and beef prices are at depressed levels, — remarked. "If you made that speech (against farm subsidies) in Des Moines or Omaha, they would throw sticks and stones at you."

Import quotas, he argued, were often needed to protect employment against inroads from less expensive imports.

Weidenbaum contended that the quotas not only result in higher consumer prices, but also could prompt foreign retaliation against American exports—threatening jobs in U.S. export industries.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

(By Allan H. Meltzer)

Any system of price and wage controls reduces freedom of contract and freedom of choice. Decisions to restrict these or other personal freedoms are justified in a totalitarian society by reference to some alleged, often vague and illusory, social benefit. In a democratic society, we require or expect some demonstration that the benefits to society exceed the costs of government policies, so that individuals who suffer losses can be compensated without eliminating the entire social gain.

Let me accept this principle and ask how it applies to the present system of wage and price controls. The costs are clear and positive; we have reduced freedom and efficiency. In exchange, we have received little more than unsubstantiated hopes, unverified conjectures and rhetoric about a new era and a "new ballgame." Can we expect benefits in the future that will more than match past and future costs? I know no reason to expect any such benefit or, indeed, any net benefit at all. We have treated freedom and efficiency as worthless by sacrificing both in exchange for nothing more tangible than promises based on the hopes and beliefs of those who have been urging us to adopt controls for the past several years.

THE ALLEGED BENEFITS

What are the alleged benefits? I find three main arguments for controls as a solution to our present set of problems. One argues that controls reduce current inflation by reducing anticipated inflation. A second sees price and wage controls as a type of incomes policy. Although many of the people who make this argument recognize that incomes policies have not worked here or abroad, they claim to be hopeful that current efforts will meet with success because we start from a position in which output is below potential. A third argument views wage and price controls as a means of reducing the monopoly power of large corporations and large unions. I believe this argument is of particular interest to the members of the committee since it proposes price and wage controls as a substitute for more vigorous enforcement of existing anti-trust laws or as an alternative to new laws. I will discuss each of the arguments briefly.

The first argument is reversed. The public becomes convinced that the rate of inflation is slowing when they find themselves able to buy the same baskets of goods and services with a smaller increase in expenditure. Price indexes are useful devices for monitoring broad changes in the economy. To expect the public to regard changes in such indexes as more reliable measures of the rate of inflation than the facts they encounter in the market place is a poor principle on which to build a policy.

Perhaps the government can convince people that prices are falling by controlling some components of an index. Our knowledge of short-term changes in anticipations and in

price levels is not so firm that we can dismiss the argument completely. Pushing beyond that weak general statement, however, we can say much more about the role of anticipations in the current inflation and in the attempt to control inflation.

Broad-based measures of prices rose at an annual rate of 4% in the second quarter of 1971 and about 2.8% in the third quarter. Almost every forecast I have seen for 1972 puts the anticipated rate of inflation between 3 and 3½%. If these forecasts are credible, the rate of inflation is expected to rise next year. Apparently, the forecasters have either not heard or have not accepted the argument that price controls reduce inflation by reducing anticipations of inflation.

A possible remedy might be a law controlling the anticipated rate of inflation that forecasters are permitted to announce.

It is now generally agreed that controls or incomes policies cannot reduce inflation when total demand exceeds our capacity to produce. At most, controls suppress inflation under these conditions and only temporarily. Proponents of controls dismiss this argument as irrelevant now. They point to the number unemployed and to the low operating rate in manufacturing and conjecture that output can increase without raising prices or wages.

The broad record of experience offers very little support for their conjecture. During the twenties, unemployment rates were low, and resources were, for the most part, employed. Output increased by approximately 50%, and prices changed little. During the recovery from the worst depression of modern times, 1933-37, prices rose ten to twelve per cent while large parts of the labor force remained idle. Prices rose very little both when unemployment rates were relatively high, from 1961 to 1964, and when unemployment rates were generally low, from 1952 to 1956.

Government monetary and fiscal policies are considerably more important than the current unemployment rate or the current rate of capacity utilization for determining the rate of inflation. Moreover, it is a mistake to believe that inflation can be controlled by controlling a few prices and wages. Inflation means that a broad based price index rises. Preventing a few prices and wages from rising distorts the numbers we use to measure the rate of inflation and misleads some people. I know of no reason to believe that changes of this kind have any significant effect on the actual rate of inflation, the rate of price change experienced by consumers and business in the market place.

This brings me to the monopoly issue. Probably the most widely accepted myth about inflation is that inflation is produced by the independent actions of some special group. In recent inflations, business and labor monopolies have been cast as villains. At earlier times, "speculators" were often blamed for inflation.

There is no basis for the belief that monopolists are responsible for the current inflation or for earlier inflations. Nor, is there evidence that large firms raise prices more than small. The rate of price increase in the heavy industries—steel, coal, aluminum, autos, glass, or chemicals—in the year before the price freeze was lower than the rate of increase in many other sectors of the economy. Of the 25 consumer prices that rose most in the year ending June 1971, ten are food prices, mainly fresh foods, and seven are prices controlled and regulated by governments at various levels. The latter include airfares, taxi fares, freight rates, postage stamps and auto insurance rates. Hardly any of these goods or services are produced or sold by the type of monopoly usually pictured as a price leader.

THE ROLE OF ANTITRUST

There is an obvious reason why monopoly power and inflation are commonly associated in the public mind. The reason is that those

who make this change fail to distinguish between high prices and rising prices. Monopoly firms raise prices above the competitive level by restricting output. Unions that are able to restrict entry into a craft or occupation raise wages for the particular craft or occupation. Government restrictions that reduce entry and competition raise product prices or the wages of employees in the occupations to which entry is limited.

An increase in monopoly power produces a one-time increase in the prices of those goods and services that are newly monopolized. If the government's monetary and fiscal policies are non-inflationary, a properly constructed price index will not show any increase in the rate of inflation. In short, anti-trust policy is not a substitute for controls, and controls are not a substitute for anti-trust policy.

I do not want to leave you with the idea that you should be unconcerned about prices. There is much that you can do, and that I hope you will do, to lower the prices the consumer pays for the goods or services he receives. High on my list of proposed activities would be an investigation of the costs to consumers of restrictions enforced by governments at all levels. Quotas on oil imports, restrictions on the importation of meat, vegetables and other commodities, restrictions on the number of banks and their branches, laws regulating the wages received on contract construction, restrictions on the number of licensed taxicabs by most municipalities, restrictions on price cutting by airlines, tariffs on imports, laws restricting entry into crafts and professions, these are but a few of the restrictions maintained and enforced by government that prevent competition and raise the prices paid by consumers. Removing these restrictions would lower the prices paid by consumers for the services they receive. Removing the restrictions would have no noticeable effect on the rate of inflation.

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION*

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, in the announcement of these hearings the subject of today's session was entitled "Are there steps that make sense economically which would erase the need for wage and price controls?"

My short answer to this question is, "No." I am convinced that some sort of intervention by the federal government into the setting of wages and prices will for a long time to come be a necessary condition for simultaneously achieving full employment and reasonable price stability in our economy.

On the other hand, if the question were rephrased to ask whether there are economic measures which, while not erasing the need for controls, would reduce their rigor and severity and give them a better chance of success then my answer would be, "Yes." I think there are economically sound measures which would moderate, even if they could not eliminate, the magnitude of the inflationary problem under high employment conditions.

In order to be more specific let me list and briefly discuss the major sets of economic conditions and industrial practices which either generate or perpetuate inflationary conditions.

Inflation can be generated and perpetuated by an excess demand for goods and services relative to the economic capacity of the nation to furnish them. When market demands are so high that the unemployment rate is pushed to very low levels; when the supply, particularly of experienced full-time workers in large sectors of the economy, becomes very tight so that employers are forced to bid up wages rapidly; when output presses hard on industrial capacity, inflation is

bound to occur. Wages are bid up more rapidly than productivity gains, raw material prices soar, and on top of this profit margins begin to widen especially in competitive industries. But, paradoxically, inflation of this variety is not our major problem. If inflation only occurred when, for one reason or another, the sum of consumer, business, and government expenditures was excessive, the standard tools of monetary and fiscal policy could handle the situation by reducing the overall level of demand. Mistakes might be made, but there would be no reason for wage or price controls or for structural reforms introduced on grounds of inflation control alone.

The really intractable problem is our modern economy is that inflation occurs simultaneously with the existence of underutilized resources. In the current situation, an inflation which did indeed start with the overheated economy of the late 1960's, has persisted for more than two years after the overheating disappeared, and persisted through a period of substantial unemployment. In the mid-nineteen fifties we had an inflation which began in the absence of economic overeating and continued for about two years.

In short, if inflation occurred only when the unemployment rate had been pushed very low, and promptly disappeared once unemployment had risen to the 3½ to 4 percent range, the problem we are discussing today would be insignificant. It is the fact that inflation persists, indeed sometimes begins, when unemployment is at or above 4 percent that poses real dilemmas for public policy.

There are, I think, five elements in the nation's economic structure and habits which lead to the problem of inflation along with high unemployment:

First, there is the fact that in a number of industries characterized by a high degree of economic concentration, prices are rigid downward—they often do not fall when economic circumstances in a competitive environment would dictate that they should fall. This leads to two inflationary consequences:

(1) Even under conditions of healthy and not excessive prosperity and growth, not all industries will experience the same rate of market expansion. Some markets will be expanding sharply, some moderately, and some falling. Costs and prices, we know, are likely to rise in industries whose markets are sharply advancing. If prices on the average are to remain stable, these price increases must be balanced by price cuts in industries whose markets are growing subnormally or are declining. This is what would happen in a competitive environment. But if prices in large concentrated industries are "sticky," if they resist falling in periods of weak markets, then the price averages cannot fall to rise. In short, since some prices are always rising in a healthy economy, others must fall to preserve overall price stability. Paradoxically, therefore, unless some prices fall the overall price index will rise, even when the economy as a whole is not overheated.

(2) Productivity expands at widely differing rates among different industries. Bureau of Labor Statistics studies of productivity gains among individual industries confirm this fact. But the rise in wage rates among the different industries is much more uniform than the rise in productivity. As a consequence, if wages generally are to rise at a non-inflationary rate—in line with national productivity gains—then the unit labor costs of industries with greater than average productivity gains will fall. Their above average productivity gains will be larger than the advance in wages. As a consequence their prices should be reduced. If, however, prices are sticky downward in concentrated industries with higher than average productivity gains, then profit margins will widen. In turn, it is most likely that the increase in profit margins will not be allowed to go on un-

challenged. Management won't let the margins rise too far above normal for fear of inviting unwanted new competition into the industry. Unions will seek to take the abnormal gains away and very often will succeed. Their success will be emulated by unions in other industries which do not have above average productivity gains. This will raise costs and prices in those other industries.

In summary, the failure of prices in concentrated industries to respond to downward economic pressures tends to generate an inflationary bias in the economy; in part because some price cuts are always needed to balance the inevitable price increases, and in part because the failure to cut prices in response to large productivity gains invites excessive wage gains which tend to be emulated in other sectors of the economy.

The nature of wage bargaining is a second major factor producing inflationary bias. The so-called "wage-wage" spiral tends to perpetuate inflation once started. Union contracts typically cover periods of more than a year—three-year contracts have become a common practice. A long-term contract signed during a period of economic overheating, say in 1968 or 1969, will usually contain a large wage increase, simply reflecting the inflationary conditions and tight labor market of the period. Subsequently, even when inflationary pressures subside and even if unemployment is rising, other unions signing new contracts will feel a necessity to win wage increases for their numbers equal to the wage won earlier by the first union. Settlements in such large industries as autos, steel, aluminum, aerospace, and can manufacturing influence each other. One large construction settlement, for a particular craft or in a particular locality, acts as a magnet for other crafts and other localities. Such mechanisms as the Davis-Bacon act and the union contracts for public employees in many cities help spread these construction wage increases widely.

If inflation, once started, is ever to be brought under control the sheer arithmetic of the situation requires that contracts signed after an inflationary boom is over contain lower wage advances than contracts signed earlier. But the "wage-wage" spiral and "follow-the-leader" union settlements substantially delay this period of adjustment and help perpetuate inflation long after labor markets have loosened up and excess capacity appears.

A third contributor to the current problem of inflation lies in the changing nature of the labor market. Fifteen years ago, when the overall unemployment rate was 4 percent, about 30 percent of the unemployed were teenagers and young adults. In 1969, when the overall unemployment rate also averaged about 4 percent, half of the unemployed were teenagers and young adults. Conversely, a smaller proportion of the unemployed are now skilled experienced adults than was true fifteen years ago. To reach an average unemployment rate of 4 percent today would mean a much lower rate of unemployment among the core of the experienced labor force than was the case in earlier years. And it is the tightness of the labor market among such experienced adult workers which probably has the most significant impact on key wage bargains. In short, 4 percent unemployment probably means tighter labor markets and larger wage increases than it did ten or fifteen years ago.

This is not to say that we should abandon our attempts to reduce unemployment to 4 percent or less. But we do need to face the fact that at this overall unemployment level labor markets may be tighter and wage increases larger than they once were and that specific manpower training and public employment programs may be needed to reduce the size of the inflationary problem.

A fourth set of factors which operates to produce inflationary bias in our economy re-

*This testimony represents Mr. Schultze's personal views and not those of the Brookings Institution.

lates to the price-fixing policies of the federal government itself. Transportation rate regulation which discourages rate reductions, expensive farm price supports import quotas (both legal and "voluntary"), subsidies to an inefficient merchant marine Davis-Bacon wage provisions in government contracts, all operate in a generally inflationary direction, by reducing competition and putting relatively high floors under prices. Professor Weidenbaum has covered this set of problems in his testimony. I need not repeat but do wish to underscore the importance of the points he makes.

The fifth element of inflationary bias lies, I believe in the ease with which highly concentrated industries pass on wage and other cost increases. Many observers have noted that these industries tend to follow "target-rate-of-return" pricing. During periods of economic overheating, they may raise prices by somewhat less than would be characteristic of competitive industries. But once monetary and fiscal policies succeed in throttling down the overheating there is a tendency for inflationary price rises to be perpetuated by target-rate-of-return pricing. Despite weakening markets, firms with substantial market power continue to pass along cost increases fully. Their resistance to wage demands based on market conditions which no longer exist is weakened because of their propensity to raise prices to cover the higher costs. Moreover, as sales level off while additional capacity continues to be installed, these industries sometimes attempt to recover their target return at a lower rate of capacity utilization. This occurred quite extensively during the 1956-57 inflation. It is another factor which tends to perpetuate an inflation well past the period of economic overheating and produce the paradox of general price increases during periods of less than full employment.

All of these five features of our economic system interact with and reinforce each other. "Follow-the-leader" wage settlements help spread to other industries the inflationary wage gains which arise when high productivity growth industries refuse to cut prices. The target-rate-of-return pricing helps perpetuate price increases long past the end of an economic boom and feeds back into wage increases through its effect on the cost of living. The total impact of these structural characteristics is greater than the sum of the individual parts.

What can anti-trust policy do about these problems? I do not pretend to be an expert in anti-trust policies and can only offer some highly tentative suggestions which follow from an analysis of the nature of inflation.

Let me first get out of the way what I believe is a spurious issue. In general, I do not believe that concentrated industries generate inflation by arbitrary increases in their profit margins during periods of high unemployment and weak markets. Aside from the possible case of the steel industry in the middle nineteen-fifties, this kind of behavior does not appear to have been a major inflationary factor. But the first and fifth factors mentioned above do appear to represent practices by which concentrated industries impart an inflationary bias to the economy:

By often failing to reduce prices in the face of either weak markets or above average productivity gains;

By target-rate-of-return pricing that results in a full pass through of cost increases even in the face of weak product markets, and in some cases preserves profit margins by raising prices to cover the costs of unutilized capacity.

Industries characterized by large numbers and low concentration ratios are less likely to exhibit this kind of behavior. Their prices and the wage increases they are willing to grant respond more closely to the forces of the market. As a consequence fiscal and monetary policies, by regulating the strength of market demand, can more promptly choke

off incipient inflationary pressures. Inflation may indeed still occur if monetary and fiscal policies "goof" and permit excessive demand pressures to build up. But the correction of these errors would be swifter and the tendency for inflation to persist while unemployment rises would be less.

An anti-trust policy which concentrated explicitly on helping to reduce the inflationary bias in the economy would require important changes in traditional approaches. Anti-competitive behavior would have to be judged in terms of its departure from competitive pricing policy, particularly in terms of how prices in an industry behave in the face of softening markets or extra large productivity gains. Downward price rigidity would become a prima facie reason for viewing the industry structure with suspicion. The desirability of divestiture and the breaking up of large scale units would be judged in terms of its likely effect on prices flexibility, not in terms of the particular practices by which bigness had been attained or price rigidity maintained. I am not enough of an expert in anti-trust matters to determine the extent to which this approach would require changes in the anti-trust laws or could be carried out by a different execution of existing laws.

Let me close as I began. I believe that the current inflationary bias in the economy stems from a number of structural characteristics in our society. Not all of those structural characteristics can realistically be corrected by anti-trust policy. If we are to have both full employment and reasonable price stability, some form of incomes policies will have to be around for the foreseeable future. But anti-trust policy can attack some of the structural distortions in the economy; it can lessen, although not eradicate, the inflation which accompanies full employment; it can increase the likelihood that incomes policies will work. It can therefore help rescue economic policy from the cruel dilemma that it has been facing in recent years. A nation and its leaders should not be put in the terrible position of choosing between price stability and full employment. Both justice and economic efficiency require that we have both. Anti-trust policy can help us have them.

CONTROLS OR COMPETITION?

(Testimony of Murray L. Weidenbaum, Malinckrodt distinguished university professor, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.)

About a year ago it was fashionable to debate the relative effectiveness of monetary and fiscal policy. I should like to recall the stock but serious answer that I frequently gave. First of all, I would rephrase the question to read, "Which is weaker, monetary or fiscal policy?" My answer was "both".

By that I meant and still maintain that following the classical prescription of tightening monetary and fiscal policy to bring down inflation was not working as well as we should have expected. Such economic policies were succeeding in bringing something down, but all too frequently that something was employment rather than inflation.

Moreover, a reversal of the policies brought comparable problems. All too frequently, monetary and/or fiscal ease was resulting in more inflation, rather than in bringing down the unemployment rate. This is quite a policy box for a country to be in. Moreover, to talk in terms of accepting inflation in order to obtain high employment is misleading. A continuing high rate of inflation inhibits the return to full employment because it inevitably restrains our willingness to maintain expansionary policies. That is a key point that is often overlooked: in a modern economy, one of the prices that our society tends to pay for inflation is a higher level of unemployment than would otherwise be the case.

What should be done? Basically, we need to deal with those concentrations of private economic power which have become insulated from the influences of aggregate monetary and fiscal policy. In the short run, I believe that we are on the right track. That is, we need to use some form of "incomes policy" to get those sectors of the economy where substantial concentrations of private market power exist to abstain from using such power to its fullest. Clearly, the Nixon Administration's compulsory wage and price restraint effort deals with that central issue.

To the extent that the combined effects of Phase I and Phase II do succeed by and large in eliminating the inflationary psychology in the economy, the bulk of the problem will have been dealt with, at least in the short run. Certainly, we all look forward to an early elimination of compulsion over individual wage and price decisions.

I almost said that we all look forward to an early return to the free market. However, let us not delude ourselves. Although in the overall ours is essentially a market system, many parts of the American economy prior to August 15, 1971 did not correspond to the competitive market model that we like to talk about so much. In so many cases, labor groups, business groups, and professional groups are in position to control or at least strongly influence the segment of the economic pie that they receive, because of their power over wage, price, and productivity decisions. As you can see, I am taking pains not to point the finger just at labor, or just at business, or just at the services. In fact, I would not limit the analysis to the private sector.

So much of the departure from a freely functioning competitive economy—in which monetary and fiscal measures would work far more effectively than they have been—results from government itself. Far too often, government statutes and regulations have given rise to the problem that faces us. Far too often, legislation designed to help one part of the society has harmed others and frequently without achieving the benefits intended.

I would like to cite a case in point. When I lived in the Pacific Northwest about a decade ago, I was struck by the self-defeating nature of some of this legislation. Specifically the problem at the time was the Federal legislation requiring U.S. firms to use American vessels in coastwise trade. That seemed like a simple and straightforward way of helping the American merchant marine.

But how was it working in practice? Because of the shipping restriction, Pacific Northwest lumber producers were having great difficulty in competing against the Canadian industry in our own domestic markets. Apparently, the Canadian lumber industry, not being limited in choice of vessels, could often deliver the product to the important Southern California market more cheaply than our own industry. Hence, what ostensibly was an effort to help one industry (shipping) merely turned out to hurt another (lumber), with the benefits all going to companies in other nations.

I believe that this is an appropriate time to examine afresh all of the Federal legislation, rules, and regulations which interfere with competition, unduly raise prices or otherwise give our economy an inflationary bias. The accumulation over the years has been so substantial—production and import quotas, excess stock piles of minerals and metals, mineral and agricultural price supports, hidden subsidies, barriers to employment; "prevailing" wage determinations, restrictions on shipping, etc., etc.

I would anticipate that this committee has a full job on its hands if it decides to dig into this area in detail. For one thing, I would not underestimate the obstacles. That the cost to the nation of each of these spe-

cial provisions may exceed the benefits to the Nation may not be the politically relevant criterion: the benefits to some particular group are likely to far outweigh the costs to them and thus a powerful "clientele" may have been developed.

Perhaps we need to get across the crucial point that when we add up the costs of all of these various special arrangements they outweigh the benefits even to the groups involved—that is with so many segments of the population attempting to insulate themselves from competition, the total effort is self-defeating. The "dead weight" of these interferences with economic progress and productivity reduces the slices of the "economic pie" available to all of the participants.

I would like to leave the committee with one final thought. Personally, I expect that the present wage and price control apparatus will be dismantled during the coming year or so. However, unless the underlying structural problems that I have been discussing are dealt with, I would anticipate later in the decade one or more bursts of inflationary pressures and subsequently additional experiments in "incomes" policy.

PROJECT POLE REVISITED

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21, 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, in November of last year I brought to the attention of this body a unique public relations program—"Project Pole." "Project Pole" was created by a good friend of mine from Pennsylvania, Ed Piszek, to emphasize to America and to the world the positive contributions made by people of Polish descent.

As the sponsor of S. 23, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1971, I have followed the progress of Ed Piszek's project very closely. I am pleased to report that his efforts to reduce prejudices and praise the accomplishments of Poles has been most successful.

Recently, articles about "Project Pole" appeared in Life magazine and the Washington Evening Star. In order that all Senators can keep abreast of the latest developments relating to "Project Pole," I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-MAN CRUSADE AGAINST THE POLISH JOKE

Edward J. Piszek, 54, is a self-made, Polish-American millionaire who lives by his version of the Golden Rule. "The guy with the gold," he says, "makes the rules." Thanks to a "fish-cake factory" (as he modestly calls Mrs. Paul's Kitchens, the prosperous frozen food business he owns right down to the last fishcake), Mr. Piszek has the go'd. He would like to use it to make a rule with a more familiar ring: "Do unto Polish-Americans as you would do unto others." To this end, Piszek is dedicating half a million dollars to upgrade their ethnic image. He calls his campaign "Project Pole," and for a start, he wants to stamp out those Polish jokes that have been going around the country for the last five years. (Current example: Did you hear about the Polish kamikaze pilot? He flew 13 successful missions.)

Privately, Piszek thinks the jokes were probably the best thing ever to happen to Polish-Americans. "They got us off our rear ends," he says. "We became motivated by adversity."

Since Piszek was all of 52 years old before he learned that the astronomer Copernicus was Polish, he feels he typifies the poor grasp of Polish history that the Polish peasant had who emigrated here around the turn of the century. All the immigrant brought with him, Piszek says, were his hopes and aspirations and the polka, a vigorous but monotonous musical form that he believes contributed to the Poles' low esteem in this country. "If I thought the polka was the only thing that Poland had contributed in 1,000 years," he asserts, "I too, would cry 'Shame!' But let's not forget Chopin. How many people know that he was a Polak?" (It should be pointed out that, according to Piszek, "Polak" is not an insult in Polish: it just means "Pole.")

During his travels to Poland, Piszek learned that even Poles tell Polish jokes. In one joke a commissar is interrogating a peasant who is applying for Communist party membership. "Are you willing to give the party your horse, your house and your land?" the commissar asks. The peasant replies: "Gladly!" But when the commissar asks for the pig he is carrying under his arm, the peasant balks. Asked why he refuses to give up the animal when he has already made so many greater "sacrifices," the peasant explains, "A pig I've got." It all goes to prove, Piszek concludes, that Poles love to laugh. "We just don't want to be the butt of every joke."

The working director of Project Pole is a genial, bespectacled priest, Father Walter J. ("All good Poles have Joseph as a middle name") Ziemia. Two years ago Father Ziemia, an accomplished fund-raiser, wrote Piszek a letter in Polish extolling the virtues of the small Polish college and seminary in Orchard Lake, Mich. that he directs. A few days later he received a letter from the millionaire's secretary explaining apologetically that Mr. Piszek doesn't speak Polish. Now a mainstay of Project Pole, Father Ziemia defines his role: "I'm the one who can spell the Polish names."

Project Pole was launched last fall with a series of newspaper ads in Detroit, where some 500,000 Polish-Americans live. Under the headline "One of the greatest storytellers in the English language was a Pole," one ad features a picture of Joseph Conrad, né Korzenowski, with this addendum: "He changed his name, his language and the course of English literature." Available through the ads are a \$6 book on Polish art, a 46-page pamphlet entitled "The Imagination of Poland," and a wall chart that shows "at a glance the great men and women of Poland."

An ancillary aim of Project Pole is to restore the Polish patriot Tadeusz Kosciuszko to his rightful place in American history. Kosciuszko, who served as a general during the American Revolution, contributed more than his countryman Count Pulaski, but Piszek says he is far less well known because his name is almost impossible for non-Poles to pronounce. Even George Washington had trouble with the name, and solved it by calling his Polish comrade "Kosky." Piszek recommends that Polish-Americans with difficult names either shorten them or spell them phonetically.

At the root of the poor Polish image, Piszek believes, is an excessive national modesty, a historical reluctance to blow one's own horn. With the techniques of mass communications, he is trying to change all that. "It's what Project Pole is all about."

No chauvinist when it comes to charity, Piszek has not only donated 11 mobile TB detection units to Poland, but also helps support a college in Ireland ("I like the Irish, they're very Polish"), Father Ziemia's Orchard Lake Seminary ("the Polish Notre

Dame") and the state of Israel, which commended him for purchasing bonds.

POLE SHINES ETHNIC IMAGE

(By David Braaten)

What happens at a Polish-American businessman's press conference intended to boost the old ethnic image?

The caterer serves Jewish pastrami, sauerkraut and Swiss cheese. A reporter asks the businessman to tell his favorite Polish joke. Photographers spend most of their time on the hotel balcony taking scenic fog shots of the Potomac. The beautiful illustrated book on Poland given as a souvenir turns out to be a translation from the Italian of a book published in Milan.

It was, in short, a logical extension of the loser's image that has dogged the Poles—and which led to the Watergate Hotel press conference in the first place.

As Edward J. Piszek, the man who called the press conference explained things, Poles suffer from an attribute that works against them: Modesty.

"The Pole is modest to a fault," he said, "and this modesty is looked upon by others as foolishness or weakness."

Thus it transpired that Watergate's caterer, an Italian named Bruno, was permitted to serve Reuben sandwiches and egg salad and slices of Swiss cheese at a press party designed to extol the virtues of a country that produces perhaps the greatest salami and spicy sausage in the world.

Any less modest customer presumably would have insisted that the management go out and find some ethnically appropriate hors d'oeuvres.

The national fault—excessive modesty—also would account, in Piszek's view, for the paucity of books in English about Poland or by Polish authors. Anyone who wants to know about Poland is expected to learn Polish.

When he decided to finance the publication of a book about his parents' native land, he was reduced to having a book—written by an expatriate Pole who married an Italian—translated into English. It had to be translated into English instead of Polish because most of the 10 million Polish-Americans wouldn't have been able to read it otherwise.

"There's a certain number of Polish-Americans who are ashamed of being Poles," said Piszek. To correct this unhealthy condition, Piszek already has shelled out more than \$250,000 for newspaper advertising and publication of 60,000 copies of the translated Italian book.

The Polish tendency to stomp their image into that of the illustriously downtrodden was reflected in Piszek's own life, he disclosed under questioning.

The company he cofounded in 1946, and which has made him a millionaire able to afford \$500,000 for ethnic hornblowing is named "Mrs. Paul's Kitchen." It produces frozen foods.

When asked, "Who in the heck Mrs. Paul" is or was, Piszek hedged a bit, describing Mrs. Paul as an imaginary character, "an image beyond human possibility, with no weaknesses that a real individual would have."

Then, it developed, his original partner had been a man named John Paul, and that's how the named evolved.

Why didn't they call the company "Mrs. Piszek's Kitchens?"

"That's just what my mother said," replied Piszek, with one of the many touches of rue he displayed at the session. "She said, 'You let him steal the name.'"

One of the main purposes of Piszek's promotional campaign is to educate Polish-Americans about the glories of their heritage—of which most are as ignorant as he was a few years ago. His account of his awakening is poignant.

It occurred when he was flying back to the old country seven years ago—his first visit to the land of his ancestors. As the plane circled over Warsaw, he looked down and marveled at the modern city that had risen from the ashes of World War II.

"I wondered where they got the engineers, the experts who designed the buildings, laid out the streets, planned the utilities," Piszek said. "I knew it couldn't have been Poles. Not the Poles I knew. I thought maybe they brought in some Swedes or somebody to do it."

Confronted with the reality that his forebears were not the dolts he had grown up believing they were, Piszek did a little research into his ethnic origins and, among other things, discovered to his surprise that Copernicus was a Pole.

And, as a press agent would say, many, many more.

It is similar enlightenment and pride that he hopes to bring to his fellow Polish-Americans through his "Project: Pole" publicity campaign. If public relations can help Poles to overcome their traditional loser's image with other Americans, so much the better, as far as he is concerned.

Asked about the Polish jokes that have been going around, Piszek insisted they had nothing to do with his decision to start a pro-Polish campaign.

"We're not mad at anyone," he said. "It's a positive program."

Something of his problem, though, was illustrated by what happened to the newspaper advertisement taped on the wall of the Watergate elevator to direct newsmen to the press conference.

"Press conference on Sixth Floor" it said across the top. The ad read, "Before there was a United States there was a Poland."

Somebody had scribbled next to that statement: "Yes, but Poland was discovered by Roto-Rooter."

Let us all wish Piszek good luck. He's going to need it.

PRESIDENTIAL CENSURE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, House Congressional Resolution 500, which I and 14 other Members introduced on January 18, would censure the conduct of the President in ignoring section 601 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971 and in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam.

An interesting precedent for such action took place in 1848, when the House agreed to an amendment describing the Mexican War as one "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." Of additional interest is the fact that the roll of Members voting in favor of that amendment were a former President, John Quincy Adams, and a future Chief Executive, Abraham Lincoln.

The precedent is well taken. President Nixon's callous and unlawful disregard of the will of Congress and the American people is inexcusable, and his failure to end all American military operations—in the air as well as on the ground—in Indochina is indeed unnecessary and unconstitutional.

The text of the relevant portion of the House proceedings of January 3, 1848, follows:

THANKS TO GENERAL TAYLOR—THE WAR
Mr. Houston, of Delaware—previous notice having been given—introduced the following joint resolution of thanks to Major General Taylor:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the thanks of Congress are due, and they are hereby tendered, to Major General Zachary Taylor, and through him to the officers and soldiers of the regular army and of the volunteers under his command, for their indomitable valor, skill, and good conduct, conspicuously displayed on the 22d and 23d days of February last, in the battle of Buena Vista, in defeating a numerous Mexican army, consisting of four times their number, and composed of chosen troops, under their favorite commander, General Santa Anna, and thereby obtaining a victory over the enemy, which, for its signal and brilliant character, is unsurpassed in the military annals of the world.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to cause to be struck a gold medal, with devices emblematical of this splendid achievement, and presented to Major General Taylor, as a testimony of the high sense entertained by Congress of his judicious and distinguished conduct on that memorable occasion.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to cause the foregoing resolutions to be communicated to Major General Taylor in such manner as he may deem best calculated to effect the objects thereof.

Mr. Evans, of Maryland, desired to offer an amendment, which he sent up to the Clerk's table, and moved the previous question on the adoption of the amendment and resolutions.

The Speaker stated that the resolutions were not now open to amendment.

Mr. Cummins inquired if they could now be considered as a matter of course if objections were made.

The Speaker replied, that the resolutions having been received, they would now be read a first time by their title. After the first reading, if objections were made, they would lie over for a second reading until tomorrow.

The resolutions having been read a first, and, no objection being made, a second time—

Mr. Jamieson moved their commitment to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Evans now proposed to offer his amendment, and renewed the demand for the previous question thereon.

The Speaker replied, that their commitment being called for, that question was first in order.

The question then being on committing to the Committee on Military Affairs—

Mr. Gayle demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. Jamieson withdrew the motion to commit.

Mr. Schenck renewed it.

Mr. Houston, of Delaware, said, he apprehended there would be no objection to the adoption of the resolution. No gentleman in this House would vote against a resolution of thanks to General Taylor and the officers of his command.

The Speaker reminded the gentleman from Delaware that debate was not in order.

Mr. Evans again intimated his desire to offer the following amendment:

Resolved, That the capitulation of Monterey meets with the entire sanction and approbation of this Congress; and that the terms of that capitulation were as creditable to the humanity and skill of the gallant Taylor as the achievement of the victory of Monterey was glorious to our arms.

Some conversation ensued between the Speaker, Mr. Schenck, Mr. Evans, and others. Mr. Houston, of Delaware, to obviate all

difficulties, moved the previous question on the original resolution.

The previous question was not seconded. The Speaker again announced the question to be on the motion to refer to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Henley moved to amend, by adding an instruction to the committee to add the words "engaged as they were in defending the rights and honor of the nation." On this he asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. Ashmun moved to amend the amendment by adding the words "in a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States."

Mr. McLane said, before he recorded his vote, he desired—

The Speaker interposed, and informed the gentleman from Maryland that debate was not in order; if it became the subject of debate, it would go over until tomorrow.

Mr. McLane said he had an amendment to offer.

The Speaker said no amendment was in order at present.

After some further conversation, the yeas and nays were ordered on Mr. Ashmun's amendment to the amendment; and, being taken, they resulted as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. John Q. Adams, Ashmun, Barringer, Barrow, Belcher, Botts, Brady, Buckner, Canby, Clingman, Cocke, Collamer, Conger, Cranston, Crowell, Crozier, Dickey, Dixon, Donnell, Duer, Daniel Duncan, Garnett Duncan, Dunn, Eckert, Edwards, Alexander Evans, Nathan Evans, Fisher, Fulton, Gayle, Gentry, Giddings, Goggin, Grinnell, Hale, Nathan K. Hall, James G. Hampton, Haskell, Henry, John W. Houston, Hubbard, Hudson, Irvin, Kellogg, Thomas Butler King, Daniel P. King, Lincoln, McIlvaine, Marsh, Marvin, Mullin, Nes, Newell, Preston, Putnam, Reynolds, Julius Rockwell, John A. Rockwell, Root, Rumsey, St. John, Schenck, Shepard, Sherill, Slingerland, Caleb B. Smith, Truman Smith, Stephens, Andrew Stewart, Strohm, Sylvester, Thibodeaux, Taylor, Tompkins, Richard W. Thompson, John B. Thompson, Toombs, Tuck, Van Dyke, Vinton, Warren, and Wilson—85.

NAYS—Messrs. Beale, Bedinger, Birdsall, Black, Bowdon, Brodhead, William G. Brown, Charles Brown, Cathcart, Chase, Beverly L. Clark, Howell Cobb, Williamson, R. W. Cobb, Cummins, Daniel Dickinson, Faran, Featherston, Ficklin, Fries, French, Green, Willard P. Hall, Moses Hampton, Harmanson, Harris, Henley, Hill, George S. Houston, Inge, Charles J. Ingersoll, Jamieson, Jenkins, Andrew Johnson, Robert W. Johnson, George W. Jones, Kaufman, Kennon, Lahm, La Sere, Sidney Lawrence, Leffler, Lord, Lumpkin, McClelland, McClenand, McDowell, McLane, Mann, Meade, Miller, Morris, Morse, Murphy, Peaslee, Peck, Phelps, Pillsbury, Rheft, Richardson, Richey, Robinson, Rockhill, Sawyer, Sims, Smart, Robert Smith, Stanton, Starkweather, Charles E. Stuart, Strong, Thomas, James Thompson, Jacob Thompson, William Thompson, Thurston, Turner, Venable, Wick, and Williams—81.

Mr. Houston, of Delaware, inquired if it would be in order to move to lay the amendment as amended on the table.

The Speaker replied in the negative.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM SEEMS NOT THE REAL ISSUE AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is possible that President Nixon might have

spoken too sweepingly in his state of the Union address when he said:

Our colleges and universities have again become places of learning instead of battlegrounds.

On the campus of one of our most prestigious centers of learning, Stanford University, there is at least a skirmish over conflicting ideologies. The issue is whether or not a tenured professor can be dismissed from the board of trustees for repeatedly inciting to violence the malleable minds of students.

The claim of academic freedom has been raised against the university's right to protect itself against irresponsible and potentially dangerous activities. Over the past few months, Stanford University has been the scene of a fire bombing, window smashing, a takeover of the university computer center, and posted threats of retaliation if the associate professor of English, H. Bruce Franklin, is finally fired.

The New York Times of January 11 edition published a keen analysis of the matter and editorially concluded that Franklin, or any other teacher, has no right to "shout fire in a crowded theater." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROTECTING STANFORD'S FREEDOM

The recommendation by a seven-man faculty advisory board at Stanford University that a tenured professor be dismissed for repeatedly inciting students to "the use of illegal coercion and violence" is a matter of utmost gravity for the nation's academic community. If the Board of Trustees follows suit, this would be the first such step by a major university in the context of recent campus unrest.

Although the professor's defenders have predictably charged that the 5-to-2 faculty recommendation is a violation of academic freedom, massive evidence shows that it is quite the opposite: a painful but necessary attempt to protect such freedom against coercion and disruption from within the academy.

H. Bruce Franklin, an associate professor of English, has long and publicly encouraged students to commit illegal acts. He urged actions that threatened injury to persons, damage to property and interference with the lawful activities of other members of the community. He has in effect cried "fire" in a crowded theater. His conduct has been cowardly as well as irresponsible, manipulating students, endangering their own safety and damaging their future careers. It makes pawns of vulnerable young men and women, while the professor as instigator seeks immunity behind the shield of tenure.

At no time has Professor Franklin's Maoist ideology been an issue. What is at stake is the university's right physically to protect itself. The senior faculty panel's painstaking deliberations, after six weeks of hearings of more than 100 witnesses, led to the unimpeachable conclusion that incitement to illegal conduct is "an abuse of power" rendered particularly serious when it ignores a teacher's responsibility toward his students. In a flagrant instance last February, a student occupation of the university's Computation Center followed Dr. Franklin's appeal for just such a take-over.

The panel's two dissenting members disagreed with the majority only with regard to the severity of the penalty. Their counsel of leniency might be supported had the

offense been an aberration of momentary passion. But Professor Franklin's consistent contempt for the foundations of a free, rational and non-violent community was unmistakably reaffirmed when he responded to the faculty verdict with a call for "revolutionary counter-violence," while his wife "symbolically" stood by his side with a rifle.

A better symbol of the universities' determination to uphold freedom through self-government under law will be Stanford's notice that neither tenure nor inflammatory rhetoric constitutes a license for coercive and illegal action.

ROCHESTER VFW POST MARKS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was 25 years ago that a group of World War II veterans met to form the James H. Lundgren Post No. 8948, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in Rochester, N.Y.

The charter membership consisted of 60 overseas veterans, all employees of the Rochester Post Office. The post was named for James H. Lundgren who was killed in action on Iwo Jima in 1945. His father, an employee of the Rochester Post Office, was one of the charter members.

The post has grown to a membership of more than 300, including veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict and the war in Vietnam.

The anniversary affair was arranged by Albert J. Rago, chairman, and Marvin A. Bruley, cochairman. Interestingly, Mr. Rago, as a sergeant, served in World War II with our colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE of Texas.

Toastmaster at the affair was State Senator Thomas Laverne, past county commander, with invocation by Chaplain Herbert J. Migliore. The welcome was by the post commander, Vincent H. Ippolito.

Honored guests included: Leonard L. Schieffelin, past post, county and department commander; Richard F. Tickner, past post and county commander; Harold B. O'Connor, eighth district commander; Postmaster William E. Finn of Rochester; and New York Department Commander John M. York.

Our colleagues, the Honorable BARBER B. CONABLE and the Honorable FRANK HORTON, representing parts of Rochester, were unable to be present because of official business.

Following are highlights of the post's 25-year history:

HIGHLIGHTS OF 25 YEARS

The James H. Lundgren Post 8948, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, was formally instituted on January 26, 1947. The Post was named in memory of James H. Lundgren, who was killed in action on Iwo Jima, March 3, 1945. The charter membership consisted of sixty overseas veterans, all employees of the Rochester Post Office, one of whom was James' father, Henry Lundgren. The present membership, over 300, includes

veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean Conflict and the war in Vietnam.

Many resolutions originating in the Lundgren Post during the past two and one-half decades have been adopted by the VFW County, District, State and National organizations. Some have become state and federal laws; such as the McCormick Bill, restoring the rights of certain veterans in the Post Office Department and the Whitten Amendment, preserving the rights of veterans under the Civil Service Law.

Since January, 1957, a most important activity of the Lundgren Post has been its V.A. Hospital Committee. Television sets and a bowling foul line setup have been provided for the patients' enjoyment. The active volunteer service of the committee membership during the past fifteen years, has made it possible for patients to attend many events, such as the Ice Follies, circuses, rodeos, musical productions, the Rochester-Americans professional hockey games, and Rochester Red Wing baseball games. This program has contributed much in the treatment and rehabilitation of our disabled veterans from our local hospitals in Bath, Batavia and Canandaigua.

Helping to strengthen patriotism and Americanism in our community, the Lundgren Post colors have been displayed in twenty-five Memorial Day parades, and have represented our post in numerous patriotic celebrations, tributes to our honored dead, and many other civic programs.

Improved youth activities and elimination of juvenile delinquency are part of the Post's programs. Toward this end we have sponsored Junior Softball teams, Junior Bowling teams, Lite-A-Bike campaigns, Loyalty Day, and have helped and involved ourselves with the Girl Scout and Boy Scout movements.

In 1952 the Post adopted a set of By-Laws which were approved by the State and National organizations. This, in itself is unique, for there are very few posts which have such a set to guide them. To assist the families of our deceased comrades we have for the past seventeen years established and maintained a death benefit.

The post social functions, dinners and picnics which have been well attended over the past twenty-five years, have developed a true spirit of comradeship among the members.

Lundgren Post is noted not only for its quantity, but also for its quality. Beginning with some sixty members in 1947, the post is numbered among the larger posts in Monroe County. Leadership has been a trademark of Post 8948 . . . it has produced 24 Post Commanders, 3 County Commanders, 1 District Commander, 1 Department Commander and several County and District officers.

Lundgren Post's highlights and achievements are numerous and impressive, but they only indicate higher levels of accomplishments for the future.

. . . on to the next twenty-five years, God willing.

Charter members were: Laurence J. Burns,* John C. Crowley, John J. Curtin, Walter J. Czarniak, Frederick Dykstra,* William E. Finn, and Donald C. Hilliker.

Raymond J. Hoefen, Lincoln L. Kalwas, Joseph W. Kircher, Joseph Lauricella, Walter Lysy, Raymond J. Moore, and Joseph R. Ortolani.

Philip L. Palermo, Raymond J. Richens, Chester C. Rowley, William C. Sanger, Leonard L. Schieffelin, Earl E. Schirmer, and Gerard J. Schultheis.

Frank Stiegel, Harold A. Suits, William A. Tatyga,* Richard F. Tickner, Joseph R. Wahl, Frank A. Welland, and J. Frank Wixted.

I was honored to be the main speaker on this happy occasion and I include my text with my remarks:

*Deceased.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THADDEUS J. DULSKI AT 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROCHESTER, N.Y., VFW POST

It is a very special pleasure for me to be here this evening to help you celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the founding of the James Lundgren Post No. 8948 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars here in Rochester.

The VFW has never been afraid to stand up and be counted on the issues which confront our great country. You have had superior leadership within your organization, and I know first-hand that your leaders and your members do their homework well on the issues.

The VFW has always been in the forefront seeking sensible benefits for our nation's veterans and, more silently, it has played a major leadership role in helping the returning Vietnam era veteran to re-establish himself in society as he comes back to civilian life.

Our country needs more organizations such as yours, which are champions of American democracy, and which are willing to stand up to the draft and card burners, flag desecrators, the whiners, and the complainers.

DEBT TO OUR VETERANS

We need a strong America, and I stand with you every step of the way as you marshal the support of our nation's veterans. I do not know of any harder working group of dedicated Americans in our country today than the members of your great organization.

Our country owes all who served in the armed forces a great debt that can never be repaid. Our nation's veterans represent the strength in America, and because of you, our nation is strong and free today.

I am indeed glad to be associated with such fine organizations who do more than pay lip service to the American way of life.

Next week the second session of the 92nd Congress will convene, and there are a number of important veteran issues which will be considered.

Before I review these, however, I want to point out that during the 91st Congress, we passed more legislation benefiting veterans and their dependents than had been passed by any previous Congress since the end of World War II.

LEGISLATION PASSED

The legislation which we passed resulted in direct payments of benefits to veterans and their dependents, approximating \$1 billion a year. This included increases in compensation and pension rates averaging about eight percent; increased and expanded GI home programs; a 35 percent increase in education and training allowances, and other benefit improvements.

During the first session of this Congress, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee held numerous hearings and took action on a number of bills to improve and expand veterans' benefits.

Two of the most important laws which originated in our Committee were H.R. 11652—now Public Law 92-197—and H.R. 11351 which became Public Law 92-198.

Public Law 197 increases Dependents and Indemnity Compensation rates for approximately 176,000 widows, 46,000 children, and about 68,000 dependent parents. It also prevents parents receiving DIC from losing aggregate income because of social security increases in 1971.

Public Law 198 provides an average cost of living increase of approximately 6½ percent in non-service-connected pension rates, payable to approximately 1.6 million veterans and widows. It also prevents pensioners from losing any of their VA pension received on their own behalf due to the 1971 increase in social security benefits.

BILLS FROM COMMITTEE

Other bills that have originated in our Committee include:

Public Law 92-66—which preserves the direct loan program for GIs who live mostly in rural areas. This is one of the best investments ever made by America in a government-backed housing program. It has made a profit of over \$200 million during the life of the program and yet the Administration sought to shut off the funding of this profit-making program while, at the same time, it was supporting other types of subsidized housing mostly for non-veterans.

Public Law 92-95—which provides mortgage protection life insurance for service-connected disabled veterans who have received grants for specially adapted housing with the veteran paying the standard premium, and the government paying the remainder of the premium because of the veteran's serious service-connected disability.

DRUG TREATMENT

Other legislation, which was passed by the House in the last session and now pending in the Senate, includes:

A measure providing for VA facility treatment for veterans or military personnel addicted to narcotics—regardless of the character of their discharge.

A bill to provide financial assistance for medical schools.

A measure providing an extension from six to nine months for veterans' nursing home care.

And an omnibus bill which would broaden medical care for veterans, dependents, and survivors, and improve the recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the VA.

Also, as the first session closed, our Committee had completed hearings on the veterans' educational assistance program.

The Administration has recommended an 8.6 percent increase in educational assistance allowances. However, I expect the Congress will pass a bill raising the rates by about 10 to 12 percent, inasmuch as the Administration's proposal is based on the increased cost of living as of October 1971. By the time the bill is finally enacted, it can be reasonably anticipated that higher rates will be necessary to offset the higher cost of living. Our Committee will probably act on this legislation soon after Congress reconvenes.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER

Other issues which we may consider in this new session are:

National cemeteries and burial benefits for veterans generally, which would include—(1) the transfer of jurisdiction over national cemeteries to the VA; (2) the authorization of a study of the entire problem by the VA—with a report of recommendations to be made to the Congress; (3) the recast of the national cemetery system on a regional basis; and (4) the authorization of a burial plot allowance of \$150 in cases where the deceased veteran is not buried in a national cemetery.

We also plan action on a bill to liberalize the rates of compensation commensurate with the increase in the cost of living which will have occurred by the time legislation can be approved. By November 1971, the cost of living had risen by 5.4 percent since the last compensation increase was approved.

Our veterans' housing program needs improvement because of the state of our economy, and we plan to explore several proposals designed to better assist young families of veterans with low income to obtain adequate housing.

LIFE INSURANCE CONVERSION

We also plan to consider a liberalization of the conversion privilege under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance program which will greatly aid the young low-income veteran who may be newly married.

Of prime concern to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee is the VA medical program. We have a gigantic medical system in 166 hospitals which is the greatest single medical system in the world under one leadership.

The Office of Management and Budget has, for years, tried to "manage" and dominate the VA hospital system. However, the Congress has vigorously fought to preserve the present system. This has led to a hard confrontation between Congress and the Executive Branch.

The idea of seriously curtailing or phasing out the VA hospital system is a clear objective of the Office of Management and Budget. However, the tactics have changed from trying to close down entire hospitals to nibbling away at them, year by year.

VA HOSPITAL BUDGET PROBLEM

It has been necessary for the Congress to take strong action to keep the hospital system from being bled to death by the Office of Management and Budget. Two years ago, Congress added a total of \$155 million to the medical care budget of the VA, because our Committee investigation proved beyond doubt that the program was seriously underfunded and understaffed.

When the President submitted his budget for fiscal 1972, it was based on lowering the average daily patient census from about 84,500 to 79,000. If Congress had allowed this action to stand, it would have had the effect of closing about ten 500-bed hospitals over a period of a year. In the Appropriations Act, for the first time in history, Congress stated that the VA medical system should operate at an average daily patient census of not less than 85,500 and at an operating bed level of not less than 97,500.

Through administrative finagling, the Office of Management and Budget has been able to make some inroads into these minimum operating levels—so that it appears the overall average daily patient census at the end of the fiscal year in June will be about 83,000 at best.

FUNDS ARE WITHHELD

During the current fiscal year, Congress added almost \$200 million to the President's original budget request for VA medical care, and yet, the Office of Management and Budget has told the VA they cannot spend about \$72 million which Congress appropriated.

These funds are badly needed to better staff and equip our VA hospitals to take care of the rising workloads. It is just inconceivable to me that these funds are being withheld when they are so vitally needed to treat our nation's sick and disabled veterans.

Very shortly the President will present to the Congress his 1973 budget. While it will probably contain more dollars for VA medical care and other programs, it is highly doubtful that this increase will be in keeping with higher medical costs and the rising workload brought on by the 1.3 million World War I veterans who have an average age of about 76, and who need a great deal of care.

Add to this about 15 million World War II veterans, who have an average age of about 52, along with the growing number of Vietnam veterans—many of whom have extremely serious injuries—and it is readily apparent that there is a great need to expand and update our VA medical program.

Congress is dedicated to this course of action. With your help, and the help of other VFW posts throughout the nation and that of other veterans' groups, I hope that we can put a stop to this sly plan which has been developed by ivory-tower bureaucrats.

I said, at the beginning, that the VFW has never been afraid to stand up and be counted. The time has come again for you to do this—and I know we can count on you for swift and positive action.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MIKE FROME AND AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 21, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to some correspondence between Mike Frome and the American Forestry Association which was recently published in the Living Wilderness magazine.

It is certainly the prerogative of the American Forestry Association to publish what they wish, but it is a sad day when they can no longer look at all sides of forestry. When they openly advocate censorship of their columnists, whose propaganda line are we reading?

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STRANGE CASE OF MICHAEL FROME, LOVER OF TREES AND BÊTE NOIRE OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

EDITOR'S NOTE.—One of the best writers on conservation issues today is Michael Frome, author of such books as *Whose Woods These Are: The Story of the National Forests* and the recently published *The Forest Service*. Mike serves as Conservation Editor of *Field and Stream Magazine* and until recently wrote a monthly column for *American Forests*, the magazine of the American Forestry Association.

In his *American Forests* column Mike used to probe into anything and everything related to our nation's forests and range lands. His approach was direct, his style incisive. He gave quarter to no one he thought deserving of criticism. Oftentimes he was critical of the U.S. Forest Service and/or the timber industry.

We always thought it was to the credit of The American Forestry Association that it published Mike's column, which began in 1966 and was preceded by occasional articles going back to 1959. Here was convincing proof that the association could look objectively at itself and its many close friends in government and industry and fight for change where change was needed. With at least seven industry representatives and several former officials of the U.S. Forest Service among its officers and directors, the association needs to show this kind of independence.

To us, it is indeed sad that this relationship has ended. It is especially sad for what it seems to tell us about the internal problems of The American Forestry Association, once thought to be a strong voice for conservation and now, perhaps, something less than that.

We take no delight or satisfaction in reviewing the firing of Mike Frome. But after wrestling with our consciences on what is, or is not, our responsibility in the matter, we have decided to share with you some of the correspondence that has come into our hands concerning it. We hope you find it instructive.

The episode began with the memorandum reproduced above, directed to James B. Craig, respected editor of *American Forests*. We then pick up the exchange of correspondence with Frome's note to Craig on first learning of the memo.

THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1971.

MEMO

To: James B. Craig
From: William E. Towell, Executive Vice President
Subject: Mike Frome's Column in *American Forests*

The formality of this memorandum is to clarify for the record the decisions made regarding Mike Frome's column in *American Forests Magazine*. It will be your responsibility to see that these decisions are carried out.

It is hardly necessary to review the background and reasons for this action, except to say that Mike's column frequently has been in conflict with official Association positions; it often has been personal and inflammatory, particularly with respect to the Forest Service; and, in the opinion of many, sometimes contains outright inaccuracies or harmful innuendoes. For the protection of the Association itself, it is necessary to require certain editorial restrictions on Mike in the future. It is my understanding that Mr. Frome has agreed to these restrictions as a requisite to his continued service as a columnist with *American Forests*:

1. Frome's column is to be censored by you as Editor to insure that it is not in conflict with established AFA policy or position.

2. Frome, in the future, is not to write critically about the U.S. Forest Service, the forest industry, the profession or about controversial forestry issues.

3. A disclaimer is to appear permanently on Frome's column that he is a paid columnist and does not speak for the Association.

I am very pleased, as was the Board, that Mike has agreed to this censorship and wants to continue writing for us. He is a very effective and popular writer who has been and can continue to be a great asset to our magazine.

W.E.T.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
March 22, 1971.

DEAR JIM: Attached is my next column for the magazine.

Please advise Mr. Towell that I have received a copy of his memorandum of March 4 written to you on the subject of "Mike Frome's column," although it did not come either from him or from you.

Will you please advise him further—and he may feel free to pass this word to the Directors of the Association, if he so wishes—that at no time, and in no manner, have I agreed to having my column censored and/or edited as a requisite to its continued use in *American Forests*.

You know this to be the fact and I will appreciate your acknowledgement.

Sincerely,

MIKE FROME.

AMERICAN FORESTS,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1971.

Mr. MICHAEL FROME,
Alexandria, Va.

DEAR MIKE: I regret more than I can say that someone inside AFA has seen fit to open up this can of worms by sending you Mr. Towell's memo to me of March 4 concerning your column. I had hoped—and I still hope—that we can work this thing out.

As you know, prior to our Directors' meeting you and I discussed your column at the Cosmos Club and we both agreed that it would be a good idea to lay off forestry for awhile and let readers and others have their say on the basis of the dialogue the magazine has opened up as regards even-aged management and other concerns. There certainly was not any mention of censorship which is

why I was shocked when Mr. Towell first showed me his memo with that ugly word used not once but two times. At that time it was my understanding he would delete those two words before sending the memo to Directors. At the time I told him what I had already told you, that it was time for you to lay off forestry for awhile at least.

Mike, I was not invited to sit in on a closed session of the Directors on this matter so I can not say with certainty exactly what happened. I understand some were very critical of your column. On the basis of the reaction of others following receipt of the memo, some thought it was too harsh.

Accordingly, I did not show you this memo because I was not completely sure just how exacting it was or how permanent. I hoped our previous discussion would cover the situation sufficiently and that we could ride with the punches. The current column on black walnut, which we discussed at that time, strikes me as fine except for one reference to the Chief of the Forest Service which I must delete.

In reply to your letter, you are quite right that you never agreed to any form of censorship and in fact the whole idea of starting the column was to present an outside opinion in an effort to ward off blandness in the magazine. That was the whole idea. And while I did not care for the disclaimer idea myself, I thought it was a reasonable request since obviously you are not speaking for the association as such as an officer of the organization. That is self evident it seems to me.

Perhaps I was in error not to show you this memo immediately. The reason I did not was that I thought: 1) It was an inside matter to be interpreted by me in terms of the actual rigidity of the thing; 2) I thought Mr. Towell and I were in agreement on how we would proceed, namely, that you would lay off forestry for awhile at least until we saw how things developed. And it was my impression Mr. Towell's personal reaction was much softer than the memo itself.

It is also quite true that as regards some of the things on which you have written the AFA has no official policy—such as the recent Timber Supply Bill, the SST and other hot issues of the day. Where we have had a position I have always appreciated your restraint even though you sometimes took the opposite point of view in other publications, which is your right.

Where does this new development now leave us? I am still proceeding on the premise that the words "censorship" were deleted from the memo of March 4. I do not believe that the whole Board in a showdown would go along with that ugly word. I do feel that as regards forestry you have stirred up the Indians enough for now and that we should lay off, which you said was right. While you have helped stimulate readership and have contributed to our really remarkable growth in the last couple years, the time comes to ease up. As you know, Mr. Towell is hard at work on a series of "Areas of Agreement" conferences between preservationists and industry which may or may not be successful. But since this is an association as well as a magazine, I feel we should help him all we can and some statesmanship is now required.

Also, there were indications at the Directors' meeting that they intend to take a much more aggressive stance on issues of the day than was previously the case. If this develops, it will be my job to help implement those positions and I think you would agree that if our contributors can't go along with those positions at least they should not be encouraged to oppose them in our own magazine. That is how I interpret Point No. 1 in the memo. Point No. 2 I interpret as meaning "lay off forestry" for awhile, which we had already discussed. And I was told in

no uncertain terms that the disclaimer on your column must be put there to stay. Some also urged that you also stay away from personalities—which, of course, makes hot copy and is widely read—but which is not always helpful in terms of achieving the goals of an organization.

This is not a pleasant experience, I agree, and it is now obvious that at least some members of our Board are unhappy with both of us. But Mike I have put over 20 years into this magazine and I want to make a success of it. With some help from you all we'll have it over the 100,000 mark in another year or so and I've got some ideas for expanding both our scope and coverage that I think will be sure fire. I know this memorandum has upset you and I had hoped to shield you from the sharpness of the tone of the thing which I feel is catering to the ideas of a few Directors and not necessarily the majority of them. I have had to learn to ride with the punches here from people in a wide cross section of opinion.

So, as I see it, we have two choices: 1) We can say this memo is inflicting censorship on *American Forests* and quit; 2) For a number of reasons I have tried to outline, it is not as grim as it sounds and actually reflects a real desire by the Directors to start taking positions on issues and move into the main conservation swim. I choose to interpret the memo along the second line at least for the time being. I hope you will do the same for I would hate most awfully to lose your good services and so would a large number of our readers.

As ever,

JAMES B. CRAIG, Editor.

JOURNALISM DEPARTMENT,
THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING,
Laramie, Wyoming, April 2, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President,
The American Forestry Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TOWELL: I have been slow in reading mail delivered to my home lately and slower realizing the full import of your March 4 memorandum to James B. Craig, editor of *American Forests*, regarding Mike Frome's column.

To say I am shocked and deeply concerned is an understatement.

Will you please furnish me the details as to how the decision resulting in the memorandum was arrived at and if the matter was put to the board of directors and if so, what the vote was.

I am very much aware that I am a new member of the Board of Directors of the American Forestry Association and have attended only one board meeting. Perhaps what I need is a copy of the AFA constitution and bylaws or other documents setting forth the rights and duties of the directors, especially regarding the magazine, *American Forests*.

Any pertinent information you can give me in this regard will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST H. LINFORD,

Professor and Head; Editorial and conservation writer 35 years.

cc: Officers, Board of Directors and Honorary Vice Presidents, American Forestry Association

EDITOR'S NOTE: On April 8 Towell replied to Linford saying that the Board of Directors had instructed him to "control" Mike Frome, that his memo of March 4 had been issued at the explicit request of President Charles A. Connaughton, that he regarded Frome as a fine writer but one with objectives in direct conflict with those of the association, that the "unfortunate" choice of the word "censorship" was his own, and, finally, that in his opinion the distinction between editing and censorship was not really important. Referring to Craig, he described him as "my editor."

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,

April 8, 1971.

Mr. JAMES B. CRAIG,

Editor, *American Forests*.

DEAR JIM: I have your letter of March 24, which constitutes the first direct revelation to me of the decision to deprive me of freedom of expression in *American Forests* through censorship of my column.

For the record, and the protection of my good name and professional integrity, I would like to review our communications on the subject.

On Monday, March 1, you asked me to meet you at the Cosmos Club. At that time you transmitted a message from Mr. Towell requesting that I ease up on my criticism of the Forest Service and timber industry. I agreed to do so, particularly since I had other subjects in mind for the next two or three issues of the magazine.

Several days later you invited me to dinner. I was puzzled as to the reason. The date was March 10, clearly after Mr. Towell's memo to you of March 4 on the subject of "Mike Frome's Column in *American Forests*." Although the contents of the memorandum certainly could have serious effect upon my reputation as both journalist and conservationist, you made no mention of it; nor did I learn about it subsequently through direct communication from either you or Mr. Towell. Nor did I learn that you had already started to impose censorship until I received a copy of the April issue with serious deletions from my column.

In mid-March a copy of the memorandum came to me through other channels. I was utterly astonished at terminology and assertions that my column "has often been personal and inflammatory . . ." and that it ". . . sometimes contains outright inaccuracies or harmful innuendoes." Neither you nor Mr. Towell has ever discussed such charges with me at any time or ever indicated anything but appreciation for the contents of my column. Therefore, I feel deeply pained at having these charges broadcast without any substantiation to Officers and Directors of the American Forestry Association.

On March 22 I wrote you on this matter, requesting that you advise Mr. Towell that at no time, and in no manner, have I agreed to having my column censored and/or edited as a requisite to its continued use in *American Forests*.

Thus we now reach your letter of March 24, in which you admit that I never agreed to any form of censorship and that you withheld an important memorandum dealing directly with my work for the magazine.

To sum up, the purpose of the column is clearly to present a public viewpoint. I cannot agree not to write critically about the U.S. Forest Service, the forest industry, the profession or about controversial forestry issues. I cannot, do not and will not accept censorship as a requisite to continued publication in *American Forests*.

Only on this basis can I continue to provide my column. The choice is yours and I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

MIKE FROME.

APRIL 8, 1971.

Professor ERNEST H. LINFORD,
Laramie, Wyo.

DEAR ERNIE: I was not invited to attend the two-hour Executive Session of the Board which, as I understand it, chiefly discussed *American Forests* and Mr. Frome. When Mr. Towell showed me his proposed memo I was shocked and suggested all mention of the word "censorship" be deleted since it was dynamite. I thought that had been done.

Now, I have had certain problems along this line before, and after talking to Mr. Towell and hearing of the comments of some other Directors I considered it highly possible this memo may have been over emphatic. I did not show the memo to Mike as we had

discussed the whole situation previously, thought it had been worked out, and I decided it was my duty to interpret the memo to him as I understood it . . . which was probably a mistake, for someone sent him a copy of same.

As a result, I wrote a letter to Mike outlining the situation as I saw it. At the Church hearing yesterday on the Hill, he said he was replying in a letter. It was, and is, my hope that we can work this out but I am not at all optimistic, as you might imagine.

As I mentioned, there are problems that arise from time to time but in the final analysis they have always been worked out satisfactorily. I am trying to weigh this thing carefully and do not want to go off half cocked. Naturally, I am concerned for I have worked hard here for almost 20 years in an effort to build up this magazine as a forum of wideranging opinion that, I think, has gained some respect. But, naturally, I am now thinking of resigning if that is what the Directors think I should do.

When I took Mike on some years ago, it seemed to me the magazine was getting too bland at a time when new readers were bringing new ideas to conservation. Mike, I thought, would represent this point of view as a paid columnist whose views were his own and not necessarily those of AFA. From a readership standpoint, the column has been rewarding.

At the same time, I realize the magazine is the spokesman of the association and should reflect its policy. I am well aware that some Directors have been unhappy with some of Mike's comments but so far as I know he has never violated AFA policy since most of his statements have been on questions on which the AFA has no policy—the Timber Supply Bill being a case in point. And should a magazine merely reflect the views of Directors?

My feeling has been, and the Directors know this, that *American Forests* is big enough and has a wide enough spread of readership to present all points of view in conservation. After the last few Board meetings, I am not so sure about this as of now, of course.

I am trying to keep my cool about this and I hope Mike does too, at least until all the results are in. But as your own letter indicates, it is a delicate situation. And I may be deluding myself when I indicate it is merely a matter of over-emphasis. Feelings are running high in conservation right now, as you know.

I think it boils down to this. While the memo is pretty pointed, I just cannot bring myself to believe that the Directors would willingly go along with any form of censorship.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. CRAIG,
Editor, *American Forests*.

APRIL 13, 1971.

MEMO

To: James B. Craig
From: William E. Towell, Executive Vice President

Subject: My Memorandum of March 4
My memorandum to you dated March 4 gave rise to some misinterpretation and is herewith retracted. Please substitute the attached revision.

W.E.T.

cc: Officers and Directors

APRIL 13, 1971.

The formality of this memorandum is to clarify for the record the decisions made regarding Mike Frome's column in *American Forests* magazine. It will be your responsibility to see that the following is carried out.

1. Frome's column is to be edited by you to insure that it is not in conflict with the established AFA policy or position.

2. For the time being, Frome is not to write about the Forest Service, the forest industry, the profession or about controversial forestry issues.

3. A disclaimer is to appear permanently on Frome's column that he is a paid columnist and does not speak for the Association.

It is hardly necessary to review the background and reasons for the above action, except to say that Mike's column has been highly critical, particularly with respect to the Forest Service, and in the opinion of many sometimes contains outright inaccuracies.

I am very pleased, as was the Board, that Mike has agreed to this editing and wants to continue writing for us. He is a very effective and popular writer who has been and can continue to be a great asset to our magazine.

W.E.T.

cc: Officers and Directors

LARAMIE, WYO.,
April 14, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President,
The American Forestry Assn.

DEAR Mr. TOWELL: Thanks for your letter of April 8.

I am glad to know that you intended to use the term "edited" instead of "censored" in your March 4 memorandum to Editor James B. Craig, a copy of which you sent the directors. There is a very important distinction. An editor edits, an outside person or agency censors. It is a relief also to have you clear up the matter of Jim Craig going to Mike Frome and asking him to "cool it" for a while regarding forestry issues, with Frome assenting. This having occurred, however, it is utterly incomprehensible to me why it was necessary for you to write the memo, the second point of which said: "Frome, in the future, is not to write critically about the U.S. Forest Service, the forestry industry, the profession or about controversial forestry issues."

Do you honestly believe anyone could write conservation under such a stricture? Mr. Towell, I cannot find the words to express my amazement and distress that a spokesman for the AFA would impose such an outrageous and crippling rule on a columnist for *American Forests*. In 30-odd years of writing and editing I have encountered some weird obstacles, but this breaks all records for sheer audacity.

Now I am fully aware of my freshman status and I suppose some fellow AFA directors would prefer that I get more experience on the board before speaking up. I am not a newcomer to the field of conservation and forestry, however, and I probably have written more column inches on the subject than anybody else on the board. Most of my editorials have been favorable to the U.S. Forest Service, whose rangers and I&E people have taught me a great deal.

Your April 8 letter to me says, "It was at the request of President Connaughton that I summarized the agreement between Mike and Jim in my March 4 memo." This question is an ugly one but it is unavoidable in view of that statement. Did Mr. Connaughton also suggest that you order Mike Frome not to write critically about the Forest Service? I most earnestly hope not because it reflects adversely on Mr. Connaughton and implies a serious conflict of interest.

It is one thing for the editor of *American Forests* to ask Mike Frome to lay off the Forest Service for a while. This may have been a courtesy due the new president of AFA, but to imply that *American Forests* is to be the Charlie McCarthy of the service and the forest industry is absolutely untenable to me as a director of AFA and as a conservationist.

I have no idea what Frome intends to do. I finally reached him by telephone over the

weekend and he says he only informally agreed to "cool it" for now, but he did not consent to the censorship thing. I do know what I would do under the circumstances and I must add that I as a director have no intention to submit to the restrictions you put in your memo. I would not agree to "not write critically" about any agency or person or industry that needed criticism in my judgment. If that be treason, make the most of it.

In the last two sentences of the second paragraph of your April 8 letter you say Mike Frome repeated his criticisms of the Forest Service and Chief Cliff in testimony before the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee last week. This seems to me to be beside the point since Frome was speaking as a representative of *Field and Stream*, not *American Forests*. I do hope you are not implying that Mike's writing and speaking outside his column to *American Forests* should also be in keeping with the objectives of the American Forestry Association.

What are American Forestry Association objectives anyway? I have studied the copy of the bylaws you sent, and Article 2 seems to say that the objects are to promote more efficient conservation of forests and other natural resources. I see nothing there that says AFA has to look the other way if the Forest Service bows down to the timber industry.

Considering Jim Craig's eminence as an editor and conservationist and his remarkable record in building up *American Forests* to its respected status, I am disturbed by your statement in the next paragraph of your April 8 letter that you acted to control Mike Frome "by making it clear to my editor what he must do."

This makes me all the more curious as to why the directors discussed this matter for two hours in executive session without calling in the man who was most concerned, the editor. I wondered why Craig was not present when Frome was discussed at Atlanta, but this was my first meeting. As an editor I have never been left out of a board or executive meeting that discussed my work.

Now as to Jim Craig and his great service and value to the organization. He said in a letter to me April 8 (copy sent to WET) that he was thinking of resigning. I most urgently hope he can be dissuaded from doing so. If a man of Mr. Craig's stature, ability and prestige were to be sacrificed in this deplorable and needless mess, the American Forestry Association would be badly hurt.

This letter is already overly long, but I must say I have no special brief for Mike Frome. I have met him briefly only once several years ago in Salt Lake City. I have read his columns with interest and I heartily agree with most of them. Mike Frome needs my support like Kellogg needs cornflakes. But *American Forests* needs both Jim Craig and Mike Frome and if they left under conditions of censorship that required subservience to the timber industry, a permanent blight would be left on this great organization.

Needless to say I would have neglected budgetary matters in my department here and would have been present at the Washington meeting if there had been any hint that this matter was on the agenda. I thought it was settled at Atlanta.

Very respectfully,

ERNEST H. LINFORD.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
April 17, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
American Forestry Assn.

DEAR BILL: Your memorandum of March 4 to Jim Craig, the editor of *American Forests*, evidently was written with the intention that it not be seen by me, although my column in the magazine was the stated subject at hand. When a copy came to me,

through unusual channels, I was utterly astonished and distressed.

For one thing, you saw fit to disseminate serious written criticisms of my personal integrity and professional competency among leaders of forestry education, the forest products industry, state and federal public agencies, and citizen conservationists who comprise the Officers and Directors of the American Forestry Association. Never in my experience as a writer has this type of situation occurred.

Even more consequential, however, you chose to misrepresent and misquote my position to these men and women.

For the benefit of all concerned I endeavored to set the record straight at once. In a note to Mr. Craig, dated March 22, I asked him to advise you—with the further thought that you should feel free to pass the word to the Directors of the Association—that at no time, and in no manner, had I agreed to having my column censored and/or edited as a requisite to its continued use in *American Forests*.

Nevertheless, although I endeavored to make this point as clearly as possible, I find in your memorandum to Mr. Craig of April 12, which he has made available to me, this statement:

"I am very pleased, as was the Board, that Mike has agreed to this editing and wants to continue writing for us."

I certainly made no such commitment. Since I have been receiving inquiries from individual members of the Board on this point, I must respectfully request that you make this information available to all of them.

There is no objection on my part to a disclaimer, as you have proposed, appearing permanently on my column that I do not speak for the Association. Once that is done, however, I must insist upon my freedom of expression.

Of the three conditions set forth in your memorandum to Mr. Craig, the first directs that my column be "edited" to insure that it is not in conflict with established AFA policy or position. But what is the established policy on issues which I have undertaken to discuss? I refer specifically to the following:

- (a) massive clearcutting in the national forests;
- (b) intensive use of hard pesticides in forest management;
- (c) the widespread burning of logging slash and debris, wasting wood and contributing to air pollution;
- (d) the National Timber Supply Bill, which the House of Representatives defeated last year in response to public protest;
- (e) the imbalance in the Forest Service budget, favoring timber above all other uses;
- (f) the harvest of low quality timber on steep slopes of the Rocky Mountains, with negative stumpage returns to the federal treasury.

Exactly what policies have I violated by treating these important resource questions in the pages of *American Forests*? When and where were these policies determined?

The second condition stipulates that "for the time being," I am not to write about the Forest Service, the forest industry, the profession or about controversial forestry issues. But why should they be sacred in a publication designed for citizen interest? How long is "the time being"? Who is to give me the signal when it becomes once again safe to exercise my freedom of expression?

It is perfectly true that Mr. Craig asked me to ease off in my criticism. I agreed to do so as a matter of sound journalism; or, as Mr. Craig expressed it in his letter of March 24, in order to "let readers and others have their say on the basis of the dialogue the magazine has opened." We reached our understanding in a healthy editor-writer relationship. But I cannot and will not accommodate my writing to official edicts.

In your penultimate paragraph, you men-

tion that "in the opinion of many," my column has contained outright inaccuracies. In the light of damage that such an assertion causes to my professional reputation, I must request that you specify the alleged inaccuracies found in my writing. Why have I not heard of this before, either from you or from the editor of the magazine? Who are my accusers, whom you tabulate as "many"? Why do they deal in the shadows instead of in the light?

I appreciate your words that I am a very effective and popular writer who has been and can continue to be a great asset to *American Forests*. My secret is simple. As I wrote to Mr. Craig, I deal by choice in public issues in public view. This is the only basis on which I can remain with you.

I will repeat that any time the Directors and/or management of the organization do not want me to express my views, as I see them, in *American Forests*, then you should tell me so openly and forthrightly. I trust that you will communicate my position accurately to the Officers and Directors.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE FROME.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 26, 1971.

DEAR MIKE: I have not replied to your letter of April 17 because every attempt to do so has seemed stilted or argumentative. Why don't we get together for lunch sometime this week or next and talk about it? Jim Craig is invited, of course.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President.

MAY 4, 1971.

DEAR BILL: Thanks for your invitation to have lunch and talk things over.

We certainly should do that soon and I am glad you want to include Jim Craig.

However, when Jim asked to talk to me at lunch or dinner early in March, at your personal request, it turned out to be a disaster, leading to misrepresentation of my position and aspersions cast upon my character and competence. Therefore, I'm sure you will understand why I feel we ought to resolve certain questions on the record.

I have no objection to the disclaimer over my column. Will I then have freedom of expression in the contents?

Will I be free to write critically as I see fit about the U.S. Forest Service, the forest industry, the profession and about controversial forestry issues?

Would you please acknowledge that at no time, and in no manner, have I agreed to having my column censored and/or edited as a requisite to its continued use in *American Forests*? You may call your previous reports to the contrary a misunderstanding, if you wish.

Once these key questions are answered on the record, we can easily get together to discuss the rest. I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

MIKE FROME.

DENVER, COLO.,
April 20, 1971.

ERNEST H. LINFORD,
University of Wyoming.

DEAR ERNIE: I am in receipt of copies of the correspondence between you and Bill Towell regarding Mike Frome's column in *American Forests* magazine.

I appreciate your concern in regard to this whole matter and I certainly agree with you that this controversy should not affect Jim Craig's position. Jim is an outstanding editor and I sincerely hope that he continues with the American Forestry Association for a long time.

As to the situation with Mike Frome, I

feel somewhat in the position of an objective observer because I am neither in the federal government nor associated with private forest industry. From my viewpoint, I will have to admit that some of Mike Frome's columns seem to be in poor taste to be printed in the *American Forests* magazine, in spite of the fact that I have agreed with many of the things that Mike has written. It appeared to me that some positive action was required, whether it involved terminating Mike's services, editing his copy or some other approach.

Having spent my entire career working with a citizen's commission, which can be rather specifically compared with the Board of Directors of the American Forestry Association, I must admit that I have strong opinions that the Board must conduct all of its business through the Executive Vice President. Nothing would destroy the American Forestry Association any faster than having the Board of Directors develop decisions with various Association employees. For this reason, I think it was perfectly in order that the Executive meeting regarding this matter was restricted to the Board of Directors and Bill Towell. After all, we meet for just a few hours twice a year and the rest of the time we leave the entire operation in Bill's hands. He must know that we support him and that he is responsible for all of the activities of the Association without exception.

I think we are making great progress in the American Forestry Association under Bill's leadership and I hope that no major problem develops out of the matter of Mike Frome. Most especially, I certainly want Jim Craig to know that he has my support because he is an extremely competent member of Bill's team.

It's a shame that we live so close together and yet see each other so infrequently. I will make a special effort to get in touch with you and come to Laramie one of these days so that we might have a chance to exchange some ideas over lunch. I hope that if you find yourself with any time in Denver that you will do the same. With my very best personal regards.

Sincerely,

HARRY R. WOODWARD, Director.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Woodward, head of the Colorado State Division of Game, Fish and Parks, is a director of The American Forestry Association.

[Los Angeles Times Syndicate in association with Newsday, for release April 21, 1971, by Stewart Udall and Jeff Stansbury]

CENSORSHIP

As a leading and staunchly independent conservation author, Mike Frome has brightened the pages of *American Forests* magazine with a no-punches-pulled monthly column.

Recently, in typically outspoken pieces, Frome has told the magazine's 83,000 readers about clearcutting, erosion and waste in the national forests. We have learned that, on March 4, William Towell, executive vice president of the American Forestry Association (which publishes the magazine) sent editor James Craig a memo. Its contents were apparently designed to appease American Forests' principal advertisers—the forest products industry.

"Mike's column," wrote Towell, "is to be censored. . . . Frome, in the future, is not to write critically about the U.S. Forest Service, the forest industry, the profession or about controversial forestry issues."

Without telling Frome, Craig reluctantly began softening his star columnist's copy. Frome protested vigorously. According to latest reports, Craig, who has edited *American Forests* for nearly two decades, may resign rather than remain a party to censorship. We hope Frome's admirers will rally behind him and force the AFA, supposedly a citizens group, to keep his column.

[This excerpt from the Udall-Stansbury column is reprinted with permission of Newsday and the Los Angeles Times Syndicate.]

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 22, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President,
American Forestry Assn.

DEAR BILL: I was shocked to read in Stew Udall's and Jeff Stansbury's column about your censoring Mike Frome's column in *American Forests*.

As you well know, AFA has always had problems from its critics calling it the captive of the timber industry and/or the public relations arm of the Forest Service. Your action in censoring the most consistently lively and readable part of *American Forests* would seem to confirm that criticism.

If you don't think there is a widening debate over forestry as it's practiced by the Forest Service and the industry, then I suggest you take off your blinders and earmuffs and eavesdrop on what is really a pretty lively discussion out there in the great world beyond the forestry meetings.

Also, I would suggest you read Mike Frome's book, *Whose Woods These Are*. I think that reflection upon the sentiments in that book and the sentiments you want to censor in Mike's latest columns will tell you something about the way the wind is blowing.

Bill, before you let Jim Craig resign over your authoritarian, heavy-handed censorship order, I suggest you rethink your decision and rescind your order. If you can't find it in your heart to change your mind, I would suggest that you give AFA members a choice of whose resignation to accept. Censorship of public issues is a pretty serious affair, Bill.

Sincerely,

GARY A. SOUCIE,
Conservation Director, Friends of the Earth.

APRIL 26, 1971.

Mr. GARY A. SOUCIE,
Conservation Director,
Friends of the Earth,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR GARY: Thank you for your opinion. I am well aware that censorship is a serious affair, public issues or otherwise. But, there are aspects of this situation which did not appear in the newspapers, and I am sure your reactions would be different if you had the whole story. However, I choose not to make a public issue or prolong this one by disclosing internal affairs of The American Forestry Association.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

April 29, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
The American Forestry Assn.

DEAR BILL: Thanks for your reply to my letter about the Frome affair.

As you say, my reaction might be different if I had the whole story. But I don't, according to your letter, have the whole story, and you indicate the whole story isn't forthcoming, so my reaction remains unchanged. All in all, a pretty sad affair.

Sincerely,

GARY A. SOUCIE,
Conservation Director.

PRESCOTT, ARIZ.

April 29, 1971.

Editor JAMES B. CRAIG,
American Forests Magazine.

DEAR MR. CRAIG: I was a National Park officer—ranger, Chief Ranger, and Park Superintendent—for 35 years, and for a good many of those years I have read every issue of *American Forests* from cover to cover. I

consider it the best by far, of any conservation magazine on the market today.

Imagine my consternation, then, when I read Stewart Udall's column of April 23 in the *Arizona Republic* entitled "Lumbermen Raid National Forests." In it he said that on March 4, William Towell, executive vice-president of the American Forestry Association, sent you a letter directing the censorship of Mike Frome's column, divesting it of criticism of the U.S. Forest Service, the forest industry and of controversial forestry issues.

Now I don't always agree with Mike Frome, who has tongue-lashed the National Park Service just as enthusiastically as he ever has the Forest Service. Just the same, his column is one of the reasons I think the Magazine is so great—as Stew Udall puts it, he's staunchly independent, and he pulls no punches. If his column is emasculated by censorship of what is controversial and critical, and if this kind of thinking is going to color the editorial policies of *American Forests* Magazine I'll want no more to do with it, and I think I'm speaking for a majority of its readers.

I hope you can assure me that censoring Mike is not going to happen, and that you and the editorial policies you have been following will continue along the lines that have made *American Forests* a great and progressive publication in recent years.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD B. STRICKLIN.

MAY 5, 1971.

Mr. HOWARD B. STRICKLIN,
Prescott, Ariz.

DEAR MR. STRICKLIN: In reply to your letter of April 29, I think I can assure you the matter referred to by Mr. Udall in his column has been resolved. Sometimes misunderstandings occur in the best of regulated families. Tempers sometimes flare, harsh words are said that people do not fully mean. It is probably all a form of vigor and vitality but it does sometimes cause problems with readers. But the letter to which you refer has now been retracted and I believe that all matters regarding columns and other contributions will be left to editorial judgment by the editor.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. CRAIG, Editor.

JULY 19, 1971.

Mr. CHARLES CONNAUGHTON,
President, American Forestry Assn.

DEAR CHARLIE: I have been advised by Jim Craig of my dismissal as columnist in *American Forests*. This action, I presume, was taken at your direction or with your approval.

When I asked Mr. Craig to fire me officially with a letter, he declined on grounds that he had been instructed to put nothing to me in writing. This in itself is shocking, considering the American Forestry Association declares itself to be a public organization, not a secret society. When I asked him to state the reason for my dismissal, he declined again, declaring only that it was "beyond the purview of the magazine."

I have never had a word of criticism given to me by any president or director of the AFA, or by Bill Towell, your executive vice president. When I wrote to Mr. Towell recently for clarification of statements that I had written contrary to AFA policies, he declined to reply.

There is no doubt that my readers in *American Forests* will want to know my column has been terminated. They will write to me and I feel they deserve an explanation. I trust you will agree that I deserve an explanation, too. Certainly when you were Regional Forester for the Forest Service, from which you have recently resigned, and felt that an employee must be dismissed you saw to it that a reason was given.

Therefore, will you please advise why I

was dismissed as columnist in *American Forests*? I look forward to receiving your letter.

Sincerely,

MIKE FROME.

THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1971.

DEAR MR. FROME: I have your letter of July 19 asking for an explanation concerning discontinuation of your column in *American Forests*.

Content of *American Forests* is varied from time to time, including its columnists. It was decided that the time had come in the best interests of all to terminate the arrangement with you which has been on a month by month basis.

As you have been advised, your column will be dropped. This action has the full approval of the Executive Committee.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. CONNAUGHTON,

President.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Readers should know that Mr. Connaughton retired this year as Regional Forester for the U.S. Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

July 27, 1971.

AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The Advance Dues Notice in the Association comes at the time that, I understand, Mike Frome's column will have censorship of a sort.

My primary purpose in subscribing to *Forests* was to be able to get Mike Frome's straight from the shoulder stuff. Without it, there is nothing in the magazine I can't live without or find elsewhere.

Please advise me if I'm wrong, but a fairly responsible scuttlebutt has it that the real Mike Frome may be somewhat muzzled, and what a pity!

Sincerely,

BEULA EDMISTON.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA,

August 3, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President American Forestry Association.

DEAR MR. TOWELL: I have heard that Mike Frome's column will no longer be appearing in *American Forests*. I hope that this is not true, and would appreciate a note from you as to the accuracy of this rumor.

I consider Mr. Frome one of the finest environmental writers in the nation—courageous, accurate and widely respected for his integrity. I know that many readers of *American Forests* share my enthusiasm for Mike's work and would be most disappointed to see it disappear from the pages of your magazine. In talking to many members of AFA, I have gathered that Mike's column was one of the magazine's most popular features because Mike tells it "like it is"; not necessarily like we'd like to think it is. This independent viewpoint and this willingness to face the naked truth of issues before us has been one of the strong appeals of *American Forests*.

I look forward to hearing from you; hopefully with assurances that we can continue to look forward to seeing Mike's work in your publication.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL.

AUGUST 11, 1971.

Miss BEULA EDMISTON,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MISS EDMISTON: Thank you for your comments about Mike Frome's column in *American Forests*. No, Mike Frome will not be censored (we don't believe in censorship either), but his column has been discontinued.

Please keep in mind, Miss Edmiston, that *American Forests* is not a news publication. It is a membership service of the Association governed by a policy making Board of Directors. Mike, or anyone else working for the Association, must conform to basic policy and philosophy as laid down by the Directors. Mike chose not to do so and his column was terminated.

Sorry to lose you as a member, but no individual can be independent of the organization for which he works.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TOWELL,

Executive Vice President.

[Los Angeles Times Syndicate in association with Newsday, for release Aug. 7-8 by Stewart Udall and Jeff Stansbury]

HOW TO KILL A CONSERVATION ORGANIZATION

With no great pleasure we write this obituary for the American Forestry Association (AFA). It is not dead in a literal sense, but its leadership has sold out its birthright and therefore its future claims to our attention.

This spring we informed our readers about an inexcusable case of censorship at *American Forests* magazine, which the AFA publishes. Mike Frome, an outspoken environmentalist who had scored telling blows against Forest Service mismanagement in his monthly column for the magazine, drew the wrath of AFA officialdom. On March 4, editor James Craig was ordered to censor Frome's column so that it would no longer speak critically of the U.S. Forest Service, pulp and timber companies, or the forestry profession.

Frome politely refused to be censored. After our column on this imbroglio appeared, AFA executives waited for the furor to die down, then told Craig that Frome was no longer welcome on the pages of *American Forests*.

Frome's column was offered to another honest conservationist who promptly turned the offer down.

This whole episode belies the citizens-group status of the AFA and erases any lingering pretense that *American Forests* is an environmental journal.

Editors' Note.—And thus ends the story, as it has come to us, of Mike Frome, the fire-breathing columnist who upset the Forest Service and lumber industry, and his association with *American Forests*. Perhaps there is more to it: if there is, we're prepared to print that, too.

Two questions, at least, seem to be left dangling:

1. Was Frome, in fact, guilty of "outright inaccuracies"? If so, why did his accusers refuse to specify what they were?

2. Does the AFA have policies which are not included in the statement of purpose appearing in *American Forests*? If so, what are they and where can they be found?

We would welcome responses from the AFA or any of the persons involved which would contradict the inferences that otherwise might be drawn from this affair. For what is at issue, in our judgment, is not the absolute right of columnists to write what they please but rather the continued effectiveness of the conservation movement.

AFA POLICY STATEMENT

What are the policies of The American Forestry Association which Frome violated when he criticized the Forest Service and the timber industry? Following is a policy statement appearing in each issue of *American Forests*:

The American Forestry Association is a national conservation organization—Independent and non-political—for the advancement of intelligent management and use of our forests, soil, water, wildlife, and all other natural resources necessary for an environment of high quality and the well-being of

all citizens. Established in 1875, the Association seeks, by means of its magazine American Forests and in other ways, to promote an enlightened public appreciation of natural resources and the part they play in the social, recreational and economic life of the nation.

WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE UNION?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, several of the President's remarks in his state of the Union message of January 20 need to be commented upon lest they be taken as facts.

The President stated:

All of my recommendations, however, will be rooted in one fundamental principle with which there can be no compromise: Local school boards must have control over local schools.

Certainly no American can disagree with this very constitutional statement. However, the President has now been in office for 3 years. Why must he wait until reelection year to reiterate the law of the land? Especially is this so when the clear record of his administration in the public and private educational field has been one of more Federal control and Federal intervention, denying a voice to the local elected officials, than any other President who preceded him.

Mr. Nixon is the President. If he truly means what he has said about restoring local control over local schools, then why does he not do it? Why has he not simply told his appointed HEW officials, his Department of Justice appointed officials, and yes, even his strict constitutionalist Federal court appointees, including the Chief Justice, to stop their Federal usurpation of the people's educational system and comply with the law of the land, which is the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto by Congress which prohibit such Federal control and intermeddling?

Four years ago when President Nixon performed for the voters in order to induce their votes and support, he led them to believe he was opposed to forced busing to achieve racial balance and yet his record, made not on what he has said but what his agents have carried out, is the greatest busing of school children in the history of the world and the greatest exodus of white people and industrious blacks from the American cities to the suburbs.

If the President wants to carry out his state of the Union recommendations on local schools, he does not need hide-behind committees and advisory commissions. He needs only to comply with the law of the land under his sworn oath of office and he would have the support of the majority of Congress and the overwhelming majority of the American people who still believe in the Constitution and have not been hoodwinked by the Federal court superiority doctrine.

Federal judges may be able to rule in accordance with what fits their personal whims but the vast majority of the American people understand that all of the Federal officers who are personally executing judge-made de facto law are of the executive department, answerable directly to the President of the United States and sworn to support the Constitution rather than the dictates of a group of appointed politicians who happen to occupy the bench of a Federal court at any particular time.

The President further stated:

Our cities are no longer engulfed by civil disorders.

This is a pleasant sounding reassurance to most Americans who have not been touched by the violence of organized crime hooliganism, and revolutionary extremism. I sincerely doubt that the President's soft sell assurance offered much consolation to the people of my hometown, Baton Rouge, La., where a Black Muslim invasion from outside our State just last week resulted in a death toll of four, and more than 30 injuries. Evidence indicates that this Black Muslim army had been on a travel itinerary from State to State spewing their racial agitation and in search of a violent confrontation. And as one of the newspaper writers in my district editorialized—

Maybe we should examine a national police force that can suppress the Ku Klux Klan but seems to do little about the Black Muslims, Black Panthers, and other radical black groups. It is time law-abiding blacks and whites alike rise up in unison against inflammatory trouble makers. Violent death knows no color.

It does not seem that the people of my district who have personally experienced violent civil disorders share the President's confidence that the President's national law enforcement people did all that they could to prevent civil disorder in Baton Rouge, La.

The President also commented:

I shall soon be visiting the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. I shall go there with no illusions.

If the President, before his visit to two aggressive Communist nations already forecasts no progress, then why is he so insistent in making the trip? Many Americans wonder if he has weighed the cost of such recklessness—the loss of faith of other free-world allies, the loss of respect from the great majority of the American people in the leadership of their country and the devastation of our servicemen in Vietnam who daily face death from Communist firepower, and the utter feeling of contempt by those mothers and widows whose loved ones have died in vain in the cause that they were supposedly halting Communist aggression to keep the free world safe for democracy. Isn't that beautiful!

If nothing is to be gained, then why must he make the trip and feed more propaganda about mellowing of communism into the TV and news media for an already confused and demoralized people. I, like many Americans who have explored all alternatives, shudder at the prospect of American public reaction should a U.S. President fail to return from such an unnecessary and uncalled-

for trip. And it is not beyond speculation to assume that our "friends" of the Soviet Union have agent provocateurs in Red China just as the Red Chinese have paid agents in the Soviet Union who would like nothing better than to see ill befall an American President in the other's country.

A leader who understands the problems that plague our country as well as the world, would do better to apply his talents and energies in solving the many critical domestic issues facing his own people. Such a leader is sorely needed at home where, if he would lead, he could accomplish something constructive toward making the dreams of the American people a reality.

As to our food and fiber producing sector, the President said:

Our program to raise farm income and help meet it (full employment) by helping to revitalize rural America—would be giving to America's farmers their fair share of America's increasing productivity.

Certainly every knowledgeable American understands that U.S. agriculture is one of the few food and fiber producers in the world that consistently supplies domestic needs and has surpluses for export would agree with such a statement? Our agricultural producers are long overdue their fair share of profit by way of farm income for an excellent job. But they have not been receiving it, and the President and his administration have now been in office for 3 years; nor does the President indicate how he would accomplish his promise. The President's farm assurances do not jibe with the testimony of Mr. Palmbly, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, on the sale of feed grain from Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—stocks at preferential prices below the U.S. market and below which the U.S. farmer can produce or even obtain.

It may be well for the President to talk of "encouraging progress in our negotiations with the Soviet Union on limitation of strategic arms." But many informed Americans may question how we are assisting the American farmer by underwriting Soviet-United States progress at the cost of subsidizing Soviet beef production, which in the future can be anticipated to underprice U.S. beef on the world market.

In his state of the Union address, the President stated:

I shall soon send to the Congress a special message proposing a new program of Federal partnership in technological research and development—with Federal incentives to increase private research, and Federally supported research on projects.

Such a policy suggests that the President has lost confidence in the private sector through the traditional free enterprise system of allowing the people to decide for themselves what progress, styles, and programs they are desirous of buying and supporting. With Federal funds or incentives must come Federal control. With Federal control there can be no private research or private projects which respond to the needs and wants of the people in order to be profitable and successful. With the need for profit being replaced by taxpayers' dollars, the consumer public loses the free-

dom of choice and traditional right to a preference.

In the ultimate, President Nixon's state of the Union address leaves much for conjectures. He fails to mention the real issues such as the national debt, oppressive Federal taxation, how the Federal Government can create jobs, and erosion of U.S. sovereignty by enhancing international one-world movements.

Apparently the approach of the tacticians of the new American revolution program is to ignore the country's condition by not calling attention to the real issues. The Members of Congress as well as the American people will have to resort to facts and information elsewhere in order to learn the true state of the Union.

A POPULATION IMPLOSION?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, a favorite argument of abortion proponents has been that abortion is a valuable tool in controlling an allegedly dangerous population growth in our country. Now, however, statistics are showing that instead of the predicted "baby boom," we are experiencing a "baby bust," which provides refutation of these pro-abortion arguments.

The Boston Herald Traveler recently published an editorial regarding the downward trend in the American birth rate, and I insert it into the RECORD:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Jan. 8, 1972]

A POPULATION IMPLOSION?

The experts are surprised and puzzled. They thought there would be more people than there are. The first six months of 1971 recorded fewer births in America than in the corresponding months of 1970, and the Census Bureau demographers had expected that there would be more. It looks as though births for the whole of last year were fewer than those of the entire preceding year, although tallies are not complete.

Last year was considered a key year in the people count, because of the continuing four per cent annual increase of women in the prime child-bearing years of 20 to 29. Instead of rising, though, births for the first half of the year fell 17,000 below those of last year and the whole year bids fair to show a decline in both the birth rate and the size of families.

Put another way, the birth dearth, as the declining number of new citizens has been dubbed, has produced a drop of 15 per cent in children under the age of five over the past decade, while even in the Depression decade of the 1930s the decline was only eight per cent.

How come? Well no one quite knows, and the experts in the field are trying to find out what has happened. There is no indication that grown-ups like children less than they ever did, but there is speculation that new means of birth control are enabling many more people to manage the size of their families.

New life styles, including a reluctance of women to tie themselves down to baby sitters, concern for the rapid world population growth, and the recent economic squeeze

are among other suggested reasons for the birth decline. And some scientists are even hazarding a mention of some innate alarm-clock mechanism working in human beings as it does in lower animals to slow the rate of births when population reaches certain levels of concentration.

If the declining birth rate continues, all manner of social and economic changes will be seen, and industrialists involved in the young people's market already are making sweeping changes in their merchandising plans, their product lines and their expectations of future populations.

It is far too early for demographers to make any significant reduction in their population projections, but they are watching the figures carefully, trying to understand what they mean, both in cause and effect.

And everyone else is watching with them.

GOP INFLUENCE ON POW FAMILY ORGANIZATION

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Republican National Committee has become a dominating influence in the affairs of the National League of American Families of Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia. The Republican National Finance Committee has given political advice and financial support to these organizations, according to documents that I am releasing to the public today.

The documents indicate that the Republican National Committee secretly gave lists of its major contributors to the league to aid in their fundraising campaign. Board members of the league were told:

No one will know that we are using lists owned by the National Republican Committee . . . The mailing will be done in such a way that the Republican donor will not know that their names have been supplied by the Republican National Committee.

Republican officials have also given political advice to the league's members. Executive director of the Republican Finance Committee, Robert Odell, warned the league that, in fundraising:

Great care should be taken to insure that the message in the mail is very, very clear.

The Republican National Committee also gave detailed instructions to the league on procedures for soliciting funds, including the advice:

Each and every contributor should receive a receipt and/or thank you letter for their contribution.

As a result of this shocking development, I have written to Republican National Chairman ROBERT DOLE to find out how and why the Republican National Committee has become involved in the affairs of a supposedly nonpartisan organization.

These charges, if true, Mr. Speaker, are nothing less than scandalous. It is inconceivable that this organization, the National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia, can be truly nonpartisan while receiving help from the GOP.

The National League still claims to be nonpartisan, but it publicly opposed the Mansfield-Boland amendment to end the war, which was defeated by this House last November. The administration also vehemently opposed the amendment.

In light of the political and financial aid that the league received from the Republican Party, it is now clear why their positions were identical.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many Members of this House voted against the Mansfield-Boland amendment in the belief that this organization represented what was best for POW's. Now we find that all the league represents is what is best politically for the administration.

While the administration criticizes its opponents for attempting to politicize the POW issue, clearly, the Republican National Committee is the guilty party.

It has also been rumored that the Republican National Committee may have contributed directly to some POW/MIA organizations. I have asked Chairman DOLE to confirm or deny these allegations.

The documents that I am releasing today also reveal that a public relations firm headed by Paul Wagner, BARRY GOLDWATER's press secretary during the Arizona Senator's unsuccessful presidential campaign, collected as costs of fundraising 61 percent of all direct mail funds raised. A total of \$80,000 of approximately \$130,000 collected was paid to Wagner's firm for fundraising expenses.

Mr. Bernard Talley, of Baltimore, has courageously protested the league's activities, but to no avail. Mr. Talley quite correctly has characterized Wagner's fees as "outrageously exorbitant." Mr. Wagner, however, claims that 60 percent of the funds collected is an acceptable figure for fundraising expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Republican National Committee is guilty of the cheapest form of political manipulation. What happens when the best interests of the POW's and the political interests of the administration clash? It is my fear that the political interests of the administration have already won out.

As a result of my learning of this situation, I have called upon Chairman DOLE to stop this unconscionable manipulating of POW families by completely withdrawing his so-called advisers from the League of POW Affairs.

I hope that the Republican National Committee will take to heart President Nixon's call for nonpartisanship during this election year and stop manipulating POW families. The documents I have received and my letter to Chairman DOLE follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

April 14, 1971.

DEAR BOARD MEMBER: The attached outline was submitted to us by Bob O'Dell and Wayne Bradley who volunteered to help us in direct-mail soliciting. Bob O'Dell is Republican National Committee (Finance) Executive Director, and Wayne Bradley is Executive Director of the American Medical Association in Washington, D.C.

Both, when we first met with them, believed that we paid very high prices for our last campaign, though the results were fairly good. We were given an outline of costs, which is as follows:

	<i>Per thousand</i>
Postage -----	\$16
Mailing services -----	8
Letter printing -----	4
Printing card (computer) -----	10
Enclosure -----	5
Lists -----	---
Envelopes (750,000 already printed and unused per thousand) -----	---
Total -----	43

Mr. Bradley will have the solicitation letter written, and we believe paper for the letters and the enclosures will be donated.

Most importantly, no one will know that we are using the lists owned by the Republican National Committee. The Committee itself has got to protect its donors. So the mailing will be done in such a way that the Republican donors will not know that their names have been supplied by the Republican National Committee.

Mr. Havens, Mr. Wagner, and Dr. Ladley feel that we must make another appeal for donations soon. Thus, we ask you to consider this carefully, discuss it with the other Board members, and send or phone your votes in to Jane Denton (703) 340-6349 as soon as possible.

JOAN.

APRIL 14, 1971.

Memorandum for: The League of Families.
From: Robert P. Odell, Jr.
Subject: League solicitations.

I. COMPUTER SERVICES

Maurice DuFour, President of IBMI, has agreed to maintain and print the necessary documents for the past contributors to the League. Someone on the staff of the League should call Mr. DuFour at 965-5015 to make the necessary arrangements for transferring the tape from the facility that Gorman was using.

II. MAINTENANCE OF PAST CONTRIBUTOR FILE

(a) Certain statistical counts should be made of the current file including the total number of names, breakdown of individual contribution amounts, etc.

(b) The League should determine whether or not each and every individual who contributed something through the direct mail program has actually been thanked and provided with an action pack. Those who have contributed \$100 or more should be extracted from the file and a special letter of appreciation sent to them.

(c) Approximately 6 months after the initial solicitation, it would be appropriate and worthwhile to re-solicit these individuals for a contribution. The letter should indicate that the League recognizes their past support and is returning to its friends with the hope that they may be able to help out again. This solicitation should also indicate, in rather specific terms, what the money will be used for.

III. NEW SOLICITATIONS

(a) It is my suggestion that the League develop a solicitation program for new contributors. The program should include the selection and use of lists which might be made available to the group on a free basis.

(b) Copy should be developed by a professional on a no fee basis.

(c) A knowledgeable and experienced individual on a volunteer basis should purchase supplies and coordinate the physical arrangements for the mailing.

(d) A group of informed volunteers should act as a steering committee to set overall policy and direction for the mail solicitation.

It should be always understood that the solicitation mailing also spreads the word about the POW-MIA situation. Therefore, great care should be taken to insure that the message in the mail is very clear.

IV. FULFILLMENT

(a) Each and every contributor should receive a receipt and/or thank you letter for

their contribution. Those who contribute a substantial sum should receive a personal letter from the head of the League.

(b) If it is the purpose of the League to send its message to as many people as possible and to enlist support for its cause across the country, it should either on a regular or continuing basis, mail to its contributor list information on its activities. Individuals who have already contributed have indicated their support, but should be kept up to date on the problems and the work of the League on a continuing basis.

APRIL 21, 1971.

Mrs. CAROLE HANSON,
El Toro, Calif.

DEAR CAROLE: The letter of April 14, 1971 concerning fund raising, I believe to have been ill advised in several respects. I recall the previous fund raising campaign, that was handled by an organization highly recommended, but left much to be desired. I would hope that the entire Board, in a formal meeting, not by telephone or letter survey, have the opportunity of inquiring into and fully considering this recent proposition.

However, of far more serious import, was the suggestion of using a private list, more or less surreptitiously, and particularly I have grave misgivings of the discretion involved in the letter, spelling out some of the details. Although, the goal of the National League is to go out of business successfully and soon, but certainly it is not contemplated by political harikari.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD L. TALLEY.

BALTIMORE, Md.,
November 18, 1971.

DEAR BOARD MEMBER: The expected major statement by President Nixon was stepped up by three days in an impromptu news conference. As Evelyn Grubb, our new National Coordinator, wrote in her first news letter:

"In fact, this could be the speech we have all been waiting and praying for . . ."

Many of us in our anxieties and frustrations at times seem engulfed in an almost self-induced hypnosis, making us susceptible to grasping at straws of vague hints, rumors or implied suggestions. You, as members of the new board, seem to have been persuaded along a similar line in that the first scheduled board meeting was postponed for two weeks, because of this anticipated major statement.

This letter is being written only after many fervent prayers and deep soul-searching. There are certain remarks and observations concerning past decisions and activities, or lack of same, by the National League, I, in good conscience, feel must now be said. Hopefully, you and the other directors may avoid mistakes of the past and become a viable force working for our 1600 men prisoners in South East Asia.

Each passing day intensifies the challenge with which you are charged, not so much with the administration of the League as a corporate body, but with the very life or death of the human bodies of hundreds of our men, which the League was formed to benefit. The League was founded by the unflinching dedication of physical and financial resources in long, and sometimes lonely hours, by our respected and esteemed Sybil Stockdale. The National League must not be permitted to be subverted to use of a political party or immobilized by even sincere and well-intentioned complacency to fall into partisan political control.

The so-called news letter of October 13, 1971, stated "Our Second Annual Meeting went very well . . .". It did not spell out some of the frustrations, disillusionments and dissatisfaction of more than an insignificant segment of the League members; there was clearly an undercurrent of distrust, disbelief and even despair permeating the gathering. It was, however, illuminat-

ing that the October 13 letter devoted a full page, printed in bold face type, outlining the meaning of "Humanitarian and Political"; that there should be a need for such explanation at this late date, long after the meeting, identifies this as fuzzy thinking on a phoney issue.

This hypocritical pose of being righteously humanitarian and wholly non-political, while at the same time seeking and accepting instructions, directions and partisan advisors from the Republican National Committee is not only nauseous, but by the resulting pacification of the families of the National League, can be sentencing our POW's to additional suffering in Communist Prison Camps. How much longer must our men be sacrificed on the altar of Vietnamization? The real humanitarianism goal must be to get our men home!

Attached is a copy of a two page memorandum dated April 14, 1971 to the League of Families from the Republican National Finance Committee, with instructions about fund raising and a covering letter of same date to the Board Members from the National Coordinator, spelling out the role of the Republican National Finance Committee in directing and assisting the League fund raising campaign—how non-political can you get?

Also attached is a copy of the letter dated April 21, 1971 which I wrote to Mrs. Carole Hanson, expressing my concern about the lack of discretion implicit in these letters.

Included also is a memo handed to the directors at our Board Meeting of May 7, 1971, requesting an executive meeting to consider the fund raising plan and to urge the board to meet more frequently so as to assist our officers and office staff, and not to abandon them to dependence upon non-family members advisors.

At the executive session I suggested that we immediately drop the fund raising advisor recommended by the Republican National Finance Committee. We were told, however, that an attempt was being made to enlist the support of the Democratic National Committee in an attempt to reflect a non-partisan position. Alas, the same familiar pattern seems continuing. The newly elected board scheduled meeting is delayed two weeks to hear Mr. Nixon's "Major Statement". In the past, no meeting has empowered some non-family advisors, whom ever they may have been, to fill the vacuum and virtually control the League. In one obvious and flagrant instance these advisors vetoed the unanimous vote of the board of directors which specified that the Geneva trip be paid for by those participating on a cash-in-advance basis before signing the contract, and not to be financed or underwritten by the League. The Geneva junket, despite hard sell bulletins, news letters and phone calls, never did reach the quota of 175 persons required by travel charter, even though to pad the passenger list a free trip to Europe was arranged for the only salaried worker in the office who had been on the job six or seven weeks.

I believe the membership wants the newly elected board members to actively and actually direct the affairs of the League. Apparently there has been no meeting of the board since the annual meeting and election of officers, and I am fearful that our new officers are again forced to seek advice and guidance from outside advisors which, of course, is what many of us hoped would be remedied by the new board.

This suits the purpose of those members with Pollyanna-ish philosophy that our men will all come home if we just do and say nothing.

A minority report, or maybe one man's opinion of the 2nd Annual Meeting is that while admittedly, the almost complete dominance and control of the business meeting might be a source of satisfaction to the past officers and advisors, to many of the body of the membership there was a feeling of hope-

lessness in the face of the ruthless power politics. This squelched any real consideration of any opposing viewpoint—this just seemed to confirm the thoughts of a not inconsiderable number of those present that the entire procedure was "rigged". The tone seems to have been set in an informal meeting Sunday night in the South American Room, filled by an estimated two hundred people, when after suggestions and discussions from anyone who wished to present their ideas, Lt. Frischman arose several times, as did others, to add to or explain some previously expressed thought. When one of the membership told him * * * to be quiet, he was taking time and talking too much * * *. This insult to a former P.O.W. in North Vietnam sent a chill down my spine, and no doubt of many others which I still feel as I write this letter—indeed this was an insult to each and every one of our POWs, known and unknown.

At the Maryland meeting of October 17, 1971, a resolution was unanimously adopted to ask the National League Board, on behalf of the entire membership, to offer an apology to Lt. Robert Frishman for this unwarranted rudeness.

That the League administration was firmly in control and with the muscle of votes, was evidenced by what appeared to be a professionally planned and executed format. The agenda was set up with a tight time limit so that any extended period for questions or debate was cut short, sometimes by the hotel management to rearrange chairs and put up tables for the next scheduled meeting.

The conduct of the meeting was with seemingly military precision and positioning, and maybe with some simulated coincidence.

Again and again the same persons from a small coterie of members would rise, gain the floor for a motion a second or discussion. Any attempt to question or ask an explanation of such items as the extraordinary fund raising costs, of the thousands of dollars spent on travel or what was covered by the large amounts listed on financial statements as educational materials was quickly and decisively cut off by—"I move to accept the report as read" or closing off debate by call for vote on motion. Yes, control of a meeting was never more obvious.

But those items are still in the minds and conversation of many of the members in the lobby, the coffee shops, or private conversation in some of the meeting rooms.

As members of the new board I believe it might be of interest to you to delve into the financial position of the League to be able to answer future questions—to review some background.

At the July 9th meeting of the Board, I asked Dr. Ladley to break down the financial statement into income from fund raising and income from other sources, which he had merged in previous two statements, making it impossible to determine fund raising costs. At that same meeting I asked Mr. Wagner who initiated the fund raising campaigns if 60% seems like an acceptable figure for fund raising cost. He stated, yes, that he thought so. It was later at the same meeting and continued the next day that I was maneuvered into a position where I was pressured to resign at the insistence of the representative of the Western States, due to the Open Letter to President Nixon printed in the Washington Post, May 27, 1971.

An article in the February issue of *Change* Times magazine says that legitimate fund raising costs should run 3% to 5%, and never more than 20%, and in the Handbook of successful fund raising by Paul C. Carter, published in 1970 (Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 74-109092) written for professional fund raisers, gives actual case studies of projects in both \$100,000, also \$1,000,000 plus brackets, and these costs run 7% to 7-1/2%, including the manager's fee. Mr. Carter writes, "Never should costs run

above 20%, otherwise your client will consider it exorbitant." According to my calculations, the fund raising costs have been about 61 cents out of every dollar contributed (check the past financial statements!).

In my opinion this is an outrageously exorbitant cost and while it has been pointed out Mr. Wagner is doing this without any fee, and some people no doubt believe we are getting a bargain, this is the type of bargain I always try to avoid, and I don't feel that the National League can any longer afford the benefit of his services.

To put into focus some of the questions which raised a credibility gap concerning the Board election and the comic opera script of the 2nd Annual Meeting:

1. A nominating committee of five members was named and instructed to submit a list of 45 candidates for the 15 places on the Board, just as in previous years.

2. At the July 9 meeting, the committee submitted a list of 45 names. Whereupon one of the board members, in what was no doubt a magnanimous gesture, suggested everyone whose name had been sent to the committee be included on the ballot. This negated the generally accepted practice of most organizations to screen out some proposed persons and put on the ballot only those who, in the judgment of the nominating committee, are best qualified. Putting everyone on the ballot might be a fine generous attitude to advocate for a local improvement association or a national service club, but for the serious and vital interests of more than 1600 POW's, and MIA's vested in a board member of the national league, this procedure would seem to demand more thought and greater responsibility. There is also a collateral effect of by diluting opposition, it adds to the advantage each incumbent is supposed to enjoy.

3. The two questions asked each candidate *Humanitarian or Political*, which as noted before, needed a full page explanation in the October 13 newsletter were of the loaded brazenly biased "Have you stopped beating your wife" type. They raised a fuzzy thinking and phoney issue. The specific questions were not submitted to the board—at least not before I resigned immediately following the July 9-10 meeting.

4. Three of the five members of the nominating committee (60%) again put themselves on the ballot. In conversation at the annual meeting, someone said "It sounds incredible, but those girls are so gullible, yet so dedicated, sincere and truly hard working, that they are blissfully unaware that this is highly unusual."

Roberts Rules of Order states a member of a nominating committee may be nominated, otherwise some valuable member might be prevented from serving.

Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure states: "A member of a nominating committee who becomes a candidate should resign immediately."

Elaine Mendenson Parliamentary Procedure simplified states: "Common sense dictates that a nominating committee cannot take advantage of its power and nominate an unreasonable number of its own members."

Of course, not being prevented by the League's bylaws, this is perfectly legal. Just as legal as President Thieu's election. He even had the South Vietnam Supreme Court okay his control of the ballot.

Aside from the frantic and confused last minute instructions about proxies from "The Office Staff" requiring notarization, which was seemingly inexcusable where there had been six months to plan and prepare for the election. However, making it all the more ludicrous was that the ballots were mailed out without any apparent minimal safeguards. Last year the ballots had a provision for signature on the bottom of each ballot, so that the Red Cross which counted, could

check off the list and count with confidence those ballots as authentic.

Many state absentee ballots have a tear off portion of the envelope for identification. The National League had no provision for any authentication and multiple ballots were sent on a family basis, with single return envelope, further to preclude any check for accuracy.

The whole election and meeting was so "non political" that Mayor Daley might well chuckle at the operation.

It is sincerely hoped we will never need another League election. But with Secretary Laird's projection, through at least December 1972, and other official reports, it is certainly recommended that some provisions be instituted for verification and safe guarding in case we have the voted May 1972 meeting.

This is an overlong and not a pleasant letter, but many of our 1600 men still surviving have been overlong in Southeast Asia Prison camps. Some going into the 8th year, and we can be sure they don't think these prison camps are pleasant—each dawning day must be an agony for them.

I urge you to poll the membership and learn if they want the league to continue the present hypocritical pose or want the board members to break the shackles of political influence and work for the real and honest humanitarian goal of getting our men out. To the members of the League, I suggest that in addition to writing to or contacting your congressmen and senators. You let your representatives, the Board Members of the League know what you want them to do on behalf of our POW's and MIA's in Southeast Asia.

Prayerfully,

BERNARD L. TALLEY,
Father, POW.

BALTIMORE MD.,
January 18 1972.

DEAR BOARD MEMBER: Any lingering vestige of doubt that the National League was non-political, was effectively dispelled by the November 16th letter to Congressman Mahon from Evelyn Grubb, speaking for the League with the Board of Directors direct or tacit approval lobbying against pending legislation.

Now that the League has openly taken a positive political stand, it is appropriate that the membership be polled to determine in what direction they want to set their course.

Attached is a copy of the letter I wrote to Evelyn Grubb after receiving the standard form reply the same as was printed in the last newsletter.

The three questions in the telegram which elicited the form letter were (1) Does this not violate tax exempt regulation prohibiting attempts to influence legislation? (2) Does this not jeopardize National League tax exempt status? (3) Did this letter have prior approval of Board of Directors? These specific questions were wholly ignored and remain unanswered.

On the same page of the Congressional Record on which appears Evelyn Grubb's letter is Congressman Clarence Long's statement "I believe that opposition to this amendment comes from those who want us to believe that 'Poppa Knows Best.' Indeed the League has been influenced by politicians, sometimes using well intentioned, sincere but naive family members seemingly mesmerized into an Alice in Wonderland Through the Looking Glass article of faith that nothing is political if it steadfastly follows the Republican National Committee line.

I for one feel that the time has come for individual family members to revise our thinking to, hopefully we have only one POW/MIA at a time. He is a close and dear member of our personal family. It is the responsibility of each one of us who has the

greatest interests, to work to get him home.

In my letter to you November 18th 1971, (before I knew of Evelyn Grubb's letter), it was pointed out that the Board not meeting more frequently created a vacuum, which was filled by non family advisors, who for most part were unknown to the general membership and even to Board members. In the same letter were copies of instructions and advice on fund raising from the Republican National Committee. While I am confident others would agree, I do not want and I resent any designee of any political party being in position in the League that might manipulate League policy which could even in the slightest degree tend to extend my sons time in a North Vietnamese P.O.W. camp or by so doing even imperil his life.

In this election year Republican workers seem more geared to returning the President to office then returning our 1900 men to their homes.

It was further pointed out in November 18th letter, that the fund raising costs were exorbitant, in excess of three times reasonable maximum guide lines or 61%. A difference of reasonable normal costs to actual costs to League, which could amount to tens of thousands of dollars.

Using the football language of Mr. Nixon—when a coach has a miserable win and loss record, fire him.

The members, I believe are not only entitled to know but by the reason of fact that the very life or death of many of our POW/MIA is our constant concern and torment, have a "compelling right to know". What is the fund raiser and advisor Paul Wagner's fund raising expertise; what political function has he been involved with the Republican Party and under what circumstances and whose sponsorship was he introduced to the National League.

Sincerely,

BERNARD L. TALLEY,
Father of a POW.

THE CAPABLE CHAIRMAN OF THE FPC

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Federal Power Commission Chairman John Nassikas is doing an outstanding job in directing the destinies and powers of the vitally important regulatory agency in a period of energy crisis. The extent of this crisis will adversely affect millions of Americans in their lives, their livelihood, and their environment for generations to come. An increasing demand for energy from natural gas to electricity presses heavily upon technology as a crash search for additional energy sources continues. In the meantime, the rate-paying public is being protected by the FPC and Chairman Nassikas, but with due regard to consumer interests and industry requirements.

Pressure for increasing rates, problems of rate base structure and determinations of price structure from wellhead to kitchen are in capable and responsible hands under Chairman Nassikas, for which all Americans should be thankful.

In this connection, I am including in the RECORD an interesting article by Edith Roosevelt appearing in a recent edition of the Manchester, N.H., Union

Leader, describing in some detail Chairman Nassikas' outstanding background and record:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader,
Jan. 8, 1972]

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S NASSIKAS CHANGING POLICY As FPC's Boss

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—New Hampshire's former deputy Attorney General is quietly bringing about policy changes in the Federal Power Commission which might win applause from even some of the most ardent supporters of Consumer Advocate Ralph Nader.

Yet John N. Nassikas, chairman of the Federal Power Commission, who admitted in a press briefing that he had "sort of shaken things up" in the Agency, is a lifelong conservative Republican. A tone bordering on reverence creeps into his voice when he refers to "American free enterprise—the best system in the world and the indispensable base of our political and personal liberties."

At the same time, the record shows that Nassikas has fought for policies that would give the FPC more regulatory clout as well as compel the big gas and power companies to give a greater consideration to environmental and conservation factors.

Nassikas' philosophy should come as no surprise to New Hampshire residents who recall his reputation as a vigorous advocate of consumer interests. As Deputy Attorney General, Nassikas successfully fought against abandonment of railroad lines for passenger service and against rate increases by the New England Telephone Co. as well as by other public utilities.

At the same time, Nassikas admits that as a practicing attorney in Manchester he successfully represented big corporate clients as well. He sees no inconsistency in this.

"When you fight for a private client you must fight for his interests and I submit that being part of an adversary legal system, I can fight for the public interest as chairman of the FPC."

As an example, one of Nassikas' first acts when he was appointed Commissioner in 1969, was to establish a new office of Environmental Quality to advise the Commission on environmental issues and standards. Next, he set up a task force on the environment in order to get the independent advice of environmental experts concerning issues of electric power and the environment.

Four months ago, the FPC's Environmental Task Force completed its work and its report will be printed shortly in conjunction with the National Power Survey which Nassikas also instituted. This is the first National Power Survey completed since 1964.

Under Nassikas' leadership, the Commission issued a National Policy Statement in April 1970 and power companies were required to file their plans for added capacity in transmission and their review of environmental requirements a decade in advance of construction. All companies have responded.

Another move instigated by Nassikas is a national investigation of the reliability of electric power and gas service. Understandably, there was some opposition to the move in the business community. The proposal squeaked through the commission by a 3 to 2 vote, with Nassikas casting the deciding vote.

Other reviews have followed at a whirlwind pace. The FPC staff has completed a national review of all nuclear plants scheduled for operation in the next six months and submitted its analysis to the Atomic Energy Commission. This means that from now on nuclear power needs will be determined as part of the AEC's environmental review and thus conform to strict standards.

"This review delayed the operation of

several critically needed plants in the interest of environmental considerations," according to Nassikas, but he added that New England need not be much concerned over the effects of thermal pollution over the next 30 years. He said:

"Fortunately, New England is blessed with cold seas and abundant water so that it can absorb thermal discharges of needed nuclear plants to meet expanding power loads required over the next 30 years."

One of Nassikas' concerns is the rate at which we are consuming our national resources. For this reason, for the first time, in the Commission's 40-year-old history he ordered a national gas survey to evaluate the nation's natural gas reserves to meet its energy requirements.

Another review instituted by the Commission consists of a series of rate proceedings to review national rates and delivery requirements for natural gas. For the first time, the Commission has set rates for natural gas pumped at the wellhead.

When Nassikas became chairman, the Commission had during the past 15 years set rates for natural gas in only one area, the Permian border of Texas, despite the fact that it had overall responsibility of setting rates throughout the United States.

All these reviews—as well as some of the changes which came about as a result of their findings—have not sat too well with some segments of industry. Private industry was opposed to some of the national reviews as well as the American Public Power Association and the American Public Gas Association.

Don't these environmental considerations cost consumers as well as companies more? Arguments used by opponents of "the disaster lobby," a derisive term used to describe conservationists and environmentalists, is that the corporations simply pass on increased cost of doing business due to environmental control onto the consumers. According to Nassikas:

"Although environmental safeguards will cost consumers more in the short run, in the long run I believe that government and industry have the ability to come up with the technology and processes that will eventually reduce costs to consumers."

In public forums, Nassikas vigorously defends the Commission's more responsive approach to the consumer. In a talk before the National Energy Forum at the Mayflower Hotel on Sept. 24, 1971, he declared:

"The public interest has not been well served by government and industry energy policy over the decade of the 1960's as we would have wished. Anti-trust and consumer protection policies must be included in our energy policies and the attainment of our national goals."

When Nassikas returns to New Hampshire as he says he looks forward to doing someday, he says he wants to be proud that he chalked up a record as "an independent thinker." He believes that he has tried to impact "my strong belief in social accountability by energy industries even if policies seemingly opposed to their short-term corporate welfare are required."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

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?

BLOOD FROM PAID DONORS: DEATH BY THE PINT

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I have heard contentions that no scientific studies demonstrate that blood from paid donors is substantially more likely to be infected with serum hepatitis than voluntarily donated blood.

Dr. J. Garrott Allen of the Stanford Medical Center has compiled a convincing list of eight separate studies which clearly document the increased risk from paid blood. The people who sell their blood often have no other source of income. Their incentive to lie about past exposure to hepatitis is strong, and few of those who lie can be detected. The best available test for serum hepatitis is only 25-percent effective.

A bill I recently introduced (H.R. 11828) would immediately end the need to rely so heavily on paid donors, and eventually phase them out completely. Several thousand deaths and untold suffering can be prevented every year by a program such as this. I invite my colleagues to join with me in this important bill.

The material follows:

RISK RATES OF SERUM HEPATITIS FROM COMMERCIAL BLOOD

Number of Units of Blood from Volunteer and Commercial Blood Donors:

New York Blood Center, N.Y. City (Prince et al, Transfusion 1971, 11:25) Hepatitis risk 20 times greater from commercial blood, 94,000.

Massachusetts State Blood Program, Boston (Kilman, New Engl. J.O. Med. 1971, 284:109) Hepatitis risk 12 times greater from prison donors, 52,429.

Non-profit blood bank, Northern California (unpublished, 1971) Hepatitis risk 11 times greater from commercial blood, 27,284.

University of Chicago (Allen et al. Ann. Surg. 1959, 150:455) Hepatitis risk 11 times greater from commercial blood, 42,507.

State Dept. of Public Health, New Jersey (Cohen & Dougherty, JAMA 1968, 203:139) Hepatitis risk 70 times greater from addict and com. blood, 3,335.

University of Washington, Seattle (Boeve et al. Ann. Surg. 1969, 170:833) Hepatitis risk 11 times greater from commercial fibrinogen, 1,224.

National Institutes of Health Clinical Center, Bethesda, Md. (Walsh, et al, JAMA 1970, 211:261) Hepatitis risk 11 times greater from commercial blood, 1,945.

Columbia University, New York (Gocke, XXIVth Gibson Lecture, 1971) Hepatitis risk

13 times greater from commercial blood, 32,990.

Units of blood administered, 255,714.

J. GARROTT ALLEN, M.D.

DECEMBER 2, 1971.

THE HIGH COST OF KILLING

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the United Auto Workers' Washington Report carried an item entitled "Do You Know What War Costs You?" Prepared by "SANE," it does a fine job of pointing out the gross distortion in our national priorities and demonstrates the error of the President's recent assertion that "spending on defense has been brought below spending on human resources."

The text of the article follows:

DO YOU KNOW WHAT WAR COSTS YOU?

THE TRILLION-DOLLAR INVESTMENT

You work hard for your money. But most of your federal tax dollar goes to pay for wars—past, present and future. Sixty-one percent in the next fiscal year.

In fact, the U.S. has spent over \$1 trillion—one thousand billion dollars—on the military since 1946.

The Nixon Administration is asking Congress for \$176.9 billion for Fiscal Year 1972. Of this amount, 44% is earmarked for current military expenditures, 6% for veterans benefits, and 11% for interest on the national debt (most of it war-incurred). This comes to 61% of the proposed federal budget.

Here's what is left over:

Human resources (education, manpower, health, income security): 17%.

Physical resources (agriculture, rural development, natural resources, commerce, transportation, community development, and housing): 11%

All other (international affairs and finance, space, general government, revenue-sharing, non-military pay increases, contingencies): 11%

These figures have been compiled by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service. The budget does not include the trust funds such as Social Security, over which Congress has no direct control.

According to the Tax Foundation, Inc., the average family spent \$1,570 in federal taxes on military-related programs during 1970—against \$111 for education and \$36 for community development and housing.

Is this how you want YOUR taxes spent?

ARE YOU MORE SECURE?

At the end of World War II, no enemy could attack the U.S. Today, in case of nuclear war, the U.S. could be wiped out in less than an hour. In his 1971 "Posture Statement," Defense Secretary Melvin Laird revealed that the U.S. would soon have 4,600 long-range nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union, 2,000. Just 400 of these weapons could destroy a third of the Soviet population.

Are you more secure knowing we can "overkill" the Russians more times than they can "overkill" us? Are you more secure knowing the U.S. has at least 48 military commitments to other countries and over 3,000 bases around the world? Are you more secure knowing the needs of the American people and of others abroad are being neglected while you pay for more "efficient" weapons—with cost overruns of more than three times the original estimates?

To see what your tax dollar could buy:

WHAT COULD YOUR TAX DOLLARS BUY?

Seventeen Army machine guns (\$9,025) or one Elementary school teacher's annual salary.

One Main Battle Tank (\$600,000) or full-time psychotherapy for 171 drug addicts for one year (as practiced at Odyssey House, Phoenix), New York City costs.

One B-1 bomber (\$25 million) or fifteen 50-bed public hospitals of the type in Gonzales, Louisiana.

105 helicopters, the number totally destroyed in 1971 campaign in Laos (\$52.5 million) or 17½ health centers treating 40,000 people each per year, for a total of 700,000 people, based on a model in Cleveland, Ohio.

One destroyer (\$90 million) or 5.6 typical high schools in the Midwest.

One aircraft carrier (\$1 billion) or 67,000 low-cost housing units with two bedrooms each.

Cost overrun of the C-5A transport, as of 1970 (\$2 billion) or 6.25 billion passenger-miles of mass transit in a typical American city.

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT IT?

1. Congress holds the purse strings. Let your Congressman know how you think the federal government should spend your tax dollars.

2. Keep telling him (or her). No single letter, phone call or visit will persuade a Congressman. Get your friends to help you maintain a continuing dialogue with your elected representatives.

3. Accept no evasions. Each of us has a Ph. D. in What It's Like to Live in America, so don't let your Congressman give you the "If-you-knew-what-I-know-from-the-secret-briefings" routine. If he comes up with budget figures which show a smaller slice of the pie for "defense", ask to be shown the ingredients. Since 1969, the Nixon Administration has been lumping Social Security and other trust funds, veterans benefits, and even the cost of the Selective Service System under the category of "human resources."

Since the trust funds are set up by separate taxes, they should be treated as separate cookie jars, not as part of the federal pie.

Veterans benefits are part of the costs of past wars. Finally, if the cost of operating the draft can be placed under "human resources," perhaps the cost of missiles should be listed under "transportation."

4. Use the information in this leaflet in letters to the editor, radio call-in shows, and other community forums.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. LEE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored at being invited to address the District of Columbia Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, tomorrow morning, January 22, 1972, in Statuary Hall to commemorate the 165th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee, a great American, a great leader, a great man.

I insert the speech which I expect to deliver tomorrow into the RECORD at this point:

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. LEE

(By the Honorable JOHN R. RARICK)

Madame President, Members of the District of Columbia Division of the United

Daughters of the Confederacy, guests and friends.

I appreciate the kind invitation to speak here today to commemorate the birthday of General Robert E. Lee and pay tribute to his memory. I speak today as more than a southerner, as an American honoring the memory of one of our foremost American patriots.

Last Friday I wrote Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, protesting his order to all American forces to commemorate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I concluded my letter:

"As a member of Congress and spokesman for my people, I feel it is my duty to express my contempt and the disapproval by my people of this desecration of your office and misuse of your authority as Secretary of Defense of our Nation.

"If you would seek to justify your action as a Pacifier of minority groups, then I would remind you that there is another minority group in this country who would like a similar opportunity to commemorate one of their heroes of the past. I refer to the birthday of another southerner, Robert E. Lee, a former officer in the Union Army and a general in the Confederate Army, as well as a distinguished educator—January 19."

To date I have not had the courtesy of an acknowledgment of my letter.

The name Robert E. Lee is remembered because of his inherent faith in the rights of the individual, the most fundamental of which is the individual's right to choose his own form of government.

Robert E. Lee came by this belief in the rights of the individual naturally. His father, General Light Horse Harry Lee, was a distinguished soldier of the American Revolution and was the trusted confidante of General Washington. He was privileged to direct his correspondence directly to the attention of the father of our country.

Perhaps the most significant ancestral relationship, however, was to his cousin, Richard Henry Lee. It was Richard Henry Lee who, on June 7, 1776, offered the following resolution to the 2nd Continental Congress:

"Resolved, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved.

"That it is expedient forthwith to take the most effectual measures for forming foreign alliances.

"That a plan of Confederation be prepared and transmitted to the respective Colonies for their consideration and approbation."

Richard Henry Lee offered the Resolution of American Independence; his cousin, Robert E. Lee would, some 84 years later, lead the Southern people in the ultimate test of the doctrine of individual liberties, of the notion best stated in Jefferson's declaration, that American citizens have the right to choose their own form of government.

The famous passage from Jefferson's declaration is worth noting at this point because it was to serve as the basis for John Caldwell Calhoun's nullification theory; furthermore, it is quite clear that this passage justifies the actions of the South in expressing their right to choose their own form of government:

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing

its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Robert E. Lee believed in this basic right; he dedicated his life to its preservation, even going so far as to lead the people of his native State and section in a great war, testing this basic tenet of the American way of life.

The primary lesson of the Civil War is that the basic principle of American life up to 1860—that men had the right to choose their own form of government—was no longer viable. Had it been so, the South would have been allowed to go in peace.

The greatness of Lee shines forth even in defeat. Unlike other Southerners who fled to Europe and elsewhere where they continued to agitate against the Union, Lee accepted the fact of defeat and calmly went forward, assuming the presidency of Washington College, where he continued to exemplify the greatness of the South and its way of life. The heritage of the South is a great tradition of loyalty to home, family, and community. No where is it better shown than in the life of General Robert E. Lee.

The relevance of Robert E. Lee to the modern world is seen in his concept of duty and loyalty to home, family, friends, and community. This is perhaps most evident in his letter of resignation to Union General Winfield Scott to accept the command of the forces of his native State:

"Save in defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword."

This sentiment is again expressed by his wife, Mary Custis Lee:

"My husband has wept tears of blood over this terrible war, but as a man of honor and a Virginian, he must follow the destiny of his State."

Lee put his family, friends, and community before anything else. This is no longer the case in America outside the South; and this country has lost something noble because of it.

Critics of modern society scream about the identity crisis. Psychologists and psychiatrists claim that this is a rootless generation that lacks something upon which to base a meaningful life.

Unfortunately, this is true. This is true because, unlike Lee, too many modern Americans have lost their concept of loyalty to home, family, and community. Too often, the modern American claims to be a citizen of the world when in actuality he is not capable of functioning as a member of his own family unit. Some Americans have even gone so far as to disavow the family unit. This Congress has actually passed a bill that would, in effect, replace the family unit with the State.

Psychologists have long recognized that an individual establishes an identity in relation to the groups to which he belongs. Thus, a man means one thing to his family, another to his friends, and yet another to his community, yet it is all important that he build one on the other. Thus, a man who lacks a meaningful relationship to his home and family will experience tremendous difficulty in establishing an identity within a larger group such as the community or the nation or the world.

Simply speaking, what this means is that an individual who places his loyalty to his nation or to a world organization over and above his loyalty to home and family will be faced with tremendous disappointments. He will, in effect, be a rootless man to whom life can have no meaning.

This, then, is the lesson that the life of Robert E. Lee offers to modern men: It is absolutely imperative that a man maintain a high sense of loyalty to himself, his home,

his family, his friends, and his community or state. To sacrifice these basic ties to home and family for membership in a national organization or international groups is patently foolish and is, on the face of it, largely responsible for the problems that we face today.

I would like to point out a very important passage from the works of Confucius that illustrates my point. This is taken from his reply to the question, "What constitutes good government?"

"Therefore it is necessary for a man of the governing class to set about regulating his personal conduct and character. In considering how to regulate his personal conduct and character, it is necessary for him to do his duties toward those nearly related to him. In considering how to do his duties toward those nearly related to him, it is necessary for him to understand the nature and organization of human society. In considering the nature and organization of human society, it is necessary for him to understand the Law of God."

The principles outlined in this quotation from Confucius were known and understood by Robert E. Lee. These principles made Lee a leader and are the basis of his fame. He dedicated his life to his family, his friends, his community—to his native state. These are the requisite characteristics of an American. The traditions which he exemplifies are the great traditions of the South. They are needed now as never before in our history as more and more Americans are sacrificing personal identity and pride in home and family for the sake of membership in some theoretical one world organization.

I would like to close with a basic simile. Lee is one of the great Americans because, like the rock thrown in the pool of water, he recognized that he could not deny his loyalty to his first circle of friends—his family and his natives ties. Just as the rock thrown in the pool cannot exist in the seventh circle formed without benefit of membership in the first, so also a man cannot exist meaningfully as a member of a large group, or nation, without first existing as a member of a family, one who accepts his basic ties and duties, one who is, above all else, honest with himself, loyal to his family, faithful to his friends, and dutiful to his community and native State.

Our country is in dire need of another dedicated leader of the stature of General Robert E. Lee.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

The United States of America is sadistically practicing spiritual, mental, and physical genocide on over 21 million North Vietnamese.

We must stop the bombing immediately and set a date for the end of the brutal and immoral war in Indochina. Only then can we expect to see American prisoners of war returned to their families.