

vene the Senate earlier than 11 a.m. tomorrow. Consequently, in order to dispose of this number of amendments, with the hours required for each, before a final vote on the disposition of the bill tomorrow at 1:30 p.m., it was necessary to go into the evening hours today.

I might say, in further explanation, that objections had been placed to any vote on final disposition of this bill later than 2 p.m. tomorrow in one instance, and 1:30 p.m. tomorrow in a second instance.

However, in view of the agreement which was reached providing for final passage of the war powers bill tomorrow, and considering the current state of the calendar, the Senate either will not be in session on Friday, or, if in session, no business, except possibly noncontroversial business which can be handled by unanimous consent, will be transacted.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 11 a.m., following a recess.

There will be no period for the transaction of routine morning business in the early hours of tomorrow. Immediately, following the prayer, and any remarks by the two leaders, the Senate will resume its consideration of the pending amendment by the Senator from Colorado (Mr.

DOMINICK) on which there is a time agreement of 1 hour.

Following the disposition of that amendment, the Senate will then proceed to the final amendment, the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), on which there is an agreement for 2 hours of time.

The yeas and nays have already been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY).

The yeas and nays have also been ordered on the passage of the bill.

The bill will be voted on tomorrow at 1:30 p.m.

It has been indicated by the able authors of the two remaining amendments, by the able manager of the bill, and by the able ranking minority member on the committee, that time will be yielded back at certain points so as to assure the disposition of the two remaining amendments and also to conform with the required vote on final passage of the bill at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

#### RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 9 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, April 13, 1972, at 11 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12, 1972:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Curtis W. Tarr, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Coordinating Security Assistance Programs (new position).

Joseph S. Farland, of West Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Lee H. Henkel, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service), vice K. Martin Worthy, resigned.

##### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Benjamin L. Hooks, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1972, vice Robert T. Bartley, term expiring.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 12, 1972:

##### SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, of Virginia, to be Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

Paul Louis Perito, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### OFFSHORE OIL RESOLUTIONS

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern in New England and particularly in Massachusetts about the dangers posed by the proposed oil drilling off the New England coast.

I and several other Members of Congress from New England have consistently opposed this proposed offshore drilling, and have introduced legislation on the subject. We have also made known our views in meetings and communication with officials of the Nixon administration, particularly Secretary Rogers Morton of the Interior Department.

As an indication of the strong public opposition to offshore drilling in the North Atlantic, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions of opposition from six municipal governments in my own congressional district. I would ask that these resolutions from Gloucester, Swampscott, Rockport, Salem, Beverly, and Essex be printed in the RECORD.

I applaud the efforts of these municipal governments in their efforts to block offshore drilling in the North Atlantic. I hope that the inclusion of these resolutions in the RECORD will result in just this action.

The resolutions follow:

CXVIII—787—Part 10

CITY OF GLOUCESTER,  
Gloucester, Mass., March 24, 1972.

Congressman MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,  
Cannon Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Gloucester City Council at its regular meeting held on January 20, 1972, voted unanimously to adopt the following order:

Ordered, that the Gloucester City Council respectfully petition Governor Sargent, Senators Brooke and Kennedy and Representative Harrington to vigorously oppose any legislation that would permit the drilling for oil off the New England Coast.

Yours very truly,

FRED J. KYROUZ, City Clerk.

TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT,  
Swampscott, Mass., March 8, 1972.

Mr. MIKE MILLER,  
c/o Congressman Michael J. Harrington,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

The Swampscott Board of Selectmen, at its meeting held February 3, 1972, voted unanimously to respectfully petition Governor Sargent, Senators Brooke and Kennedy and Representative Harrington to vigorously oppose any legislation that would permit the drilling for oil off the New England Coast.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH C. SINATRA, Secretary.

CITY OF SALEM, MASS.,  
March 3, 1972.

Congressman MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the Salem City Council held in the Council Chamber on Thursday, February 24, 1972, it was voted to oppose any legislation that would

permit the drilling for oil off the New England Coast.

This action was approved by Mayor Samuel E. Zoll on March 2nd.

Very truly yours,

AUGUSTINE J. TOOMEY, City Clerk.

TOWN OF ROCKPORT, MASS.,  
March 13, 1972.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,  
House Chamber,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRINGTON: The Rockport Board of Selectmen voted unanimously in favor of being recorded as opposed to any legislation that would permit drilling for oil off the New England coast. Your support would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

NICOLA A. BARLETTA,  
Chairman.

CITY OF BEVERLY,  
February 22, 1972.

Ordered: That the Beverly Board of Aldermen respectfully petition Governor Sargent, Senators Brooke and Kennedy and Representative Harrington to vigorously oppose any legislation that would permit the drilling for oil off the New England Coast.

A true copy,

Attest:

JOHN L. COUHAG,  
City Clerk.

TOWN HALL,  
Essex, Mass., February 28, 1972.

Representative MICHAEL HARRINGTON,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: This is to advise you that at a regular meeting of the Board of Selectmen

of the Town of Essex held on Tuesday evening, February 22, it was unanimously voted to endorse the order adopted by the Gloucester City Council at its regular meeting held on January 20, 1972, wherein you were requested to vigorously oppose any legislation that would permit the drilling for oil off the New England Coast.

Our Town is very dependent upon its shellfish industry. Also the commercial and sports fishing industries form a vital part of our economy. We feel that offshore oil drilling will seriously endanger the fragile and irreplaceable resources of our coastline.

We trust that you will take all action necessary to make certain that this further depredation of our environment will not be allowed to occur.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL HOAR,  
Chairman, Board of Selectmen.

# YOU HAVE TO BE A COLLEGE GRADUATE TO UNDERSTAND THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX FORMS

## HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it takes a college graduate to understand the present Federal income tax forms. That is the conclusion of a Government-financed study done by the Vocational Reading Power Project, located in Pontiac, Mich., which I am releasing today. The study was funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This excellent and highly informative study, which was based on the 1971 Federal income tax forms—instructions for form 1040 and schedules A and B—concludes that—

A taxpayer will probably have to read at the level of the average college graduate (over 16th grade equivalent) to be able to comprehend, without assistance, the entire content of the Tax Instructions.

The study also concludes that, first, the taxpayers who would benefit from itemizing their deductions, rather than taking the standard deduction, might be discouraged from doing so, because of the complexity of the instructions on

itemizing; second, there is great variation in the reading difficulty of the different sections, ranging from the fourth grade level to the college graduate level; and; third, in the study's own words:

The more specific the information gets, the harder it is to comprehend.

The study's summary of its findings are included at the end of my statement along with a chart of the readability level of the various subsections. Since it is impossible to put the computer study itself into the RECORD, the study will be available in my office for inspection and duplication by any of my colleagues' offices.

It is certainly interesting to note that IRS Commissioner Johnnie Walters said recently that the 1972 tax forms are so simple that a taxpayer who opts to take the standard deduction, rather than itemize, could have his "daughter in the fifth grade" fill out the form. Maybe Mr. Walters' fifth grade daughter can figure it out, but that does not do much for the rest of us struggling to figure out whether we should itemize or not.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, 78 House Members have joined me in sponsoring legislation, appropriately numbered House Joint Resolution 1040, that would set up a select congressional committee to figure out how to significantly simplify the Federal income tax return process. Apparently, Mr. Walters believes that the present form is simple enough. But if you want to know why more than half of the American taxpayers—about 39,000 million people—are forced to turn to professional tax return services, this study contains the answers. The fault lies not with the mentality of the American taxpayer, but with the IRS for not paying more attention to devising simpler tax forms, and with Congress for passing all the loopholes that make the tax laws so complex.

I am writing Commissioner Walters today to ask him if he has a copy of the inch-thick computer data on which the Michigan study is based. If he does not have a copy, I will be overjoyed to supply him with one. I will suggest, however, that he not have it analyzed by a fifth grader.

The study's conclusion and a chart of its findings follow:

### VOCATIONAL READING POWER PROJECT ESEA—TITLE III

#### READABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE "1971 FEDERAL INCOME TAX FORMS" (INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORM 1040 AND SCHEDULES A AND B: TOPIC IDENTIFICATION)

Topic (sample No.)	Page	Topic identification	Readability grade equivalent	Topic (sample No.)	Page	Topic identification	Readability grade equivalent
1	1	A message from the Commissioner.	8	15	8	Pt. VI. Other taxes.	9
2	3	Form 1040 instructions:	8	16	8	Pt. VII. Other payments.	12
3	3-4	Where to get forms.	9			Instructions for schedule A (Form 1040):	
4	3	Who must file.	9			Itemized deductions:	
		You may have IRS compute your tax.	8	17	9	Medical and dental expenses.	16+
		Instructions for p. 1 of form 1040:		18	9	State gasoline tax table.	7
5	4	Filing status.	9	19	9-10	Taxes.	11
6	4	Special computations.	11	20	10	Contributions.	16+
7	5	Exemptions.	10	21	10	Interest expense.	14
8	5-6	Reporting your income.	11	22	10-11	Miscellaneous deductions.	13
9	6-7	Tax credits, payments.	10			Instructions for schedule B (Form 1040):	
10	6	Should you use the standard deduction?	11			Pt. I:	
11	7	Declarations of estimated tax.	10	23	11	Dividend income.	11
		Instructions for p. 2 of form 1040:		24	11	Dividends exclusion.	14
12	7	Pt. II. Income.	10	25	11	Pt. II. Interest income.	13
13	7	Pt. III. Adjustments.	13	26	12	1971 tax tables (instructions).	9
14	8	Pt. V. Credits.	10	27	17	1971 tax rate schedules (instructions).	4

#### SUMMARY OF THE READABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE "1971 FEDERAL INCOME TAX FORMS"—INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORM 1040 AND SCHEDULES A AND B

Our readability analysis of the "1971 Federal Income Tax Forms" (Instructions for Form 1040 and Schedules A and B) shows that there is considerable variation in reading difficulty among the different sections (major content areas) of the Instructions. This variation follows a particularly interesting pattern.

The most easily understandable parts of the Instructions are:

(1) the "Special Message from the Commissioner" (page 1).

(2) the section giving general information about Form 1040 ("Where to Get Forms", etc.), and

(3) the headings of the "Tax Tables" (pages 9, 12, and 17).

These sections have a relatively low reading difficulty level (from 4th to 9th grade equivalent), but they provide the least amount of specific information used in the actual computation of an individual's Federal Income Tax.

The two sections providing more detailed information—about pages 1 and 2 of Form 1040—are significantly harder to comprehend: the readability of the topics in these sections ranges from 9th to 13th grade equivalent, with an average reading difficulty level of 11th grade equivalent.

Most difficult to comprehend are the sections which explain how to prepare Schedules A ("Itemized Deductions") and B ("Dividend and Interest Income"). The average readability of these sections is 14th grade equivalent, and the reading difficulty levels of the topics within these sections range from 11th to over 16th grade equivalent. With respect to the section covering Itemized Deductions, our data suggest that many taxpayers who would otherwise benefit from itemizing their deductions might be discouraged from doing so because of the highly difficult reading demands of the instructions for that Schedule.

To summarize, our readability analysis indicates that:

1. There is considerable variation in the reading difficulty levels of the different sections of the "1971 Federal Income Tax Forms" (Instructions for Form 1040 and Schedules A and B).

2. Information related to actual tax computation is presented at a higher reading difficulty level than is general information; in other words, the more specific the information gets, the harder it is to comprehend.

3. The instructions for Schedules A and B have very high reading demands.

4. A taxpayer probably would have to read at the level of the average college graduate (over 16th grade equivalent) to be able to comprehend, without assistance, the entire content of the Tax Instructions.



PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION—  
18 YEARS AFTER BROWN

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD a recent address by the eminent Negro psychologist and educator, Kenneth B. Clark.

The address was presented at the National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks held in Arlington, Va., on March 29 to April 1, 1972.

I recommend its carefully prepared text and recommendations to all Americans seriously concerned with educational policies and goals.

The address follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION—18 YEARS  
AFTER BROWN

(Address by Kenneth B. Clark)

On May 17, 1954, when the United States Supreme Court handed down the historic *Brown* decision, there was reason to hope that on the basis of the finding that racially segregated schools were inherently unequal, that at long last the American public school system would be reorganized from a bi-racial to a non-racial system and as a consequence the quality of education for minority group children would be substantially raised without detriment to the majority.

In May of 1955 the Supreme Court handed down the "deliberate speed" implementation decision which suggested ways in which the transition from segregated to non-segregated systems of public schools could proceed with minimum disruption. Unfortunately, those who were opposed to any desegregation of the American public school system interpreted the "deliberate speed" decision of the Court as an invitation to procrastination and evasion. Eighteen years after the original *Brown* decision the process of the desegregation of American public schools is still not only incomplete, but is confronted with a new pattern of barriers—subtle and overt resistances—which could not only postpone, but reverse the process of public school desegregation in America.

For those who are concerned with the quality of education for all American children, it is now imperative to define and examine as objectively as possible the present problems related to the desegregation of the public schools and to seek and implement affirmative solutions to these problems. Given the present strange combination of enemies and subterfuges, the struggle for the desegregation of American public schools must now be intensified if the promises of the *Brown* decision are not to become another in a long list of cynically broken promises for racial justice in America.

The basic premises for the focus of this paper are:

1. The cases which led to the *Brown* decision of 1954 were argued on the grounds that Negro children in segregated schools were being denied equal educational opportunity because the segregated schools which they were required to attend were inferior.

2. It was also argued that the *Plessy vs. Ferguson* doctrine of "separate but equal" inevitably led to inferiority of educational and other segregated facilities provided for segregated minority groups.

3. The Court's finding that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" is as true today as it was when stated on May 17, 1954.

4. There is no evidence to support the contention that the inherent inferiority of

segregated schools will be any less damaging to the segregated children when such segregation is demanded by the victims than when inflicted upon them by the majority group.

5. Segregated schools are insidiously damaging to members of the majority group even as they are flagrantly damaging to members of the minority.

## CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS

Given the validity of the above argument and assumptions, one must examine the present forms of resistance to public school desegregation and review the related developments during the past 15 years in order to arrive at a present position and strategy for continuing and accelerating the struggle for desegregation of the public schools.

In the years immediately following the *Brown* decision, the issue of public school desegregation was seen primarily, if not exclusively, as a problem for the 17 states and the District of Columbia which had laws requiring or permitting the segregation of public schools. The struggle was seen primarily as a struggle against the *de jure* segregation of Southern and border states. The schemes for evasion and massive resistance to effective desegregation were devised and presented by Southern governmental officials and spokesmen. The problem of the *de facto* segregation of public schools in Northern urban communities did not surface as a significant aspect of the struggle for the desegregation of American public schools until the 1960's when the center of gravity of the civil rights movement shifted from the South to the North. Inferior education in the public schools in Northern urban ghettos emerged as a pervasive factor and a significant grievance in the series of riots which characterized many of America's cities during this period.

As the pattern of racial unrest and the demands for remedies on the part of Northern urban blacks increased, resistance to change intensified in Northern communities. Resistances to the desegregation of *de facto* segregated schools in Northern cities were similar, if not identical, to the resistances to the desegregation of *de jure* segregated schools in the South. This was true in spite of the evidence that the psychological and academic damage to minority group children in Northern *de facto* segregated schools was identical to the damage imposed upon these children in Southern *de jure* segregated schools. The consistent finding in Northern school systems that as the percentage of minority group children increases in a given school or school system the level of academic achievement decreases did not result in the implementation of programs to desegregate schools in Northern cities. The consistent relationship between the percentage of lower status minority group children and degree of academic retardation was permitted to continue without remedy in the South and in Northern cities.

This fact of persistent academic retardation—low quality of education and low achievement on the part of Negro children attending *de jure* or *de facto* segregated schools—was glibly explained by a variety of educational, psychological and social science theories. In fact, Northern American educators did not lack for support from social scientists who seemed all too eager apologists for the educational status quo. Explanations such as the inherent or genetic inferiority of Negro children resurfaced.

It has been stated with varying degrees of sincerity that these children were culturally deprived, came from poor homes; that their parents were not motivated educationally and therefore were unable to motivate their children for academic achievement; and therefore the schools cannot be expected to teach them to read. It has even been seriously suggested by white and black "friends"

of deprived black children that schools should not attempt to raise their academic achievement—should not teach them to read and speak standard English—because this would frustrate them and result in self-hatred. Aside from the patent absurdity and the pseudopsychology of these arguments, their common denominator is that these children are uneducable and therefore the schools are not to blame for their low academic achievement. These explanations—those based upon genetic inferiority of Negro children and those which explain their low achievement in terms of cultural and environmental deprivation—also have in common the justification of the continued educational deprivation of these children and suggest that practically no technique, including the desegregation of schools, can be successful in raising their academic achievement.

It should be noted that these explanations did not become fashionable until after the *Brown* decision which required desegregation of the public schools. They seemed to have increased in the intensity of public discussion—both in the professional journals and in the mass media—when the problem of public school desegregation of the *de facto* segregated schools of Northern communities became a basis of controversy and conflict.

The problem of the widespread and uncritical acceptance of these defeatist explanations of the continued educational inferiority inflicted upon these children tended to retard the already slow momentum toward desegregation of the public schools. The issue of public school desegregation has been further complicated by the fact that within the past five or more years the growth of black separatism emerged as a contributing factor in retarding the process of desegregation of the public schools. It is important to understand that black separatism emerged as a consequence of the slow pace of public school desegregation in the South and as a reaction to the subtle and insidious forms of evasion of desegregation of the *de facto* segregated schools in Northern cities.

Frustrations arising from the fact that those responsible for policy and practice in the desegregation of schools were not serious in developing and implementing effective desegregation plans gave rise to demands for community control and decentralization of public schools in predominantly black areas of our cities. The lack of seriousness in the implementation of desegregation plans throughout the country contributed to the total pattern of black separatism and strengthened the appeal of black segregationists. In spite of this historical and psychological understanding of the basis of black separatism there remains the overriding fact that the quality of education provided for minority group children in predominantly black schools continues to be inferior and the psychological damage inflicted upon them is as great when these segregated schools are demanded by, or allegedly controlled by, blacks themselves.

The insidious and persistent resistance of Northern whites to the desegregation of *de facto* segregated schools and the reinforcement of this position by black separatists have now strengthened the overt resistance of Southern segregationists to effective desegregation of American public schools. This new and unexpected alliance—this strange spectacle of interracial bedfellows—has confused, temporarily bewildered or exploited the ambivalence of those Southern and Northern whites who assumed the risks necessary to obtain and attempt to implement effective school desegregation programs. A presently undetermined number of blacks—still a minority, no greater than 20% according to the latest surveys—seem bewildered and uncertain about whether the

goals of desegregated schools are still worth pursuing.

During this period of desegregation stagnation a number of educational programs, plans and gimmicks were developed and offered to blacks as substitutes for serious and effective public school desegregation. In spite of the *Brown* decision, Southern and Northern resistance to desegregation sought to make continued school desegregation palatable and acceptable under one or another contemporary form of the discredited "separate but equal" doctrine. Some advocates of these special "enrichment" programs tried to enhance the salability of their specious products by even suggesting that by some miracle of racial status inversion the separate could be superior.

Compensatory education and enrichment programs were designed to raise the academic achievement of Negro children in predominantly black schools. Some of these education plans appear to have some temporary positive effects. Over a period of time, however, the results from these programs mockingly betray the overriding fact of the inherent inequality in racially segregated schools.

Whatever the combination of factors associated with the social reality of the perceived low status of segregated schools—low morale of teachers, inadequate supervision, inadequate teaching, low motivation on the part of parents and pupils, inadequate educational facilities—the fact remains that racially segregated schools are inferior schools. The inferiority of these schools continues to be expressed in the fact of low academic achievement and low self-esteem in the pupils who are required to attend these schools. The compensatory educational programs, the infusion of Title I funds and the increase in such funds do not and probably will not change this fact as long as American racism remains the dominant reality of American society and American education.

Resistance to the acceptance of this reality has spawned other attempts to circumvent serious programs for effective desegregation of the schools. In recent years performance contracts and voucher systems have been offered as panaceas and alternatives to effective school desegregation. The evidence so far supports the conclusion that performance contracts do not result in sustained improvement in the academic achievement of segregated and educationally neglected children. The performance contract approach to this problem is clearly an additional burden on taxpayers and diverts attention from the fundamental problem that inefficiency in the public schools is a responsibility of school officials and school personnel who are paid by the citizens to provide effective education for all children. The primary educational contract exists between taxpaying citizens and school personnel. Even if performance contracts were found to be more successful than they have been, there would still remain the serious question of how it is possible for an outside group to obtain positive educational results which school personnel could not itself obtain.

The voucher system has been proposed by many distinguished educators as a means for providing parents with an opportunity to choose among private and public schools those schools which they believe will provide their children with a higher quality of education. This approach as an alternative to serious desegregation of the schools also presents many serious questions. It is true that for the masses of middle and low income families the public schools have exercised an educational monopoly which has been abused. These parents do not generally have a choice in protecting their children from educational inefficiency through alternative educational programs.

It is a serious question, however, whether such choice can be provided to them through voucher systems without at the

same time further weakening the public schools; accelerating the growth of private racially and economically segregated schools and academies supported at public expense; and, most important, retarding and regressing the rate of public school desegregation even more than at present. The indications are that there are no effective safeguards against the abuses of a voucher system and that such a system is likely to proliferate segregated schools. Those who are still seriously concerned with desegregating the public schools and raising the quality of education in these public schools should be cautious in any support of voucher systems; in fact, such systems should be opposed.

The combined problems of public school desegregation and equitable financing of local public school districts have emerged dramatically as a result of the decision in the *Serrano* case. In this case, the California State Supreme Court held that inequities in expenditures for public school education among various school districts in a given state were violative of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. While this judgment has not yet been confirmed by the United States Supreme Court there is every reason to believe that there will be a greater involvement of the states in the financing of public education at the local level. This increase in state involvement will have to be in the direction of equalization of school expenditures among the districts throughout the state. If this is true, then the states will have to take a more active part not only in the financing of education, but state education boards and commissioners will have to be concerned with educational standards and the actual achievement of pupils in the local school districts throughout the state.

In fulfilling this basic evaluative responsibility, the states will have to develop effective instruments for measuring the educational efficiency of the public schools and, therefore, will have to deal more objectively with the critical problem of educational accountability. If one could assume that greater involvement in the financial and physical support of public education on the part of state educational bodies would directly or indirectly facilitate the process of public school desegregation this would be most desirable. Those of us who are concerned with facilitating general public school desegregation should therefore support enthusiastically this new development. There is still the question of whether the opponents of desegregation could so construe and implement the Court's decisions on state responsibility for the equalization of expenditures among school districts as to retard rather than to facilitate public school desegregation. All such attempts should be watched most vigilantly and resisted intensively.

Probably the most effective technique by which the *Serrano* type approach could be blocked as an effective approach for desegregation would be through the passage of antibusing for desegregation statutes or constitutional amendments on the state and federal level. All of the proposals for prohibiting the transportation of students for purposes of desegregation are racially restrictive proposals. President Nixon's explanations for his assuming the leadership in obtaining antibusing legislation must be rejected for the following reasons, among others:

1. They are racially restrictive in that they seek to prohibit transportation of students for purposes of desegregation while permitting transportation of these children for all other purposes.

2. They reflect the fact that the President of the United States is using the power of his office in a racial controversy on the side of those who have been consistently opposed to equality of educational opportunity for racially rejected minorities.

3. They represent the first attempts since Reconstruction to have the Legislative branch of the federal government enact legislation which would constrict or qualify the rights of minorities.

4. They represent an attempt on the part of the President of the United States not only to slow the pace of public school desegregation, but to return the civil rights movement to a point at or before the *Plessy* "separate but equal" stage.

5. The President's proposal would seek to restrain the federal courts as an independent protector of the rights of minorities against the oppression, passions and prejudices of the majority. In short, the President's proposal, intentional or not, could lead to a resegregation of those school systems that have already moved toward desegregation.

In seeking to turn back the clock of racial progress in America, President Nixon and his advisors must be aware of the fact that he is threatening the constitutional protections of all Americans—and that in doing so he is eroding the foundation of a constitutional government, substituting a government by the tyranny of whim and passion rather than a government of law. This is the very high price of racial prejudice and political expediency which he seeks to extract from all the American people—white as well as black.

In this regard it might be significant to note that in seeking to justify his position, the President stated that some black separatists were in favor of antibusing legislation. The fundamental constitutional questions, however, are not answered by this diversion. Constitutional rights can no more be abrogated by the alleged desires of the victims of oppression than by those who would seek to oppress. In seeking to obtain control over all black schools and insisting upon racially segregated schools through their support of black separatists are not only pursuing an impossible mirage but they are also, cynically or naively giving aid and comfort to those who would use the laws of the Federal government to constrict the rights of Negroes—and to erode the democratic rights of all American citizens. In this regard they are indistinguishable from racial reactionaries—and they are accessories to the crime of destroying the democratic safeguards inherent in our constitutional government of checks and balances.

Inadvertently, President Nixon's gratuitous, inconsistent, dangerous—if not morally irresponsible—partisan involvement in the antibusing issue could have a positive effect. It is possible that this flagrant politically expedient position of the President of the United States could boomerang by alerting and reminding the masses of the American people about the more serious problems of public education which remain to be resolved. The meretricious may sometimes make the genuine more clear.

The transparent hypocrisy which now surrounds the anti-busing controversy could have beneficial consequences if it forces those of us who have been concerned with the quality of public education to restate our goals, re-examine our strategies and tactics, and to mobilize our resources and redouble our efforts to obtain for all American children that quality of education which might prevent them from making the near fatal blunders of their parents.

We must state without apology that the primary issue is the issue of a form of American education appropriate to the multidimensional complexities of a present and future world. America cannot afford an educational system geared to a world of the 19th and early 20th Century social realities. We must educate American children for a world in which the white President of the United States and his wife are required to visit the non-white heads of China.

Education for the future must accept the



fact of diversity among the peoples of the world; must accept the fact that the status relationship between whites and non-whites has abruptly changed and will continue to change; and must accept the fact that, if mankind is to survive, these changes must be accepted affirmatively and somehow made an integral part of the educational process. We must now re-double our efforts in the struggle for desegregated schools because we are concerned with obtaining this high quality of humanizing education for all children. We cannot permit them to be educated in ways which will perpetuate the ignorance, superstitions and injustices of the past—this type of education will be fatal for the future.

It is ironic, but probably inescapable, that the burden of insisting upon an education essential for future survival must be borne by America's rejected minorities—those who have been the more obvious victims of educational neglect—those who have been educationally and economically most exploited. But this is just another burden which American Negroes have been required to bear in the seemingly endless struggle for justice in America. Each victory obtained by American blacks strengthens the base and protections of democracy for all American citizens.

We can contribute to the strengthening of the base for democratic education in America by insisting upon the desegregation of American public schools. We must insist upon this because racially segregated schools cannot be equal in a racist society—and there is no need for racially segregated schools except in a racist society. We must also argue that racially segregated schools damage white children as much as they damage black children. Racially segregated schools contribute to the moral and ethical retardation of whites even as it contributes to academic retardation of blacks. America's white children who are the products of racially isolated schools are required to struggle with inner moral conflicts, guilt, a gnawing sense of alienation and personal incompleteness. These certainly must militate against a sense of personal fulfillment and are antithetical to that quality and substance of life essential for humanity.

We must insist that the education now being provided for children in predominantly black schools be now raised to a tolerable level of academic efficiency. We must demand an improved quality of teaching and supervision in these schools—and we must insist upon reasonable standards and criteria of accountability which will guarantee that these children are not being shortchanged by those who are being paid by taxpayers to teach them. The schools, school officials, supervisory and teaching personnel must be made more responsive to the needs and aspirations of pupils and parents.

We must see that parents who care about the education of their children become actively involved in assuring high quality of education in our schools. Parents cannot passively accept educational inefficiency. They cannot and must not accept the prevailing alibis among educators as to why their children cannot be taught to read or to do arithmetic or to speak and write correct English. These excuses are destructive of our children. They must be challenged and rejected by concerned parents.

It is hereby proposed that those of us who are concerned with this most serious business of improving the quality of education for black and white children—those of us who are concerned with the immediate and eventual desegregation of American public schools—give some thought to the development of parent organizations in every urban school district which would have the following primary objectives:

Protecting the educational rights of their children in the public schools;

Holding the school system accountable for their children's achievement;

Involving themselves in appropriate methods in the actual education of their children, within and outside of the schools and classrooms;

Monitoring and lobbying in local, state, and national legislatures for effective educational programs to benefit their children (rarely is there a group or agency representing the interests of parents and pupils when educational legislation is being discussed and passed by government officials);

And above all to protect the general educational interests of black children who have been neglected—consigned to the educational dunghill—by an insensitive society.

It is all too tragically clear that black children are considered and treated as if they are expendable. Those blacks and whites who would use them as pawns in a gruesome and self-defeating power game, do not yet understand that to sentence millions of children to the prison of segregated educational inferiority is to perpetuate that pattern of social pathology which threatens the stability of the whole society. No one is so privileged as to be immune from the dangers inherent in a hard core of the uneducated within the heart of our cities.

Even as we redouble our efforts to increase the quality of education for our children; as we seek greater accountability in our schools; as we seek more equitable financing for all local school districts; as we fight the diversionary educational gimmicks; as we reveal the political hypocrisy of the anti-busing for desegregation advocates; and as we seek more direct control over the operation of the schools attended by our children—we cannot permit our understandable enthusiasm to obtain these objectives to delude us into believing that we can obtain high quality education for our children within the framework of racially segregated schools. All positive educational programs worthy of intelligent support by blacks and concerned whites must be compatible with the actual process of desegregation—or must be a step toward eventual desegregation of the public school system.

The halt of "separate but equal" education is as spurious now as it has been since the post Reconstruction era. Let me, therefore, conclude with the words of the United States Supreme Court:

"We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

It is even more urgent now that this dictum be the standard by which we judge all educational proposals, policies and programs. Only from this perspective will we be able to protect the future of our children and be worthy of their respect.

#### CONCERN FOR OUR POW'S

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are concerned about our military men held in North Vietnamese prisons for many years.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, many speeches have been delivered on the floor of this House of Representatives expressing sympathy and concern for the plight of those great men, but little or no known efforts have been made to "bring them home."

Therefore, I wish to place in the Con-

GRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the telegram that was recently sent to President Nixon expressing the feelings of the National Association of Attorneys General. This copy was provided me by Theodore Sendak, attorney general of Indiana:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL,

March 28, 1972.

The President of the United States,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter confirms action of the Executive Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General at a meeting held in New Orleans, Louisiana, Monday, March 27, 1972. To inform you of the concern of the Association with the plight of American servicemen and to request action on alternate proposals yet untried, the following telegram was sent to you yesterday:

"Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

"Following example of your Proclamation the Executive Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General in session today in New Orleans observed a moment of prayer for American servicemen who are prisoners of war and missing in action in Southeast Asia.

"Resolution of National Association of Attorneys General regarding POWs and MIAs sent to you following December 1971 national meeting urging exploration of every honorable avenue within Geneva accords for securing humane treatment and early repatriation of POWs and MIAs was reaffirmed.

"To this we today add request that you personally instruct State and Defense Departments to consider alternate proposals of Attorneys General Sendak (Indiana) and Morgan (North Carolina) which proposals have hitherto not been tried for effectuating humane treatment and ultimate repatriation of our POWs and MIAs.

"Respectfully yours,

"GARY K. NELSON,  
"Attorney General of Arizona and  
President-Elect NAAG."

Very truly yours,

JOHN K. HICKEY,  
Secretary.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in this time of increasing antagonism and misunderstanding between the older and younger generations, I would like to call attention to a group of men, women, and boys who exemplify the very best of what America has to offer its young.

I am talking of the dramatic and too often unheralded role the Boy Scouts of America play in presenting our American youth with the opportunity to develop their character, bodies, and minds so they can contribute as fully aware citizens to this great democracy of ours.

A total of 4.5 million boys from 8 through 16 years of age participate in the Scouting program—that is one of every four boys.

I have found that in communities with active scouting programs, vandalism and

juvenile crime are greatly reduced. It seems that the guidance of responsible adults from their community teaches the boys a sense of community spirit, pride, and direction.

I would like to especially praise two Boy Scout projects which should serve as models for other youth-involved groups—Operation Reach and Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources.

Operation Reach is a nationwide fight against the use of drugs. As part of the project, Scouting units in many cities have drug education programs in cooperation with State and municipal agencies.

Project SOAR demonstrates the startling results that more than 1 million Scouts and their leaders, working together, can accomplish.

On Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day, these Scouts cleaned 112,000 miles of roadways and streambanks, and 240,000 acres of parks, recreation areas, and other public places. More than 550,000 tons of trash were collected in nearly 100,000 truckloads.

All in all, a phenomenal demonstration of what one group of goodhearted, concerned Americans can accomplish.

For these two projects and the countless others which help to enrich the lives of our youth and make our communities and our Nation safe and secure, I pay tribute to the leadership and boys of the Boy Scouts of America.

#### PTA MEMBERSHIP PLUNGES

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been expressing my concern over the detrimental effects on education which have resulted from massive forced busing to bring about racial balance. Let me reiterate, as I have said before, that I believe in integration. I am proud of the fact that Virginia now has an open housing law, and I have every hope that we will see some positive benefits from it in the near future.

Nevertheless, I am convinced, as an educator, that on the elementary level especially, the neighborhood school is vital to the proper education of all children. Without the neighborhood school, it is difficult to have an effective school breakfast program, since children who come by bus do not arrive at school until it is time for classes to begin. Without the neighborhood school, it is hard to maintain valuable extracurricular activities like Cub Scouts, Brownies, and the like.

And without the neighborhood school, it is difficult to maintain parent interest and involvement in school activities. At this point in the Record, I would offer an article which appeared in the April 6, 1972, issue of the Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Star, outlining what has happened to the PTA membership in our area in the past 3 years. I do not believe that it is a coin-

cidence that the Norfolk membership has declined as busing has increased.

#### PTA MEMBERSHIP PLUNGES

(By Richard C. Bayer)

NORFOLK.—Membership in Parent Teacher Association units in Norfolk has dropped from a 1968-69 level of 15,015 to 3,771, according to the first vice president of the Norfolk PTA Federation.

Mrs. Sadie Minium, who will succeed Eugene Gordman, a Norfolk lawyer, as federation president on May 22, reported the figures in an interview and offered several reasons for the decline.

"In some schools, it's apathy on the part of parents who don't feel they have to be actively involved in their children's activities. Very often it is an administrator who—after talking with his faculty—doesn't want a PTA in his school.

"Sure, it's a bother having a PTA. If faculty members could understand what good a PTA can do for a school . . ." she said.

Mrs. Minium gave other reasons for the loss of interest in PTA in a 50,000-pupil system, which last fall—under court order—abandoned neighborhood elementary schools:

(About 24,000 pupils in Norfolk are now assigned outside their neighborhoods in order to balance the races).

"Parents hesitate to go across town to a meeting, especially at night," Mrs. Minium said.

"Some parents are simply angry and will not participate because PTA hasn't taken a firmer stand on busing.

"Most units elect their officers in May or April. Some schools lost all or almost all their PTA officers because their children were transferred to other schools. Some haven't replaced them yet."

Over the past six years, Norfolk PTA membership hit its peak in 1968-69, up from 12,000 in 1966-67 and 10,000 in 1967-68, Mrs. Minium said.

She reported 12,560 on the rolls in 1969-70 and 9,038 in 1970-71.

There are 71 schools in the Norfolk system. Forty of them have PTA units, Mrs. Minium—who is a school-community worker at Norview High—reported.

A few Norfolk schools have parent-teacher groups which are not affiliated with PTA.

While Norfolk PTA membership declined, Virginia Beach membership went from 9,492 in 1968-69 to about 15,000, according to the state PTA office.

Virginia Beach had 9,492 PTA members in 1968, the state office reported. Portsmouth had 5,914 members in 1968 and 7,335 as of March and Chesapeake had 8,499 in 1968 and 7,431 in March.

The sharp membership drop had an inevitable effect on finances of the Norfolk PTA Federation, Mrs. Minium said.

"Only about two-thirds of our units are in good standing with their dues paid," she said. She said the federation is now operating on a surplus accumulated in previous years.

The state PTA office in Richmond reported a Virginia membership, as of June 1971, of 269,500. There were 289,097 paid members in 1970, 301,783 in 1969, 294,631 in 1968, 290,367 in 1967 and 304,509 in 1966.

Mrs. Minium has had personal experience with trying to get people out to a PTA meeting.

She recently arranged for a chartered bus to haul parents and children from distant neighborhoods to Norview High and return them home. The speaker for the night was Richard Wallace, school social worker.

About six adults and six students rode that bus, Mrs. Minium recalled.

The PTA official said she will start trying to whip up more enthusiasm for her organization when she becomes president. She is unopposed for the office.

"I'd settle for 10,000 members the first year and 20,000 the second," she said.

"We're either going to slide up or slide right out the back door."

#### A SOLIDLY DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of uncertainty, Peking ping-pong and "Nixon shocks," it is good to know there is still a large element in our society dedicated to the preservation of our heritage and providing a worthwhile element of stability for our Nation, as the following survey shows:

#### FIFTY-STATE SURVEY FINDS DEMOCRATS CERTAIN OF HOUSE

(By Warren Weaver Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 8.—The man who wins the 1972 election, whether it is President Nixon or his Democratic opponent, faces the strong prospect of a solidly Democratic Congress in control on Capitol Hill for at least the first two years of his term.

A 50-state survey of all 435 contests for the House of Representatives to be decided next fall indicated today that the Republicans could not produce a majority there even if they won every election about which there appears to be any real doubt.

A similar study six weeks ago of the 1972 Senate election suggested that the Democrats would probably pick up one or two seats or at least preserve their current 55-45 majority. There are 33 Senate seats to be filled this year.

The present House includes 255 Democrats and 180 Republicans, with vacancies credited to the party that last held the seat. Political reports from all 50 states indicate, eight months before the election, that the Democrats are solid favorites in 218 districts, or enough for a bare majority.

#### NOT ENOUGH FOR G.O.P.

The breakdown is 218 seats solidly Democratic, 29 leaning Democratic, 135 solidly Republican, 34 leaning Republican and 19 too close to call. Thus, if the Republicans carried every doubtful district, they would still have only 217 House votes and be unable to elect a Speaker or organize committees.

Assuming that each party carries the seat leaning in its direction and that they divide the undecided districts evenly, the Democrats would pick up one or two seats above their present majority.

Of the six times when incumbent Presidents have been reelected since 1936, only once was the winner unable to help increase the size of his party's House delegation. The exception was Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956, when the Republicans lost two House seats despite their Presidential landslide.

Predictions for the House districts represent the best available estimates of political leaders in each state, but they could shift with the nomination of strong challengers, the emergence of unexpected issues and the character of the national campaign.

#### DISTRICTING UNCERTAINTY

In addition, there is some uncertainty in states that have not completed Congressional reapportionment, notably New Jersey, Michigan, Tennessee and Washington. Prospective shifts there are not likely to be large enough, however, to revise the picture of a continued Democratic majority in the House.



The survey ran counter to long-held Republican hopes that reapportionment based on the 1970 census returns would give the Republicans a larger share of House districts.

Generally, the census figures showed a shift in population from the Northeast and Middle West to the sun belt states of Florida, Texas, Arizona and California and, within states, from the cities to the suburbs, both trends that the Republicans expected to be politically advantageous for them.

At this time, however, neither party has appeared to gain materially over the other in the districts transferred to more populous states. The five new California districts split 3 to 2 in favor of the Democrats and the three new Florida seats include one that is Democratic, one Republican and one a toss-up.

#### FEW SEEM IN DOUBT

One of the most significant results of the House campaign survey was the small number of districts in which the outcome appeared to be in doubt. There were only 82 seats, of 19 per cent of the total, that were not judged to be virtually assured for one party or the other.

In most cases, the solid seats, both Republican and Democratic, are represented by incumbent Congressmen who are almost certain of re-election or are earmarked by political observers for a candidate of the same party as an incumbent who is retiring.

In many states, incumbent Representatives of both parties have a strong political voice in drafting reapportionment plans and work to strengthen their own districts. In addition, the publicity advantage and favor-granting power of House Members has made incumbents increasingly difficult to defeat in recent years.

The 19 House races currently regarded as too close to call—only 4 per cent of the national total—are concentrated in the Middle West (5) and the South (7). There are three in Indiana, two in Virginia and one each in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Illinois and Iowa.

At one time, party alignment in the House shifted fairly radically with each election, with 30 to 60 seats commonly exchanging hands and more than 100 on two occasions. In the last eight biennial elections, however, the swing figure has been under 15 half the time and has never gone over 50.

#### CARGO THEFT—A NATIONAL DISGRACE

**HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the theft of goods in shipment has become a national problem. Efforts are being made by industry and Government to fight this crime which costs billions of dollars every year. In the last year, Government and business have greatly stepped up their efforts to cut down on this theft. However, they need more tools than they presently have to fight this problem. One of the things that is hampering the fight is the lack of knowledge of what is being stolen, who is stealing it, where it is going after the theft, and how much is actually being stolen.

The House has now before it legislation that would create a National Cargo Security Commission to study this problem and to make actual recommenda-

tions for security regulations. The Senate has already passed such legislation under the leadership of Senator ALAN BIBLE. I have introduced the same bill in the House, H.R. 10295. I am hopeful that hearings can be held on it soon. The Department of Transportation and the industry have made giant steps toward coping with cargo theft in the past year, but they need the information and coordination that H.R. 10295 would provide.

The March 20 edition of *Traffic World* dedicated a great portion of that issue to speeches on cargo theft made by various individuals representing both Government and industry. With the permission of the House, I intend to insert these speeches in the *RECORD* over the next several weeks so that Members can become more familiar with the need to curtail cargo theft. The first statement I would like to insert is that of Senator ALAN BIBLE, who has been the leader on this fight. The Senator has introduced several bills other than the Cargo Security Commission that will help in the fight against cargo theft. He discusses the legislative proposals in the following article:

#### A 1972 LOOK AT CARGO SECURITY—EVERYONE'S BUSINESS

(By Senator ALAN BIBLE)

Security will be a major challenge for this country's transport system for the 1970s and possibly beyond.

That challenge will be sharpened by an estimated record tonnage to be transported in a society where security from crime and prevention of crime are becoming the goals of a carrier industry's efforts to deal with the biggest multi-billion dollar racket nationally today—the theft, pilferage and hijacking of truck, air, rail and ship cargo.

For the transport industry, yours is the homefront war today against cargo thieves—a war that in 1971 probably cost more in losses than the \$1.5 billion estimate for 1970. And the prestigious New York State Motor Truck Association at a Transportation Crime Conference in January asked the more expensive question: Can armed hijack, larceny, theft and pilferage cost the transport industry in excess of \$2.6 billion in 1972?

This is the atmosphere in which the carrier industry, shippers, the consumer public and the government find themselves today. One long-time rule of thumb seems to be (whether we like it or not) that when a problem gets big enough (and crime in the transport industry is big enough), then the federal government gets into it. Both the transport industry and the federal government are trying to help row the law enforcement, security-prevention boat in some rough waters these days so that efficient transport can be maintained on our highways, streets, airlines, waterways and railroads.

Even though the thieves have a good head start, we believe it can accurately be said that progress is being made to deal with the enemy. That progress is more than just on paper. Not only is the carrier industry generally becoming more alert to a problem that has some carriers almost on the ropes, but similarly the federal government is trying to help coordinate a broadscale campaign. But, there is a long road ahead to win the fight.

Three years ago when the Senate small business committee began investigatory hearings into this general problem, there was very little interest on the part of most carriers, the government or almost anyone

else except the small shipper suffering skyrocketing losses that put him out of business all too often, and the American Trucking Association's trucking industry committee on theft and hijacking which was urging trucking management in 1969 to see the danger signals. As carrier industry executives have told me, their watchword, as they moved record tonnages to the jingle of their cash registers, had been: "Move the goods . . . Let the insurance companies worry about the losses."

Today, fortunately, we believe that general picture is beginning to change along the whole carrier industry front but not necessarily based on the speed of the carriers involved. The Department of Transportation, which showed no affirmative interest in 1969, was severely criticized in 1970 for its "rhetoric vacillation and negative attitude" by the Senate appropriations committee controlling its funding and by the Senate small business committee. That Department is now marshaling an intensive effort to come to grips with the cargo crime problem under General Benjamin O. Davies, Jr. (U.S. Air Force, retired), Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Safety and Consumer Affairs.

To his great credit, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe last June called a four-day cargo crime conference in Washington, marking the first time that a federal agency or industry had really zeroed in on a broad effort to delineate the limits of the problem, to determine roles and responsibilities, and to take an affirmative first step in exploring methods to deal effectively with it.

Secretary Volpe announced to the conference: (1) organization of a Transportation Security Office within his Department; and (2) organization of an Intergovernmental Task Force under the President's direct authorization to seek out ways and means for all executive agencies of the federal government to assist air, truck, maritime and rail carriers to curb growing cargo thievery in cooperation with state and local authorities.

Meanwhile, the Department of Transportation has fashioned a 12-point federal program including physical security guideline measures and pilot security projects. Secretary Volpe has requested every governor to designate a member of his personal staff to work with federal and local organizations to push the program and to ascertain if state funding for such purposes can be secured through Law Enforcement Assistance Administration fundings from the Department of Justice.

Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst urged all U.S. attorneys to give particular attention to cargo crime areas for active prosecution.

Additionally, the Transportation Association of America, directed by its president, Harold Hammond, and representing most major carriers and shippers, announced the formation of a Transportation Cargo Security Council made up of carrier, labor, insurance, shipper and associated private industry organizations and manufacturers to assist in the federal-state efforts. All 50 state governors were asked to recognize the severity of the problem and to seek federal funding for cargo security programs locally.

The American Trucking Association's security arm, the trucking industry committee on theft and hijacking (TICOTH), continued to step up its activities begun back in 1969. The National Truck Theft Association was organized in Jacksonville, Fla., to deal with truck thefts particularly.

Meanwhile, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board have adopted or are carrying out uniform cargo loss reporting rule-making proceedings, the two former regulatory bodies with more affirmativeness than the latter's snail-like pace.

To capsule the problem faced by industry

and government efforts, let me quote a statement I made before last summer's national conference on the cargo security crisis in Washington, D.C.:

"After two years of listening to testimony from government, transportation and regulatory agencies, carriers, law enforcement officers, insurers, shippers and consumers, one fact comes through loud and clear—the cargo carrier crime crisis is growing alarmingly day by day. Our law enforcement agencies, our shipping regulatory bodies, government and the carrier industry have been unable to mount an effective response."

Two years ago, no governmental, private carrier or trade organization had any kind of a realistic handle on just how big the problem really was. The Senate small business committee, aided by insurance underwriters, carriers, Library of Congress statisticians, national news media and others sought to arrive at a generalized best estimate to shake up the carrier industry from its head-in-the-sand stance, to shake up government from its let-somebody-else-worry-about-it attitude and to bring on the focus of public interest. The committee prodded the ICC into adopting uniform loss reporting for Class I trucks and sparked current rule-making proceedings by the Federal Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Estimates showed losses were in the neighborhood of \$1.5 billion for 1970, with truck theft and hijacking in first place at \$900 million, airlines at \$110 million, maritime shipping at \$210 million, and railroads at \$250 million. There seems little reason to believe that this total moved downward in 1971 with truck hijacking substantially on the increase that year and apparently new record highs set for dollar losses per major theft, at least in the motor freight hijack category.

These figures represent only the value of goods stolen or pilfered. But what is the bigger impact such as the cost of business? And what about the consumer, who pays for all the direct and indirect losses by crime-inflated prices?

The American Trucking Association told our committee that for every \$1 of direct loss, it costs motor freight carriers from \$2 to \$5 of indirect costs in processing claims, paperwork and manpower. Shippers say their indirect losses are even greater or \$5 to \$7 for not having goods for sale, loss of profit dollars, disruption of manufacturers' production lines and the tie-up of monies due them and delayed in the claims reimbursement pipeline.

Therefore, if we add the direct dollar theft loss plus the carriers' and shippers' indirect costs, we may be talking of costs to the national economy approaching \$8 to \$10 billion annually. Again, it is the consumer who pays the crime-tagged price as that inflation spiral goes round and round.

As another example, a major recreational vehicle manufacturer had a truckload of wheels hijacked, possibly mistaken for a high-value cargo load. Because the wheel manufacturer could not resupply immediately, the vehicle manufacturer was forced to close down its production line, thereby losing its customer orders. Its building overhead expenses continued as did mortgage payments, equipment amortization, executive payroll and warehousing costs for the unfinished vehicles. Regular employees were furloughed and were substantially without pay. Other parts suppliers had to be paid. The company's direct loss for the hijacked wheels was only \$30,000 but other costs went into the millions of dollars, indirect though they were but just as expensive as the direct variety.

Today, in this turbulent world of swift change, we try to live with extremes. But today the transportation industry has been victimized by losses never thought possible a few short years ago.

And how do these thefts impact on the four transport modes? According to the American Trucking Associations' TICOTH committee, the cost to the motor freight industry was in excess of \$1 billion in 1970.

Sometimes the truck hijack bowling alley—the New York City-New Jersey metropolitan area—is said to stretch from Boston straight down the east coast corridor to Miami. Some believe it is spreading to the midwest and the Pacific coast as terminal and driver security improvements force some ordinary thieves into hijacking.

Yes, hijackings may get the headlines, but the bulk of truck cargo loss, around 80 per cent, is the pilferage and theft of one to several cartons each time and repeated thousands of times every year according to the American Trucking Associations.

Even though 60,000 trucks move in and out of New York City daily via six interstate crossings and \$17.3 million worth of goods was stolen in 318 hijackings there in 1970, the hijack rate increased beyond the 350 mark in 1971. However, greater truck losses dollar-wise occurred elsewhere from a high of 2.13 per cent of revenue on the Pacific Coast to a low of 1.61 per cent in the Rocky Mountain states.

While figures like these show the problem is a growing one, we are beginning to see more activity by insurance companies to force carriers to cut losses where possible. After all, insurance companies can't stay in business either if their losses become excessive or if customers are no longer insurable risks. In 1969, one major insurance company's loss ratio on cargo skyrocketed to an unprofitable 151 per cent. By 1971, that company cut its loss ratio to 69 per cent by forcing trucking industry management to institute security and prevention programs.

More than one insurance company executive has said that some trucking firms just cannot see any profit in preventive, security-type programs until the noose becomes so tight about their necks they don't know which way to jump. But in fairness to the trucking industry, can it carry on business as usual if the crime problem has become so rampant that only escort vehicles or western-style armed guards "riding shotgun" can help? Obviously, these expensive alternatives would increase shipping costs tremendously and would be generally impractical for other reasons. Can the motor freight industry operate in a crime-pocked society where it is a favorite and vulnerable target... one where truckload thefts are valued at about \$35,000 each compared to bank robberies which average about \$4,500 each?

As a result of our Committee's hearings about cargo theft and loss, our attention was drawn to the claims practices dealing with loss and damage in commercial transport. Several weeks ago the Interstate Commerce Commission announced it was moving to attack "mounting problems" of shippers in collecting loss and damage claims from railroads, truckers and other carriers. The ICC declared that the motor carrier rules for settlement of loss and damage claims restrict the liability of carriers and are unlawful, and at the same time announced a new set of rules carriers must begin using, including, beginning April 21:

- (1) Acknowledgment by carriers of the receipt of each loss and damage claim;
- (2) Investigation by the carrier of each claim promptly;
- (3) Disposition by the carrier of the claim within a specified period, or the carrier to be required to inform the claimant of the claim and explain why a settlement has been delayed.

This announcement came as a result of an order in the proceedings in *Ex Parte 263*, dealing with Rules, Regulations and Practices of Regulated Carriers with Respect to the Processing of Loss and Damage Claims.

It appears that the primary judgment made

by the Commission in its report in *Loss and Damage Claims*, 340 I.C.C. 515, is that there now prevails throughout the country a tremendous need and a growing public sentiment for a new approach to be taken in attempting to resolve what ICC called "a mounting national crisis in cargo loss and damage claims." The ICC said that the significance of the problem is pointed up by industry figures which show that more than \$300 million in cargo is lost or damaged each year, with the railroads and motor carriers, respectively, handling 2.5 million and 1 million claims annually. This waste of our nation's resources, the Commission concluded, no longer could be tolerated.

The ICC announced adoption of a dual program designed to utilize its existing statutory authority to the fullest extent possible. It candidly admits, however, that the limited response it is now able to make to this problem may fall short of the mark needed to achieve appreciable improvements that it has found to be necessary in the public interest.

First of all, the Commission has promulgated sweeping regulations to become effective April 21, 1972. These regulations require all surface transportation companies to acknowledge receipt of each loss and damage claim, to investigate claims promptly, and to dispose of claims within a specified time or inform the claimant the status of his claim and the reason for the delay. The Commission also made a commitment in its report to institute in the near future another rulemaking proceeding in which it will determine whether there is also a present public need for it further to define the term "reasonable dispatch" insofar as it relates to the transportation of perishable commodities.

In the second phase of the dual program outlined in its report, the Commission seeks to bring the cargo claims situation under control by recommending that the Congress grant it the authority (a) to adjudicate cargo loss and damage claims in the first instance, subject, of course, to judicial review, and (b) to issue regulations setting cargo insurance standards for railroads, express companies, and water carriers.

And what about the fast-moving world of air freight? It is setting new tonnage records with gains of at least 20 per cent per year. In 1958 domestic air cargo carriers flew 726 million ton miles. That tripled in 10 years to more than 2 billion ton miles. It should quadruple during the 1970s, far outdistancing passenger traffic increases.

Larger aircraft are on their way which will carry more passengers and more freight, a far cry from the country's first scheduled cargo-passenger flight in Florida in 1914 by the St. Petersburg-to-Tampa Airboat Line. Its motto, ironically enough, was "safety first" and its cargo was a few pounds of hand-carried packages and boxes.

The world's greatest air cargo terminal, New York City's John F. Kennedy International Airport, had reported thefts in 1969 of \$3.5 million. Additionally, airmail, parcel post thefts of securities, cash, diamonds and other high-value items at Kennedy were estimated at \$65 million from 1967 through 1969. At some airports today, like JFK, U.S. Postal Service guards are "riding shotgun" on ground vehicles hauling mail pouches between airplanes and airport mail handling facilities. The Postal Service advised our committee that in 1969, 1970, and 1971 it levied fines against 15 of the 16 U.S. domestic air carriers operating under mail contracts out of Kennedy Airport because of lax mail handling practices or for losses, such fines totaling \$450,000 in 1969, \$400,000 in 1970 and \$550,000 for the first nine months of 1971. We hope that added security steps being taken by the New York area Airport Security Council, and to its credit, will be affirmatively helpful.

As for maritime shipping, the Senate small



business committee found that industry "probably less security-conscious than either the air or truck carriers" as its estimated losses increased from \$170 million in 1969 to \$210 million in 1970 at docks, piers and warehouses.

And how are the railroads doing in this fight? Our committee's opening day of hearings last June into railway cargo thefts gave support to earlier estimates of \$250 million in losses for 1970. Witnesses said the rate of increase in rail thievery in 1970 compared to 1969 was 50 to 77 per cent higher. General Motors, one of the nation's largest shippers, said it experienced a 50 per cent increase in cargo theft and damage. It is reported vandalism loss and damage to 248,000 new automobiles being shipped by rail from assembly plants to dealer showrooms out of a total 1970 production of 2.5 million units. It is now running express-type automobile trains to stop thievery and vandalism, and packaging vehicles so they cannot be visibly detected on railroad cars, or placed inside new Vertipak cars.

Penn Central's security director, Don Nelson, reported a 54 per cent increase in thievery losses in 1970. Western Carloading, one of the nation's largest freight forwarders, said its rail thefts were up 77 per cent in 1970, a far greater increase than the 11 per cent general crime rise nationally for 1970.

There seems little doubt that the country's transport industry has become the favorite target for organized and unorganized crime. The pickings are richer and easier. Cargoes have overwhelmed facilities. Security efforts have provided little security. And that old crutch of substituting insurance payments for good security has imperiled the insurance industry in some areas and put transportation companies out of business because loss insurance was refused by underwriting companies. One insurance company, which reported only two bankruptcies of motor carriers over 30 years, recently revealed that five trucking firms went broke in 1970 because of cargo theft losses.

One insurance executive told our committee:

"... many of these things are stolen for order and they are handled by organized crime. The markets are already established and the property is absorbed into our economic system just like a huge dry sponge. It just sucks it all up and it disappears. We do not penetrate the activities of the receiver, the fences and the people in possession of this stolen property."

Certainly, the criminal redistribution "fence" system must be attacked from all directions as truck hijacks spread.

And what are some of us in the Congress trying to do to help out in this cargo carrier crime fight?

My bill, S. 942, passed by the Senate and now before the House Interstate and foreign commerce committee, would establish a Presidential-appointed Commission on the Security and Safety of Cargo, with 10 members drawn from truck, air, water and rail carriers, cargo labor unions, shippers, import-export concerns and the President's Cabinet. It provides for an in-depth, two-year examination of methods to improve security in our entire carrier system, with an interim report after one year. There are those who say the time period should be shorter, but certainly an overall examination of one of this country's greatest and most complex industries should be examined deeply and fairly if recommendations to deal with its problems in the 1970s, 1980s and beyond are to be made.

In addition to the study aspect, the bill would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish federal security standards where necessary at all airports, seaports and other commerce-associated areas when the commission concludes its work. We realize there are no overnight, magic or simple remedial measures to eliminate cargo theft and hi-

jacking, but we believe this legislation offers the broadest, most coordinated, concrete, partnership-type approach yet suggested to face up to a problem that is not getting smaller.

It would provide an opportunity for the development of innovative security methods that would be keyed, not as a hindrance to the free flow of commerce, but as an adjunct to it. Certainly, all transport modes must be examined together because they are intertwined inextricably in their daily jobs.

Another bill offering some promise as an outgrowth of our committee's 1969 hearings is the Treasury Department port security bill, S. 1654. It seeks to get at poor security at international ports, both sea and air, through Customs Bureau jurisdiction. Since this measure focuses only on one portion of the broad problem, we believe our overall approach is to be favored because of its broader application of physical security standards.

My bill, S. 2426, is designed to strike at the heart of the criminal distribution "fence" system which we believe supports truck hijackings nationwide and a substantial share of all cargo carrier thefts generally. This bill would permit transport carriers, shippers, or those lawfully in possession of goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce to recover treble damages from any person who steals them during the course of such movement or who buys, receives, or has them in his possession after they have been stolen, having knowledge of their stolen character.

Obviously, S. 2426 is the first attempt to apply the use of civil remedies to reach criminal acts associated with the fencing of goods stolen from the nation's transport system. Since I offered this bill late last year, I have had discussions with the senior Senator from Arkansas, Mr. McClellan, about this general area and the possibility that it might be included as a part of his pending "Victims of Crime Act of 1972" proposal now before his Senate Judiciary Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee. Therefore, on March 3, 1972 I introduced as an amendment to Senator McClellan's bill my own proposal broadening S. 2426 in several ways:

(1) It provides the Attorney General of the United States with the authority to enter a private civil damage suit on a class action basis for all citizens of the United States; and

(2) It grants the Federal district courts power to issue injunctive orders forcing the divestiture of business fronts or assets of those who are engaged in the purchase and resale of stolen cargo.

One of the main reasons for the introduction of legislation to reach criminal activities through civil action is that the burden of proof which must be met to obtain conviction on a charge of possession of stolen goods is so great that it sharply limits successful prosecutions for that crime. The burden of proof required in a civil action is considerably less. In other words, evidence insufficient to obtain a criminal conviction could well be strong enough to warrant a successful damage judgment in a civil action.

The treble damage provision increases the monetary risk of the fence and the buyer, resulting in a decrease of price to the thief and reduction of profit to each in the chain.

My proposal would permit recovery of damages for losses sustained as a result of the violation or conviction under the theft in interstate shipments act (18 Stat. 659), providing criminal penalties for theft or purchase of stolen goods moving in interstate commerce. It would add a civil remedy to the present criminal statute.

Briefly, my legislation is designed to help take the profit out of marketing stolen goods. Certainly, if a thief does not have a buyer to purchase or "fence" for resale his stolen or "hot" cargo, then his market will dry up. Recovery in civil damages will give to businessmen, shippers, and carriers, who pay

the brunt of losses for cargo theft, an opportunity to recover their dollar losses plus treble damages which will hit the thief, the fence or the illegal buyer where it hurts most, his pocketbook. At the same time it will tighten up the shady market area where thieves sell their multi-million dollars worth of stolen goods.

Law enforcement officials plus shipper, carrier, and insurance executives believe most of this massive cargo theft finds its way back into legitimate commerce as a result of the operations of criminal, middlemen fences.

Today, legitimate merchants, salvage companies, discount stores, as well as the more shady dealers operating behind the scenes are believed to be the link supporting widespread fence operations. It is believed that many of these merchants are engaged in selling goods which were originally stolen from interstate and foreign commerce shipments. It is charged that these merchants buy goods from middlemen fences who in turn buy directly or control the operations of thieves preying on cargo shipments from all modes of transportation.

If I remember correctly the heyday of the Al Capone reign in Chicago, he was convicted not for murder, theft, violation of the Volstead Act, or other mobster activity but for income tax evasion. Perhaps, it is time we go after the modern day cargo thieves indirectly too, as my bill proposes. Above all, this proposal would furnish a valuable addition to the arsenal of weapons our federal courts can use against those who engage in the theft of goods moving in interstate commerce, those who "fence" such goods and the buyer who deals in stolen goods.

My third bill, S. 1763, would provide airlines a "dollar sign" incentive to improve security practices by requiring them to compensate shippers at full cash value for the theft, loss or damage to cargo, thereby conforming airlines to truck, rail and maritime liability practices of cash value reimbursement.

Just as airlines are beginning to come of age in the cargo transport business, they should also be required to observe a loss compensation divorced from the horse and buggy days. Their current 50-cents-per-pound domestic liability rate is a hand-me-down from the pre-air cargo industry era back in the early 1900s. Today, international air cargo losses are compensated at \$7.52 per pound, which proves that the domestic rate is wholly unrealistic and grossly unfair to the shipping public. Whether the whole air carrier industry has yet developed a real commitment to cargo security might seem questionable. Too much of the carrier industry has not become convinced that cargo losses strike at its profit and loss statements. When they do or someone pushes them into it, we will see more affirmative movement towards a goal of adequate protection for shipments of air cargo. Some airlines have taken constructive steps. We hope the practice will spread.

Meanwhile, we believe that good security is good business for everyone's business. It would seem to be one of today's most important answers if the carrier industry is to serve the country's shipper and consumer public.

#### HEROIN MAINTENANCE? THE AMSTERDAM NEWS SAYS "NO"

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the possibility of heroin maintenance programs being imposed on the black and Spanish-speaking people of New York City

April 12, 1972

looms as a morbid shadow over Harlem. Those who falsely believe that a reduction in drug-related crime is the same as dealing with drug addiction are calling for an imposed system of free heroin. Under such a system this killer drug would be made available upon demand to those who line up twice a day for their injection of death. The 9-year-old junkie who began using heroin to escape from the misery around him will be written off. The addict who has never tried methadone or drug-free rehabilitation programs will be written off. The drug-dependent youth who have been unable to find any treatment program which addresses itself to the underlying socioeconomic, environmental, and psychological roots of addiction will also be written off—all in the name of "crime control" and "law and order."

There is much we do not know about the effects of heroin on the human body. Our doctors do not fully understand the overdose phenomenon that left over 1,000 New Yorkers dead in 1971, many of them teenagers. Our scientists are still researching the question of whether or not an individual can stabilize on heroin or, on the other hand, whether the addict will have to be given an ever-increasing dose of the drug.

Free heroin proposals ignore this type of fundamental question. We cannot morally contemplate heroin maintenance and abandon all hope that the addict can be helped. Heroin maintenance is not "treatment," it is a voluntary sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of young Americans to lives of despair and defeat.

The people of Harlem are outraged at proposals to force heroin maintenance on our community. Mr. Speaker, the Amsterdam News recently condemned the concept of free heroin in an incisive editorial which I am pleased to share with my colleagues in Congress at this time.

The editorial follows:

#### DOWN WITH FREE HEROIN

Harlem Congressman Charles Rangel has raised some serious questions about the Free Heroin experiment proposed by Mayor Lindsay and others.

"Who are the latest proponents of heroin maintenance?" asks Cong. Rangel.

"Answer: A police commissioner, a sheriff, a politician with a hard-hat constituency, a U.S. prosecutor and a Committee on Crime Prevention."

"Not one of these law-and-order folk could even remotely be considered a drug expert. It is indeed revealing that few, if any, acknowledged experts have endorsed so risky an experiment," Rangel said, in a letter to the Amsterdam News.

Rangel's attack on the Mayor's Narcotics Council and other supporters of the Free Heroin project are echoed by many community anti-drug leaders.

Andrew Henderson, Director of Operation Helping Hand, which runs a state and city-financed drug program in Harlem, has classified heroin and methadone maintenance alike as "a means to institutionalize and professionalize our destruction."

"The advocates of heroin maintenance are the parasites that feed on Black and Puerto Rican peoples' souls, but, in order to usurp us; they must first render us helpless," he finds.

On the other side, police officials, Lindsay's administration and others point out that the heroin project would include only presently

addicted persons; and that free heroin would ruin the underworld market for the drug.

After reviewing the arguments on both sides, the Amsterdam News is unalterably opposed to experiments with Free Heroin.

The drug epidemic in our society cannot be solved by avoiding the underlying issues and dealing with addicts in this fashion. Black people, young and old, escape to drugs because of the incredible oppression and the resulting frustrations caused by racial discrimination in America.

In addition, we are convinced that an experimental free Heroin Project would not represent the massive attack on the drug problem that is really needed to immediately bring relief to Black communities.

Mayor Lindsay, police officials, and others should forget the Free Heroin approach.

They should begin to realistically deal with the problems in our communities.

They should find and commit the massive funds and personnel necessary to mount an all-out attack on drugs and to place every addict under care, intensive with adequate psychological, social, employment and educational counseling.

#### TELEPHONE PRIVACY—X

#### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the Telephone Privacy Act (H.R. 14097) with 28 cosponsors.

This bill would give to individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option to require the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the names of those individuals in the phonebook who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates and organizations and opinion poll takers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individuals or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

As I noted in a statement on March 9, I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing an eighth sampling of these letters into the Record, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

SANTA ANA, CALIF.,

March 31, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I noticed an article in the Pilot, a local newspaper of Newport Beach, Cal., about the bill you are introducing to curtail telephone solicitation.

Mrs. Walton and I get sick and tired of running to the phone for that kind of calls.

Sometimes it means an interruption of our evening meal; other times we tear in from outdoors. We pay for the phone for our own, private use—not for the use of people trying to sell us something.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,

March 31, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: We heartily wish you success in your efforts to secure a "no solicitors" sign for our telephones. This is greatly needed a kind of "fifth pollution" after noise pollution (and air, water, land) a sort of "privacy pollution."

Good luck!! You have our support and thanks, if the article in the *Christian Science Monitor* is true.

And good wishes,

URSINUS COLLEGE,

Collegeville, Pa., March 25, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,  
Member of Congress, House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I recently read a brief item in the Philadelphia *Bulletin* that you are the sponsor of a bill in Congress described as "a telephone privacy bill, which would give citizens the right to be free of commercial solicitation via the telephone."

I have not seen any further information on your proposed bill, but I hope it also covers an aspect of telephone privacy which is of considerable concern to me, and that is the \$6.00 yearly charge imposed by Bell of Pennsylvania and other companies in the Bell System for unlisted telephone numbers. As I see it, a citizen who chooses to enjoy a bit more privacy in our electronic age is being penalized by this exorbitant charge. I view it as an outrageous tax on privacy about which the various state utilities commissions seem unconcerned.

My views are set forth in more detail in the enclosed copy of my letter to the editor of the *Bulletin*, a condensed version of which appeared on March 20.

I hope that your bill deals, or can be amended to deal, with this matter. I urge Congressional action.

Sincerely yours,

Associate Professor of Political Science.

FORT WAYNE, IND.,

April 4, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REP. ASPIN: I have noted recently in The *Christian Science Monitor* a good article about your bill to place a "no solicitors" sign on my telephone. I'm for it—we have been bothered no end by unsolicited phone calls, and I am no longer kind to the solicitors. In fact, I have compiled a list of companies who are intruding into the privacy of my home and refuse to deal with these companies. Recently we received a "long distance call from Chicago" from the "United States Steel Company" who turned out to be a local siding contractor! (I wrote to USS about it—they do not condone it.)

Your solution is an excellent one—I am writing to my congressman about supporting your bill. Right on!

Sincerely,

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,

April 3, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was very much interested in an article which appeared in our Rochester Times-Union regarding unwanted solici-



tions by phone, which would bar commercial firms from making these nuisance calls.

This is a very good bill which I understand you are planning to introduce, and I am sure there are many people who would be pleased to see such a bill passed.

My husband and I are elderly people (in our 80's) and such calls often come at an inconvenient time. We do own our own home, but we have always done our own repairing, or, if necessary to hire someone else, we are familiar with the "Yellow Pages" and can look the matter up for ourselves.

I am writing to our New York representative, Mr. Frank Horton, asking him to vote yes when your bill comes before the Congress.

Yours very truly,

## THE ROLE OF ENFORCEMENT IN AIR TRAVEL

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a copy of a speech given by Richard J. O'Melia, Director of the Bureau of Enforcement of the Civil Aeronautics Board before the southern regional meeting of ASTA, Inc., earlier this year. In this speech, Mr. O'Melia explains the role of enforcement in air travel and outlines innovations and improvements which have taken place in this Bureau within the past few years:

### THE ROLE OF ENFORCEMENT IN AIR TRAVEL

I am delighted to have the opportunity to meet with you today at this your first Southern Regional Meeting. I was in Chicago just last month to address ASTA's Central Regional Meeting. However, I want to assure you that my remarks today will not be a carbon copy of that speech. Instead, since this is the first chance that I have had to appear before the ASTA members in this region, I want to seize this opportunity to familiarize you generally with the functions of the Bureau of Enforcement. I want to tell you what we have done and what we are doing in enforcing the Federal Aviation Act and the regulations related to air travel—an area directly related to your own activities.

In past years, speakers would sometimes begin by saying that a speech should be like a skirt—long enough to cover the subject but short enough to make it interesting. But that was before the days of the miniskirt. I think enforcement in the travel business is too important for a mini-speech. What I hope, since I'm speaking about our activities, is that this speech will be like a peek-a-boo blouse—revealing enough to give you some good insights into our work without running afoul of the law on indecent exposure.

When I assumed the duties of Director of the Bureau of Enforcement on May 5, 1969, I recognized that no one truly likes a cop unless it's his family. To the lawbreaker you're a threat to his way of life and to the law-abiding citizen you're a tax burden who never seems to be in the right spot at the right time. So, from the very beginning, I accepted the fact that I might not be liked but, I determined to bend every effort toward being respected. Of course, respect has to be earned—earned by deeds constituting a 100 per cent effort and also by results. We are happy and proud of what has been accomplished. I am aware that comparisons are often considered odious but today, with your

forebearance, I intend to draw comparisons between the pre-O'Melia years and O'Melia—"2 years, 8 months and 25 days". My purpose is to stress that—yes, our role of enforcement in air travel has taken a tougher line. I want to substantiate that statement with some pertinent statistics and hopefully to convince you that a tougher enforcement line is in our mutual interest.

As some of you may know, the Bureau of Enforcement until recently was comprised of an Investigation Division, a Legal Division and a Consumer Complaint Section. However, in December 1970 CAB Chairman Secor Browne transferred the Consumer Complaint Sector to the new and independent Office of Consumer Affairs. This gave consumer problems new and separate attention that they merited, and sharpened the Bureau in its primary function of enforcement. The following month, January 1971, the Chairman recast the Legal Division into two distinct parts: A Formal Proceedings Division and an Informal Compliance Division. This new three-Division structure was designed to more effectively tackle the Bureau's legal workload, to produce a higher quality of work product and, at the same time, devote more Bureau effort to new areas requiring specialized enforcement attention. We recruited new talent for key staff positions and drew sharper lines of responsibility.

Let me describe briefly the work of our three divisions, beginning with the Investigation Division.

### INVESTIGATION DIVISION

The function of this Division—to conduct investigations of reported and suspected violations—is a broad and even more complex assignment. Its goal is not only to ferret out violations but more importantly to supply an evidentiary basis for proceeding in our formal and informal cases. Its staff consists of eight investigators, including the Division Chief—the same number it had in 1962, ten years ago, and only two investigators more than it had twenty years ago. Obviously, with such a limited staff, we are unable to conduct field investigations into every complaint. A substantial number of investigations are handled either through correspondence or telephone inquiries.

Lacking additional investigators and confronted with an ever expanding industry, we have found it necessary to make maximum use of our staff through improvement in techniques, utilization of modern equipment, and selection of major problem areas for massive investigations. Microfilm equipment—film recorders for copying documents—have been acquired to assist our investigators. In addition to traditional investigative techniques, questionnaires have been employed to develop information from participants on charter trips. We have found this to be an effective tool. Data obtained are being put into computers to help us analyze and retrieve information more quickly. This automatic data processing will, we hope, be of tremendous help in showing us patterns and trends in enforcement problems by types of violations and by categories of violators. And we have devoted a substantial part of our resources to breaking down major problem areas, particularly in the charter field. I expect that most of you are aware of the extensive investigations we made in 1968 and 1969 into the West Coast and East Coast charter markets. In the West Coast investigation alone, the records of 7 carriers were examined, over 100 witnesses interviewed, more than 2,000 pages of transcript were developed and over 50,000 documents were reproduced. Both of these investigations led to the issuance of cease and desist orders and the imposition of civil penalties.

Most of our charter problems have been concentrated on East and West Coasts. It is true that relatively few difficulties have been

encountered in the mid-South. I want to conclude from this that the caliber of your operators is very good insofar as observance of the charter regulations is concerned. I congratulate you on this and hope that you will keep it this way.

### INFORMAL COMPLIANCE DIVISION

The Informal Compliance Division, consisting of six attorneys, has as its primary purpose the seeking of voluntary observance of the Federal Aviation Act and the Board's regulations. Its responsibility encompasses all segments of the air transport industry. It is called upon to resolve complex legal issues of interpretation and to bring about understanding and acceptance of the law. Some 90 per cent of the violations coming to the Bureau's attention are handled informally, and these violations come in a constant stream.

To give you an idea of the volume of work involved, the Bureau last year concluded some 780 informal compliance cases and dealt with over a hundred requests for information or interpretation, many of which required both legal and factual research. We are pleased that in the predominant number of cases involving violations, the parties in question voluntarily agree to take corrective action immediately to discontinue the violation. In those circumstances, more time-consuming and more costly formal measures are unnecessary.

You may also be interested to know the major areas of violations that we deal with. Very briefly, about 25 percent of our cases involve misleading advertising and other unfair methods of competition and some 14 percent deal with tariff violations—either overcharging or unlawful rebating. Improper advertisements of pro rata charters in mass media are prevalent and harmful. We are preparing a statement on this particular problem to assist the industry, and hope to obtain ASTA's assistance in giving wide circulation to this release. Two other major areas are failure to make required reports—some 8 percent of our cases, and failure of air taxis to register—5 percent of our workload. But the single most important and most difficult area of compliance—and this is what is of primary concern to you—is in the charter field. Last year over 37 percent of our cases, of our manhours, of our efforts were dealt with the problem of charter violations. To combat this situation we need not only a vigorous enforcement program, but also a strong educational program. Air carriers, travel agents and the travelling public must all be more aware of what is permissible and what isn't. ASTA has been and can be of great assistance to us in this respect.

### FORMAL PROCEEDINGS DIVISION

The Formal Proceedings Division was created to adjudicate and litigate the more serious and flagrant violations of the Act free from other responsibilities. It has enabled specific staff attorneys to work full-time on formal proceedings and has facilitated greater emphasis on particular cases. Legal teams are now assigned to proceedings before a hearing examiner or a federal court to give each case the depth that specialized efforts can provide. Our traditional types of formal actions have benefited from the new formation and the metamorphosis has provided the Bureau with the capability to pursue new enforcement areas using relatively untried enforcement measures.

Let me be more specific. What have we done in the past year? Perhaps the most significant development of 1971 was the willingness of the Bureau of Enforcement to take certain cases to the Federal District Courts. We recognize that resorting to the court system is a drastic remedy for a regulatory agency. But we have come to realize that court proceedings are the only answer to solve certain serious problems. Accordingly, during 1971, the Bureau initiated three

court suits and participated in one other as *amicus curiae* or "friend of the court". In comparison, in the years immediately before my arrival with the Bureau, no such court actions were instituted. To help explain what type of actions the Bureau must take to court, let me briefly highlight our court actions of the past year.

In our most far reaching case, the Board, in September 1971, filed suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York against sixteen individuals and organizations charging violations of the Board's charter regulations and the Federal Aviation Act. This suit seeks injunctions to prevent the defendants from acting as indirect air carriers or indirect foreign air carriers in violation of the Act. This action represents the first time that the Board has taken direct Federal Court action against persons allegedly involved in illegally soliciting members of the general public for passage on transatlantic charter flights.

As I am sure you can appreciate, this suit is the culmination of a comprehensive investigation and lengthy trial preparation. Although certain procedural delays, including the joining as defendants of nine direct carriers, have kept the Court from issuing a decision on the merits of the case, every effort is being made to set this case for trial as quickly as possible.

This East Coast Consolidators Case, as we call it, is not the only action brought by the Board in the Eastern District of New York. As you may remember, in June of 1971, we filed suit against Alitalia seeking to enjoin the sale of youth fare tickets prior to the effective date of Alitalia's youth fare tariff. Less than two weeks after the Bureau first learned of Alitalia's activities, the Court found Alitalia in violation of the Act and indicated that the requested injunction would be signed. Following the Court's indication it was prepared to enjoin further sale of tickets, Alitalia agreed to discontinue immediately the unauthorized sales.

The one case in which the Board appeared as *amicus curiae* may be of special interest to you since it was initiated by three ASTA members in the Los Angeles area. This suit was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California and sought an injunction against a chartering organization and several individuals alleged to have been engaged in unauthorized indirect air carrier activity. Prior to filing this complaint ASTA's General Counsel consulted with us and suggested that it would be very helpful to the Court for an *amicus* brief to be filed on behalf of the Board analyzing the concept of indirect air carriage, a key issue in the proposed litigation. We were delighted to do this—both to assist our ASTA friends and, frankly to serve our own interests. We believed it would greatly assist us in future cases for the California court to issue a sound decision. We feel that our contribution was of substantial help to the court in issuing its injunction of the unlawful indirect air carriage.

Prior to the filing of that case, I and the Chief of our Investigation Division met with ASTA officials on the West Coast, and an Enforcement Attorney was sent to California to be present at the hearing in the event the Court had any further questions on this issue. The outcome of this case was the issuance of the injunction requested. As you may know, this decision has been appealed. We have filed an *amicus* brief in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and oral argument is scheduled for April 4, 1972.

You should also be aware that an injunction was sought by a number of travel agents against various "clubs" in a New Jersey state court alleging, among other things, that these clubs were holding out air transportation to the general public; that is, that the defendants were engaged in indirect air transportation without authority from the Board.

The trial court granted summary judgment for the defendants. But this was reversed and remanded by the Superior Court of New Jersey late last month. The Superior Court's ruling is of importance to you. It stated (1) that the allegations of the travel agents, if proved, would establish a violation of the Federal Aviation Act, (2) that violation of the certificate provisions of the Act gives rise to a federal course of action in favor of those injured thereby, and (3) that the state courts have jurisdiction—concurrently with the federal courts to entertain suits for violation of the certificate provisions. In that very significant New Jersey case the Board again, at the request of the Court, furnished its views as to what constitutes indirect air carriage.

This emphasis on court action does not mean that we have abandoned administrative action before the Board. On the contrary, this past year has been one of the most active on record with respect to Bureau action at the Board level. For example, since July 1, 1971, we have collected through negotiated settlements, a total of \$184,200 in civil penalties for various violations of the Act and Regulations. This sum includes \$142,000 which was collected from two supplemental carriers for certain charter flight violations. The average annual civil penalty assessments in the years prior to my coming with the Bureau was around \$40,000.

When negotiated settlements cannot be reached, the Bureau is prepared to go to trial, as it did last June against American Flyers Airline Corporation, now Universal Airlines, Inc. That proceeding resulted in a litigated Board order to cease and desist.

Another area of vital concern to the Bureau is the tremendous recent growth of the so-called private flying clubs. As you know, flying clubs which purport to be private entities operating their own aircraft for the benefit of their members, have been in existence for approximately 10 years. The failure rate on these clubs has been quite high and there have been many clubs that have gone in and out of business during this period of time.

However, several of the clubs that have survived have recently experienced tremendous membership growth largely as a result of extensive advertising in mass media, including radio, TV and nationally circulated magazines. They have also acquired large aircraft, including jets. These large aircraft are now available because the certificated carriers are converting to widebodied jets. As the size and number of flying clubs grow, so grows the Bureau's concern that such flying clubs are not true clubs, but are in fact mere devices to offer common carrier air service to the general public.

The issue involved is whether a particular flying club has gone over the line into unauthorized common carrier operations in violation of the Federal Aviation Act. We think that some of these clubs have crossed over the line. Accordingly, we have recently filed a complaint against Voyager 1000, an Indianapolis, Indiana travel club, alleging that it is engaged in air transportation without Board authority. The outcome of this case will provide guidance in future flying club cases. We intend to take a hard look at other flying clubs and will file complaints against any others we feel are operating illegally.

Part of the problem in our attempts to enforce the Act and Regulations has been an occasional inability to obtain the information and documentation necessary to form the basis of a viable enforcement case. In recognition of this, the Board on March 5, 1971, vested the Bureau with delegated authority to issue Board orders requiring the submission of documents, reports and information by U.S. carriers. Pursuant to this delegation, on March 26, 1971, I issued the first such order against Capitol Interna-

tional Airways, directing it to submit specified information and documents within 30 days. Capitol complied with this order.

While this delegated authority does not extend to foreign carriers, they are nevertheless required to furnish certain information under the regulations of the Board. In a very recent case, a foreign carrier, Laker Airways, failed to submit required information requested by this Bureau. Faced with this intransigence, the Board on December 27, issued an order requiring Laker Airways to submit charter documentation. The order declared that this action was taken because of Laker's indifference to previous informal requests of the Board's staff for information. Laker has asked the Board to reconsider this order. The Bureau is, of course, opposing Laker's motion.

Underlying our broad enforcement authority is the fundamental power under section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act to inspect books, records and facilities of all air carriers, including air taxis. In a recent instance in which this power was challenged by Basler Flight Service, Inc., an air taxi operator, the Bureau promptly filed a formal complaint seeking suspension of Basler's operation authority. Hearing was held on December 15, and this case is now awaiting decision.

It must be remembered that the Bureau has undertaken these unprecedented enforcement actions before the Board, and in the Federal courts, with a staff virtually unchanged in size from what it was twenty years ago. The Bureau's total legal staff, now numbering 12 attorneys, remains smaller than the in-house legal staffs of several individual airlines. During the same two decades the air transport industry in the United States has experienced at least a three-fold growth.

That completes my description of our three divisions and on what they do. I wanted you to see our operational plan because, as Flip Wilson would put it, "What you see is what you get". And we hope to be giving you a lot more enforcement activity that will keep the travel market free from unlawful schemes harmful to the public interest.

Before concluding I want to tell you briefly of two developments that concern and will affect your business enterprises.

#### TRANSATLANTIC COOPERATION ON CHARTER ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS

First, although we have had substantial illegal charter problems on the West Coast our most crucial current charter problems are the transatlantic flights in general and the charters between New York and London in particular. As you know, the New York-London route represents the largest charter market and, unfortunately, the enforcement problems are proportionate size.

In approaching the transatlantic charter problem, the U.S. and U.K. governments have recognized the need for tougher enforcement action to enforce in particular the affinity charter regulations. In an effort to seek cooperative, or at least complementary measures on this problem, a team consisting of a Board member, our Investigation Division Chief and me, recently went to London to conduct exploratory talks with our British enforcement counterparts. We discovered that although our approaches are basically different in many respects, the two systems do complement each other. In essence, the British try to obtain observance of their charter regulations prior to departure of the flight and direct their efforts to make the charter organization demonstrate that it is a legal affinity group. Our approach is on an *ex post facto* basis through post-flight audits, with primary attention focused on the direct air carrier. We want the direct air carrier to assure itself that the chartering group meets the Board's affinity standards.

Neither the U.K. nor the Board have authority to stop illegal charter flights prior



to departure. However, when illegal charters have been called to the attention of the carrier, in many instances the flights have been cancelled, or passengers who are not bona fide members of the chartering organization have been removed.

The British propose new regulations that will be effective this summer which will require the filing of essential documents by each organization approximately one month prior to the flight departure date. This will in turn permit the authorities to check to see whether the organizations are charter-worthy. We have in mind certain changes in the CAB regulations which, if adopted, would permit us to make pre-flight checks to isolate ineligible passengers and reveal uncharterworthy organizations.

Through the combined efforts from both sides of the Atlantic, we have hopes that many of the affinity charter problems will be brought into line. Our court complaint in New York discussed earlier should also clear the illegal charter consolidator out of the market place.

The travel group charter concept which the Board proposed on December 30, 1971, is also being considered by the British. This new concept, if approved by both countries may be in operation well before the end of this year. As you may have seen from trade publications, the U.K. is also planning to license tour organizations and is considering substantial sanctions for operators who violate the U.K. laws, including fines and imprisonment.

#### FALSE PASSENGER STATEMENTS

The second item I want to mention is that one of the most sinister and difficult devices being used, primarily on transatlantic charter flights, is the false passenger statement to conceal the ineligibility of participants on affinity charters. Passengers in many instances are being coerced by illegal charter consolidators to sign false statements as to their membership in the chartering organization in order to get on the flight. These statements are then, in turn, being employed by carriers as evidence of the charterworthiness of the charterer organization; whereas, in fact, passengers have been accepted from the general public and, in order to go on a flight, have signed false statements under duress.

Let me make it crystal clear that any air carrier that relies on this device in an attempt to legalize illegal charters are in deep trouble. We will not accept such statements as conclusive evidence of eligibility of passengers. We expect each and every carrier to make responsible checks as to all requirements on affinity charters to insure full conformance with the Board's regulations. Such other items would include check of membership records, review of bylaws, flight announcements, etc.

Under present Board regulations we do not have access to the lists of passenger names and addresses on flights by foreign carriers in advance of departure, so that it is presently not possible to make spot checks before the flights operate. This is one area in which we are requesting amendment of the regulations so that we will have this information in advance of each flight of U.S.-originating groups by foreign airlines. As for U.S. carriers, these records are, of course, available to use under the present regulations and will be requested and examined by my office when a complaint of illegality is received.

Gentlemen, I have mentioned that we are seeking a cooperative enforcement program with the British and plan to enter into talks with other European countries for the same purpose. Fruitful results from these reciprocal efforts will be of considerable help because of our limited manpower. For the same reason, we have encouraged the establishment of private enforcement machinery by the indus-

try itself. You all know that IATA has enforcement procedures and their Breaches Commission levies substantial fines on member airlines found guilty of infractions. Another example is the self-enforcement agreement between U.S. Supplemental air carriers, who are members of the National Air Carrier Association (NACA). This agreement was approved by the Board in December 1969. Under this agreement, which gives an impartial commissioner authority to impose fines on the member carriers, NACA is circulating among its members the names of non-charterworthy organizations, encouraging the member carriers to remove ineligible passengers from their charters, and is investigating complaints alleging violations. This is a constructive endeavor, and we hope that this industry will follow this example and adopt self-policing measures.

#### CONCLUSION

Ladies and gentlemen, in my opening remarks I mentioned that this would not be a mini-speech. Frankly, I don't like the maxi-skirt and I hope that I haven't covered this subject down to the ankles. But I do think it is useful for us to know each other better and for you—as key members of the air travel industry—to know what we in the Board are doing to make air transportation sound, enjoyable and prosperous. Chairman Browne and all the other Members of the Board have made clear their support of a strong enforcement program that will accomplish these ends.

We are told that our complex and heavy income tax system could not succeed without the willing cooperation of the tax payers. I am convinced that the Board's program for a growing and healthy charter industry will succeed, and I'm equally convinced that like our tax system it must rely on the wholehearted cooperation of the public and of the industry. ASTA has given us valuable support in our efforts throughout the years, which we greatly appreciate, and I want to solicit your continued assistance. As a closing thought, please watch those charters, and be on the lookout for phony or questionable affinity charters. Remember these four key points:

- (1) Affinity charters should not be the subject of public solicitation in mass media;
- (2) Affinity charter participants must be members of the affinity group for six months before flight departure;
- (3) A chartering organization should not advertise or solicit its members for a charter until a firm charter contract has been signed, and
- (4) The costs of charter flights must be prorated equally among all charter passengers.

Thank you again for this opportunity to meet with you.

#### FEDERAL PRESCHOOL AND EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS FROM A BLACK PERSPECTIVE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the following policy statement paper on preschool and early childhood programs from a black perspective was prepared and presented by an able and distinguished educator, Evelyn K. Moore, to the recent National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks.

I recommend its analysis and excel-

lent suggestions for those interested in this vital aspect of American education:

#### FEDERAL PRESCHOOL AND EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS FROM A BLACK PERSPECTIVE

A part of the new Black awareness that has grown so quickly in the past ten years is our understanding of how important it is that we raise and educate our children. We have discovered that it is a task far too important to leave to others. Because it is through education that we really maintain who we are as a people. Moreover, we have become more aware that the present configuration of the American system of education in Black communities across the country has little to do with enabling our Black children to survive in 20th century America.

Black Harvard psychologist, Dr. Chester Pierce, says, the school system has been fantastically successful in neutralizing children between ages 5 and 15. The school system was designed for that purpose and while it merely neutralizes middle class white children so that they accept the prevailing white political system, the schools generally destroy the poor and the Black altogether.

Much of the evidence we have of the importance of the first five years have been developed as part of general investigations, especially on the Federal level of ways to help all children—not just poor or Black children—become more competent. I know that I need not recount, for this audience, the history of prejudice which has masqueraded as "scientific findings." Most recently, we have had to refute the theories of genetic inferiority propounded by such person as Jensen (see Jensen, 1969). The 1971 report of the National Urban League, *The Strengths of Black Families*, refuted Moynihan and his troops.

If by the time our children reach the age of five they have not learned to survive with honor, dignity and ability, then they have already been shoved to the back of the starting line. They are beginning the long distance race with no shoes—no map of the course.

There is, in modern day America, a growing awareness of the crucial importance of healthy development in the first five years of the child's life. The purely biological arguments for the importance of this period are staggering. It is at this time that the body goes through its most crucial period of growth. Patterns, both mental and physical, are being set that can be undone only with great difficulty.

Formal early childhood programs are a relatively new thing for Black families, as noted by Black psychologist, Dr. John Dill. Throughout the first half of our history on this continent, Black children received informal care within such loose family ties as were allowed to exist. The second half of our history has seen our children generally receive informal care and a few taking part in the neighborhood settlement houses which were the only formal resource until the Economic Opportunity Act was passed in 1964.

We must now move onward and enhance our children's growth—intellectually and physically—within the Black family structure. One way we can do this is through early childhood programs.

There is a growing need, backed by a growing demand, for quality child care by an increasing number of women who, for perhaps the first time, are entering into the work force. At the present time it is estimated that there are over six million pre-school children with working mothers. This represents a 50% increase since 1960, more than 8 times as many mothers are working today than were in 1940. This includes both white and Black. Of the 6 million children under 6, about 1.2 million were Black children whose mothers were in the labor force as of March 1970. Of that total 880,000 were members of two parent families. The median in-

come of families, with the mother and father working, was \$8,179 in 1968. There were 289,000 children under 6 whose mothers were head of the household. The median family income of the female-headed family was \$3,545. One-half of all Black mothers are in the labor force at any given time as compared to less than 1/3 of white mothers. At the present time, if we were to compute the total cost for both center care and pre-school care that is needed, it would amount to approximately 2.5 billion dollars at the most.

Many welfare programs require that the mothers, as a condition for welfare services and food stamps, work. This practice too is putting a demand on federal and state governments to provide some form of child care. This care is custodial for the most part and in some cases it is much worse.

With the increased politicization of every community-based issue, new pressure groups are demanding, and rightfully so, that child development programs and institutions meet the comprehensive needs of Black children, their families and communities.

Child development must encompass not only the Black child's cognitive, physical and social need, but his psychological requirements as well. We must have programs that give self-knowledge and self-respect. And beyond his strengthened belief in self, we must have programs that give the child a greater sense of racial awareness and pride.

The only way that this can be reasonably achieved is for the community to have the decision making authority. The community can then develop educational policy which is tailored to their children's distinctive needs. As we have shown, the first five years of life are too critical to be entrusted to those for whom the Black child's interest may not be predominant. It must be entrusted to the Black community. In turn, as the community nurtures and forms child development centers; child development centers themselves become catalysts for total community development.

Because of the size of the task ahead, the present political realities, and the desperate need for some kinds of minimum standards for these programs, the federal government should be the main funding agent involved in the area of child development. Further, as Black experience in other areas has so amply shown, too often politics at the state level is a vehicle for maintaining the status quo.

Turning to the federal effort to date, what has been the recent history of these kinds of programs?

Firstly, the call for national child development came with the President's Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. This report called for a variety of steps to be taken to improve conditions for all of America's children, but the least controversial recommendations were for early childhood programs.

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, child development was a top priority of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. This report emphasized the need for parent and community involvement in the development of these kinds of programs. The real impact of this report was to help increase the national awareness of the problem, and to point up the need for comprehensive child development programs. It also put forth clear recommendations which were later included in the Comprehensive Child Development Act.

The current level of federal spending in child care and development is pitifully low, only about \$750 million. This amount of money is not adequate when we consider at least 8 million children are urgently in need of day care. It indicates that the federal commitment is a commitment in name only.

The federal programs are limited not only by their funds but by their scope; that is, by the type of child that they accept. Thus Head Start, the only significant child devel-

opment program, is limited to pre-school age children from families below the poverty level. Clearly the need transcends such arbitrary boundaries.

Head Start, the first federally funded comprehensive program, has a budget of roughly \$375 million. In the past few years it has not grown—it has only operated at maintenance level.

Dr. Edward Zigler of the Office of Child Development has estimated it would cost an additional \$1.126 billion, just to reach the Head Start target population. The target population is defined by the government as pre-school children whose families' income is below poverty level as established by OEO. Thus, nearly 1.6 million poor children in the Head Start age group would be eligible for the program if there were enough funds available. At the current level, only 240,000 children are served by Head Start. Of the 240,000 children 80,000 children are in full-day-year-round programs. Only about half of these children are Black.

In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Children, Dr. Edward Zigler said that "very little" present day care under Title IV-A is developmental.

These then are the main federal programs that bear on child development. Of Title IV-A expenditures, 60% provide care for children in their own homes, e.g., babysitter; 30% provide care in other people's home and very little of this care is developmental. Only 10% or less is spent on center care. We should briefly note here however; that there are other small expenditures for similar programs, but they do not add significantly to the amounts that we have discussed above. These smaller programs are to be found under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; under Model Cities, and in CAP (Community Action Program) versatile funds.

Let us turn for a moment and examine child care programs under the Social Security Act. This is Title IV-A which provides money and services for child welfare. To be eligible for these programs children must come from families under the Assistance to Families with Dependent Children, or under the Work Incentive Program (WIN). These are administered through the states, which pay 25% of the total costs. In fiscal 1971 the combined federal and state expenditures for the WIN programs were about 54 million dollars. For the non-WIN programs were, about 205 million dollars. When one considers the awesome magnitude of providing comprehensive child development, it is clear that the cost per child in these programs is not adequate. The Social Rehabilitation service, the federal agency that administers this program, has estimated the cost per child under Title IV-A in FY 71 to be \$833.00. This they estimated to be "lower than would be required to provide adequate care."

As anyone in the field is aware, there is a debate taking place around the country on this whole question of child development. There are conferences, study groups, and pending federal action that enter into the exchange, and suggest various alternatives for action. In the next section we will examine the issues at the center of the federal government's own consideration of child development programs. These include fundamental questions arising in the Office of Child Development of HEW, debates within the Congress, and between the Congress and the Executive.

This last category, the fundamental conflict between the Congress and the present Administration, is the most basic and the most clear cut. The sides are clear: Are child development laws necessary and wise? The Congress says yes. President Nixon says no.

Last year a bipartisan majority of both the House and the Senate passed a comprehensive child development Bill as part of

the OEO extension. The bill would have authorized a \$2 billion appropriation for new child development programs. This program would be preceded by an initial planning and "gearing up" year supported by a \$100 million authorization. Both Houses of Congress approved of the measure. President Nixon vetoed the bill.

Although the President's reasoning was totally predictable, we will recite his pale attempt to justify the veto. In this way one sees the political assumptions which inform his decisions on public policy. These biases will certainly have a bearing on the already uncertain future of child development programs. We must remember here that though we discuss figures and dry-sounding programs, what we are really talking about are our children. How are they to grow and learn?

Firstly, the Administration said there was no demonstrated need. This is in direct conflict with his own White House Conference and his own Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children. Secondly, he said the legislation was administratively unworkable, with the States relegated to an insignificant role. And what does he mean by administratively unworkable? He means that the legislation placed the correct emphasis on local control and flexibility to meet community needs. It gave the parents of the children decision making authority in program planning and operation. Thirdly, he says he vetoed the bill because it duplicates his child care programs and his welfare "reform" program. These programs can generally be described as custodial. Their purpose is to provide a place where welfare recipient can deposit their children as they go to required jobs, under HR I. Even less convincing is his last argument, that the proposals weaken families by substituting "communal approaches" to child rearing for family-centered approaches. This is clearly only a mask to cover his own opposition to the parent control element in the legislation. This destruction of the family that he speaks of is in fact at the heart of his own welfare package, since mothers will be forced to leave their children under its terms.

That President Nixon could veto the child care legislation proves that all of the rhetoric about "a commitment to the first years of life" is empty sloganeering. And it shows us that in a political year the President is more concerned about short-range political goals such as claiming the rightwing opposition, than long-term human investment in the lives of our youngest and most vulnerable children. His veto demonstrates that he has established and perpetuates a vicious double standard.

On the one hand he says that poor children can be shunted into custodial warehouses while their mothers are forced out of the home and into low-paying, demanding jobs. While on the other hand, middle class children should stay home with their mothers who can better see to their development needs.

On the one hand he commits billions of dollars to military weapons, defense systems and space shuttles, all in the name of our superiority, while on the other hand he will not spend even 2 billion dollars on the development of our young children and the support of their families. It has been said the best measure of the worth of a nation is "the concern of one generation for the next". With such double standards and deception for our youth program, it is clear that the worth of this nation is under unlightened leadership.

But regardless of the Administration, there are those within and outside of Congress who still believe that Comprehensive Child Development legislation tasks will be critical to Black children. Essentially it involves the same basic issues which were debated and resolved in the bill which was passed (only to be vetoed in the White House) last year.



Such legislation, and the programs which evolve from it, must be directed to the needs of the child first and foremost, not to the needs of the state to provide convenient storage space for children while parents are forced to work in demeaning jobs. It must be directed towards the needs of the child regardless of the income or work status of the parents. All children, not merely poor children, should benefit from child development programs.

Child oriented programs should be comprehensive, high quality, and developmental. They should facilitate the cognitive, social, emotional, and physical growth of the child. If we examine the bill which was passed last year, we can see that it met many of these criteria. It set high standards, it included the participation of parents, moreover eligibility was not dependent upon the work status of the parents.

What are the critical needs, then, and how are they specifically met by the bill introduced last year?

Most basic to any program is its planning and its funding mechanism. The essential decision-making authority in the planning, development, and operation of CD programs must be the parents. They know the needs of their children. This requires power to act and follow through. It does not mean advisory roles which are totally inadequate and unacceptable. At least two thirds of all policy bodies must be parents. Last year's bill set up Child Development Councils, with parents comprising one-half of the membership, to make decisions at the administrative prime sponsor level. Project Policy Committees, one-half of the members being parents, with parent approval of the non-parent members, make decisions at the program level. This includes planning, staffing, program content, budget, evaluation, location of facilities and other elements.

Federal funds must go directly to local sources. They must not be channeled through the states. The state government bureaucracy has proved totally unresponsive to the needs of Black children, their parents, their communities. Most have failed miserably in the Administration of the Title IV-A day care funds. The vetoed bill established a prime sponsorship mechanism which allowed any unit (or combination of units) of local government serving a population of at least 5,000 to apply directly to the federal government for funds for child care. Decisions on types of programs, projects to be funded, and children to be served would be made according to a locally-developed plan.

In line with the Administration's philosophy, and their use of "block" grants to the states, Republicans, especially in the House, advocate a prime sponsorship which would leave the states operating programs in all but the largest cities.

In line with the position on direct local funding, priority for funding must go to non-profit community groups representative of the children to be served. Franchisers and proprietors of any kind who seek profits from child development programs should not receive federal funds. While the bill itself made some community groups eligible for funding, it did not give them priority.

The President indicated in his veto message that families seeking child care should look first to the "private, open market", and like some in Congress, sees the federal role limited to vendor or voucher payments for welfare children, rather than direct funding of community-based programs.

To best meet the need of the local community and its residents, it follows that programs must employ persons from the community that it serves. These include both professional and para-professional positions, and must include in-service training and career ladder opportunities. These needs were

adequately met in the vetoed bill, and included separate funds for training.

It is crucial for the future development of all children in America that these kinds of programs be available to all children who need them. Child development legislation is not just another poverty or welfare program. Services should be available free for families who cannot afford to pay for them (at least up to the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard budget). Moderate fees could be charged, on a sliding scale for those who could afford to pay.

The legislation which did pass the Congress last year went a long way to create a national system of comprehensive child development which is rooted in the needs of the local community. Until this bill or one quite similar to it is put into law, child development will remain just a hollow phrase and an empty promise.

Lastly, let us turn our attention briefly to the (OCD) Office of Child Development activities which have impact for Black children, families and community child development programs.

OCD's stated objective is to develop realistic day care standards that are enforceable. It is obvious though that their real objective is to lower day care standards to provide cheaper, low-quality care when welfare "reform" is implemented. It will, for example, increase the child-staff ratio, which is a major expense in child care programs. But a low-child-staff ratio, can be the most efficacious part of the CD program. Further, it would exempt family day care homes from even meeting these minimum standards. Presently, only about 50% of these homes are licensed or supervised. Yet these are the types of facilities which most children will probably be condemned when welfare "reform" is implemented. OCD would also try to reduce the parent role in decision-making, especially in programs operated by proprietors and profit-makers.

In terms of evaluative schemes to determine the most effective form for licensing facilities, most approaches do not include community people at any level of the procedure.

The OCD task force is trying to provide a model to states to clean up and modernize the hodge-podge of state and local codes which have grown through the years. These codes are frequently duplicative and irrelevant to the real issues of comprehensive child care, and effectively exclude community-operated programs in many areas.

Their method in this venture is to contract with a large white consulting firm in Seattle to run a series of meetings in San Francisco, Denver, San Antonio, and Miami for various task forces. These task forces are composed of state and local welfare and licensing officials, day care profit-makers, professionals, federal bureaucrats, and non-community consultants. Participation by minority representatives have been refused. They only agreed to subcontract for community input after a group went to the San Antonio Conference to confront Dr. Zigler and to protest his agency's exclusionary methods.

In the area of research for Child Advocacy Projects, the picture is as dismal. In their investigations into what child advocacy means, most contracts went to universities, educators, and almost none to community groups or minorities. Again, officials tell the community what the community needs and what the community wants. Predictably, useless and self defeating guidelines are the results.

In the development of para-professional and associate degrees which would potentially, enable community and minority parents and others to develop credentials through in-service training, the plan to train Child Care Associates ignored community involvement.

What we see here is a picture of an executive who is totally insensitive to the needs of the nation's young Black children, and federal agencies which are only better by comparison. Though the comprehensive child bill was vetoed when it came out of the Congress, our need for such a bill has not been vetoed. We must have a comprehensive child development program which meets the needs of the Black child in his or her community. We must have total community involvement and control at every level of program planning and implementation. Anything less, and so-called child care programs will be little more than custodial waystations where poor working mothers are forced to take their children on the way to work.

We must develop child care programs which are in no way separate nor detached from the community which they serve. The community must guide and support the child care centers, and the center, in turn, will do their share to give sustenance to their own Black community.

## MODEST BUT DYNAMIC GOODLING

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague in this House of Representatives, GEORGE GOODLING, has a host of friends, and one of these recently called my attention to an article that was written on GEORGE GOODLING by Walter L. Reinecker of Mechanicsburg, Pa., and appeared in the April 4, 1972, issue of the News Chronicle. This is a prominent semi-weekly newspaper that is published in Shippensburg, Pa.

The title of this article is "What Makes Goodling Run? It is a Challenge, He Says." This article provides some interesting insights into GEORGE GOODLING, the private citizen, and it sheds some light on how his career as a public servant was launched.

All of us are aware that while GEORGE GOODLING is extremely dynamic and competent in his congressional service, he is exceedingly modest. And because his humility would prevent him from calling this very fine article to the attention of anyone, I am taking the liberty of introducing it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commending it to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The article follows:

WHAT MAKES GOODLING RUN? IT'S CHALLENGE, HE SAYS

I'd like you to meet a friend of mine.

His name is George A. Goodling, and he's our U.S. Congressman from the 19th District of Pennsylvania. He's a fruit farmer, a father and a grandfather, and a friend to the little people and to the people in high places. He keeps vigorously engaged in sports, works 12 to 14 hours most every day, and can "run rings" around a lot of men half his age. He's a man with a simple, down-to-earth philosophy of using common sense in complex situations. He's honest and sincere and dedicated to his job, which he calls "one of the most fascinating things that a man can do with his life."

"Dad always says exactly what he thinks," says his son Bill. "He wouldn't tell a woman that her hat was pretty if he didn't really

think that it was. But when he does say something—you know that he means it."

"I've been serving Mr. Goodling in this same dining room for a good many years," says a waitress in an area hotel, "and it's been a pleasure every time."

"I was having trouble getting birth certificates for my sister and myself," says another woman, "and then somebody suggested that I write to my Congressman. Well I wasn't sure if it would do any good. We'd been trying to get the certificates for so long. But anyhow I did write to Congressman Goodling, and he took care of it—in about three weeks too—and he didn't know us personally at all—but he still was interested enough to give the matter his personal attention."

The George A. Goodling story begins quite a few years ago in the little town of Loganville, not far from York, where he was born. "When I was a boy," he says, "I worked many a day on a farm for 75 cents a day, and that was from sun-up to sun-down too. And then the farmer would usually have a job or two for us to do even after the evening meal—like unloading a couple of loads of hay—or something like that."

Mr. Goodling joined the U.S. Navy in 1918 and was sent to a training station at Cape May, N.J., where he remained until the war was over. "I did everything I could think of to get overseas," he says, "but since the war was kind of winding up, I was just kept there at the training station."

George and his wife were married in 1918, and his wife stayed at home and worked in a sewing factory while he was in the service. Following his stint in the Navy, he finished his college years at The Pennsylvania State University, and then took his first job in Delaware as a teacher of Vocational Agriculture in a high school there. "Agriculture teachers got a little more than the other teachers in those days," he says, "but when I tell people what my starting salary was, they can hardly believe it. I started for \$1,600 a year, and it was a 12 month job—not a nine month one. Actually my wife and I lived pretty well on that salary, but of course a dollar went a whole lot farther then."

"I enjoyed the teaching," he continues, "but an offer came up for me to operate a good-sized fruit farm, and I thought \* \* \* the man who owned the fruit farm died and I went home to try and start my own fruit farm."

"It's not an easy thing to start a fruit farm from scratch. In fact it's almost impossible. You need some capital behind you. Well, my dad operated a store and also trucked chickens to Baltimore for sale, so I began to work for him until I could get started with my farm. You have to wait quite awhile until your fruit farm is able to support you and itself. You can't plant trees that are ready to bear. You have to wait—as patiently as you can—for maybe five or six years."

"I planted every tree on that farm with a pick and shovel. I guess you might call it the hard way—but I really enjoyed doing it. And when those trees began to grow and flourish, it gave me the greatest feeling. There's all kinds of fancy equipment today, but in those days you dug a hole, and you put the tree into it, and then you just hoped for the best."

"Weather is a big worry on a fruit farm—early spring frost—that's bad. And a bad hail storm can wipe you out in just about a minute. And there's not a thing in the world you can do to protect the trees from hail. I only ever lost one peach crop since I started my orchard back in 1923—and that was in 1936. Temperatures dropped way down below zero along toward the end of February, and the peach trees just couldn't take weather like that."

"Lots of people ask me how I ever got into politics, and I always laugh and say

the same thing. That's a good story, I always say."

"I was attending a lodge meeting one night, and the state committeeman was there too, and he was a good friend of mine. Well, we got to talking and he said that they didn't have anybody to run for a seat in the General Assembly. And just like that I said—I'll run. Well, I had no more of an idea of running for the Assembly than I did of flying to the moon. But the next morning he was at my home with petitions. I decided to give it a try. That was in 1943, and I've been in politics ever since."

"And the way I got to Congress is another story of the same kind. I was out in the orchard spraying the trees one day. I still remember the day. It was dark and cold, and somebody from my house came up in the orchard and told me that one of my friends wanted me to come right down and call him on the phone. I had no idea what he might want, but I went down and called him, and he said that he wanted me to come into his office right away. So I went—just the way I was—in my farm clothes. And when I got to the office he said, 'you're going to be our next candidate for Congress.'"

"So I said to him and the other men in his office—well, boys, you've got to give me a minute or two to think this one over. But the next day I told them that my answer was yes. I think I said yes because it was a challenge, and I always have liked to rise up to meet a challenge. Also it was an opportunity to serve, and it seems to me that you can't say no to something like that. And then, of course, I really enjoyed my years with the General Assembly in Harrisburg."

"I've always liked to take part in sports. I used to play a lot of baseball when I was young. I played in high school and in other leagues. Everybody used to call me 'Jim' then. Funny how I got the nickname. When I was a kid, I worked in a butchershop. And the butcher, who was a real nice old fellow, started to call me Jimmy. Everybody picked up the nickname and it stuck with me."

"I work hard—and I like to work hard—but I still enjoy sports. And really, I think that is the thing that keeps me going strong—the fact that I like vigorous exercise. Every day, if I possibly can, I take time for exercise. I usually play paddle ball, and say now, that's a strenuous game. We get regular checkups down in Washington, you know, and my doctors are always amazed at the good physical condition that I'm in. And I tell them it's the paddle ball that does it."

"I play paddle ball a lot with Congressman Bob Mathias from California. He was an Olympic champion twice, you know. And you know what, sometimes I beat him, too, and he's considerably younger than I am, of course."

"I've always enjoyed being outdoors. I've raised Beagle dogs, too, and I belong to several Beagle Clubs. Whenever I take the dogs out on field trials, well I'd run right along with the dogs."

"I've never done too much sitting around. I'm the world's worst sitter. The other Sunday afternoon I was sitting at home alone—and all of a sudden it seemed silly to be sitting around like that when there was work to do—so I packed my shirts—and I went to Washington and went to my office to work for a while."

"Almost every evening when I'm in Washington, and there is no other meeting that I have to attend, I'm in that office of mine—working. I can dictate letters then. It's quiet, and it's a good time to work."

"I'd say without any hesitation that the last 10 years have been the highlights of my life. I've done so many interesting things,

and I've met the greatest people in the world."

"I've been able to travel and see a whole lot of the world, too. I've attended agricultural meetings in London and in Mexico City, and one great trip took a group of us to 18 countries in Africa in 18 days."

"This job (U.S. Congressman) is the most fascinating job that any man can have if he's willing to take a beating and work about 15 hours a day for six or seven days a week. It's rewarding and satisfying to be living a life of service."

Mr. Goodling would like to go back down to Washington after the next election and roll up his sleeves and get back to work.

## ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM IS ECONOMIC SUICIDE

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that our international finances are in a bad way. Our balance of payments is running in the neighborhood of a \$20 billion annual deficit. In many of the basic industries in which we were once preeminent, the Japanese and the Europeans produce comparable quality goods at lower prices. In some areas, such as low-cost consumer electronic and photographic equipment, we have abandoned the field entirely. Aircraft and computers are about the only areas in which we continue to lead the world.

There are a number of reasons for this. American labor has priced itself out of the market. American business has been too timid in its investment policies. American research and development, the one thing we can do better than anyone else, has been channeled into military programs which have only given us the ability to seek out military involvements which have still further degraded our balance of payments. Now that the aerospace business is being reduced, we find our priceless engineering and scientific talent unemployed or driving taxicabs, because we are not set up to use it for constructive purposes.

The solutions to these problems are not obvious, and the execution of a new plan will doubtless prove more difficult than the description. Business must become more venturesome and labor must adjust itself to the reality of the market. We need to approach economic conversion in a systematic and foresighted manner.

But instead of dealing with our problems as best we can a measure has been introduced which proposes to ignore them. The Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972 proposes the most severe protectionist measures we have seen in 40 years.

In effect, it proposes almost complete economic isolationism. It would allow country-by-country quotas on imports which tend to reduce U.S. production of comparable products. Other nations could and would then retaliate with similar restrictions against our most competitive products, and our participation in world trade would be ended.



The Wells-Fargo Bank of California has done an excellent analysis of this most ill-advised bill, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

OVERKILL OR OVERCURE?

If Congress were to pass the Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972—the Burke-Hartke Bill—the action might be compared with cutting off one's head to cure a cold.

The Bill was framed, with the support of U.S. labor leaders, to alleviate unemployment in the United States by curtailing imports from abroad that compete with American goods, and by either restraining American companies from investing in facilities abroad or adding to the tax burdens of those that do produce abroad.

GIST OF BILL

As its purpose, the Burke-Hartke Bill proclaims it will "ensure that the production of goods which have traditionally been produced in the U.S. is continued and maintained". The Bill would accomplish that purpose by:

1. Establishing a new agency with authority to levy country-by-country quotas on imports which tend to reduce U.S. production of comparable products.
2. Repealing the tax credit now available to U.S. companies that manufacture abroad and pay foreign income taxes. Thus, if a U.S. company paid \$50 in foreign income tax on foreign earnings of \$100, it would immediately have to pay full U.S. tax on the remaining \$50, leaving an after-tax profit of only \$26.
3. Requiring straight line depreciation of property located outside the U.S., thus further increasing the tax burden on overseas investments of American firms.
4. Authorizing the President to prohibit any transfers of capital and to prohibit holders of U.S. patents from producing or using the patented product outside the U.S. whenever it is believed such actions would reduce the level of U.S. employment.

LESSONS OF THE PAST

The Burke-Hartke Bill is, in essence, the most protectionist piece of foreign trade legislation to come before the U.S. Congress since the Smoot-Hawley tariff law of 1930. It is no exaggeration to state that its enactment in the current form would destroy in one blow the entire structure of international economic cooperation that has been painstakingly erected during the past 25 years, and which has brought unmatched prosperity to the industrial nations.

Construction of this international economic structure was spearheaded by the U.S.; it has been based on liberal economic principles developed over more than a century by trial and error. The Smoot-Hawley Bill and the protectionism of the 1930's are considered to be among the more disastrous errors. Though far from perfect and suffering at times from great strains, the current international economic structure has served the world well during the past 25 years.

WILL IT SOLVE THE PROBLEM?

An unemployment level of 6% is intolerable, but it is the price the U.S. economy is paying for the "guns and butter" policies of the past. There is no reason to believe it is other than a temporary condition. Unemployment is showing signs of improvement now and may gradually drop to 5% by the end of this year and to 4-4½% during 1973.

OR CREATE WORSE ONES?

One thing that could impede this economic recovery would be collapse of the Smithsonian Accord attained in December 1971, when the U.S. agreed to devalue the dollar in return for currency realignments by other nations. Subsequently, trade negotiations have continued and some concessions have been gained by the U.S., which

will boost the strength of our products in world markets and make our goods more competitive with imports at home. Certainly, passage of a protectionist trade bill by the U.S. at this critical juncture would destroy the cornerstone of this delicately structured series of agreements and create havoc in the sphere of world trade and investment.

ECONOMIC SETBACK

In brief, the Burke-Hartke Bill could set the world economy back 40 years. The usual results of trade quotas would ensue—higher prices, windfall profits, an inefficient allocation of resources, loss of real income and prompt retaliation by our trading partners.

As is true of trade in goods, exchange of patents and technology is also a two-way street and an interruption in their free movement would hurt both the U.S. and the rest of the world. Had the prohibition about exchanges of patents and technology been in force a few years ago, for example, U.S. auto manufacturers would probably not be experimenting with the German-developed Wankel engine today and foreign manufacturers would have a tremendous lead in work on this innovation.

THE BATTLE OF STATISTICS

Data regarding the effects of U.S. foreign investment are rife—labor cites cases where plants have been closed because they could no longer compete with imported goods or where they have been moved overseas. Business counters that only about 8% of the goods produced by U.S. subsidiaries abroad returns to the United States, and that a large share of it comes from Canada where wages are comparable with ours—indeed, where the unions are allied with ours. Business contends that most often, an American firm invests in facilities overseas to tap the markets in that country, markets that would be inaccessible to U.S.-produced goods at U.S. prices. Manufacture of components for overseas assembly also provides many jobs here at home, according to business spokesmen.

Questions have been raised about the social and political desirability of huge multinational corporations. The growth of multinationals to the point where they begin to rival nations in power and influence does indeed raise many interesting and difficult problems.

It is doubtful that the trend toward most efficient use of resources through global production can be reversed, although it may be changed and new methods of international supervision and accountability may be developed. This is a fruitful area for study, but purely punitive measures such as are forwarded in the Burke-Hartke Bill may distort the scene so badly that meaningful study and improvement cannot be made.

CONCLUSION

Argument about whether imports and U.S. foreign investment displace workers could continue endlessly, with persuasive data put forward by both sides. More significant is the fact that labor did not think this was the case and, in fact, traditionally has supported free trade and investment until the recent recession and the accompanying balance of payments and unemployment problems.

Most thoughtful observers seem to believe that if the U.S. gets its domestic economy in order and continues to use friendly persuasion in gaining trade concessions from its partners abroad, our workers and plants can compete successfully with all comers. Where individual companies cannot produce competitively, government sponsored incentives and assistance may be required on a case basis to bring them into more efficient production. More study is also needed on the questions raised by the trend toward multinational corporations.

But lowering the curtain on all free trade and investment is no answer; it is an invitation to disaster.

NDC PLATFORM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, one of the critically important areas in the platform of the New Democratic Coalition is that of women's rights. At every level of society, in all professions and occupations, and in each aspect of everyday life, women are blatantly discriminated against and with relative impunity. The women's movement has been a manifestation of the growing awareness and creativity of those who have perceived that their lives are valuable and important, and that they, too, as women, have a tremendous contribution to make to the world.

The primary thrust of the women's movement, however, is not restricted to women but encompasses all peoples. The movement has as its goal the liberation of our entire society from the chains of all past traditions, practices, and prejudices which deny the humanity of individual citizens.

The practical problem we face at this juncture is that of the imbalance of financial, political, and corporate power. This power is today held by groups of rich and powerful men who exert extraordinary political influence. These power brokers resent the women's movement as they have resented every movement in history which was designed to liberate an oppressed group from its oppressors. Their fight is for the status quo: to retain their positions and influence so that they may continue to control the lives of others for their own ends. This kind of oppression can no longer be tolerated, for as long as any group in society is oppressed, all are oppressed.

Several things must be done to correct the lopsided balance of power, the first of which and the most basic is that as a matter of national policy Congress and the Executive must recognize that all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship accrue to every woman regardless of her age or marital status. Without that explicit recognition which is embodied in the equal rights amendment, all the unenforced legislation and Executive orders directed at alleviating the problem of discrimination against women are meaningless. With the final ratification of the equal rights amendment, women will be able to go into the courts of this land to fight for their rights. They will no longer have to depend upon the whim of the male power structure in the legislative and executive branches.

Along with a strong articulation of national policy, there must be specific programs which address themselves to the wrongs to be eradicated and promote affirmative, creative efforts to solve the problems which are rooted in the terrible institution of discrimination. A woman as well as a man must be free to choose her own destiny; she must be free to create a style of life uniquely hers, and not be the fulfillment of someone else's

concept of what a woman should be and how she should live.

Underlying all efforts to abolish discrimination, there should be a commitment to actively eliminate sex role typing in all aspects of our culture, so that as a practical matter occupations, professions, and activities of all sorts will become sex neutral. The result of this would be a benefit for society as a whole: Talents that hitherto had been hidden because of inhibitory and repressive social structures would be revealed, and we all would be the richer for it.

We support a challenge to all hierarchical structures. We oppose dictatorships in political parties, schools, businesses, unions, and urge instead development of new forms of organization which affirm the contribution of the individual.

In order to make concrete the substantive changes in our social order so that they reflect a new and real commitment toward woman's equality, we believe that the following programs must be implemented by the Federal and State legislatures:

First, we must make every effort possible, in every State, to ratify the equal rights amendment.

Second, there must be prompt enforcement of all Federal statutes and Executive orders barring job discrimination. All companies subject to Federal law in regard to hiring practices, should be required to begin affirmative action programs immediately to employ women where they are not adequately represented in the work force. This is especially necessary with regard to management, professional, and technical positions. Deadlines for affirmative action programs should be imposed without delay. The Federal Government should stop breaking its own laws and withhold contracts and deposits from firms guilty of discrimination on the basis of sex.

Third, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission should be funded and staffed at a level that would accomplish the goals set forth in the recently passed EEOC legislation. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be extended to cover Government, religious institutions, and other employers now exempted. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 should cover all workers including professionals, executives, and administrators. The Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to grant minimum wage protection and overtime pay standards to domestic and service workers, farm laborers and employees of non-profit institutions. A special division should be set up in the Labor Department to study the problem of women's unemployment and make recommendations that will be followed by the various Federal agencies and that will result in legislation by the Congress.

Fourth, we fully support and affirm that a woman has a complete and inalienable right to control her own body and to decide whether or not to bear a child. We call for an end to forced sterilization. We also call for an end—the total elimination—of any laws in regard

to abortion other than those already covering suits for malpractice. The Federal Government has a positive obligation to make low cost contraceptives available to females and males of all ages, and to institute and maintain a liberally funded public education campaign on sex and contraceptives.

Fifth, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be amended to eliminate discrimination against women in public accommodations and all federally assisted programs.

Sixth, as a matter of right the Federal Government should provide well staffed and well funded child care centers for all children. These centers should be educational, recreational, or a combination of both in accordance with the choice of the parent. The Internal Revenue Code must be amended to allow mothers who work, widows, widowers, divorced or separated men and women with the responsibility for children, and disabled, foster, or adopted parents to deduct all child-care expenses.

Seventh, Federal legislation is needed to prohibit discrimination against women in all phases and at all levels of education. Here too, the Federal Government should stop breaking its own laws and begin to withhold funds from educational institutions which discriminate against women.

Eighth, all inequities in our social security system must be corrected. All companies subject to Federal law in regard to hiring practices should be barred from discriminating on the basis of sex or marital status with regard to fringe benefits, pensions, health insurance, and life insurance. Health insurance programs should cover abortions and maternity benefits regardless of a woman's marital status. Women should not be required to take maternity leave against their wishes, nor be prevented from utilizing paid accumulated sick leave in lieu of maternity leave, nor be denied or fired from their jobs because they take maternity leave.

Ninth, discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit either by banks or other businesses subject to Federal regulation or by Government agencies must be forbidden and made subject to criminal sanctions.

The Democratic Party itself must take a leadership role in implementing reforms within its own party and convention structure. The party must make an unconditional commitment to run more women—at least 50 percent of their candidates—for party and public office. Wherever possible at least 50 percent of all major administrative and policymaking positions should be staffed by women; to this end we support a nationwide talent search by the party for women. We support and endorse guaranteeing women 50-percent representation among the delegates to national party conventions.

On this platform we take our stand. We must not—and shall not—support any candidates who refuse to give it their unqualified support and endorsement:

The platform, 1972, follows:

NEW DEMOCRATIC COALITION NORTHEAST REGIONAL CONFERENCE PLATFORM 1972

PLATFORM OF THE NORTHEAST CONFERENCE OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC COALITION—A BLUEPRINT FOR FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE

The platform of the New Democratic Coalition is based on one simple thesis: the institutions in this country are so structured that some people have too much money and power, most people have too little. Therefore, in essence, we offer only one platform recommendation—that the power imbalances between people and groups be eliminated. The fight against the concentration of power and privilege—open and covert, legal and illegal—is the most important political question of our time. Our goal is a more equitable distribution of wealth and power. This fight for fairness is political; it can be won only by organizing a new political majority in America.

Our present institutions and policies which guarantee power and money to a few, force the rest of Americans to struggle with each other for the little that is left. We must understand that such a struggle between underprivileged groups, fighting over crumbs for minimal survival, will solve no problems, and as we have seen is counter-productive. The purpose of this platform is to focus attention on the solution—a joining together of those without power and adequate resources to change our institutions to bring about a rebalance.

We feel that the best advocates of people's needs and aspirations are the people themselves, acting from positions of equal power. This is so whatever the group—be they Vietnamese or African, labor or the poor, neighborhood or ethnic, Chicanos or the aged.

Our platform deals first with corporate power, the underlying source of the unjust concentration of wealth and power, and then with labor. Next we consider campaign financing and other devices by which the powerful control government and make it impossible for government to deal with corporate power and other basic problems. The redistribution of wealth and income is the next major topic. It has two parts: the inequitable manner in which the government raises its revenues through taxation and in which such monies are then spent by the government. This is followed by sections dealing with the rights of women, institutional racism and the governmental abuse of citizens. We conclude with a section on foreign policy, which illustrates how the imbalance of power manifests itself in this critical area.

This platform is a serious effort to state the intrinsic problems facing our society and to outline a method of dealing with them. This platform can be a basis of the campaign for the presidency in 1972 and a blueprint for the solution of our society's problems.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Members of the Platform Committee: Arnold Weiss, NDC-NY, co-chairman; Bernard Sorokin, Caucus of Connecticut Democrats, co-chairman; John Nelson, NDC of Rhode Island, Lois Redisch, NDC of New Jersey, Jerome Grossman, Massachusetts PAX, Charlotte Abbott, NDC of Pennsylvania, Larry LaMotte, Maryland NDC, Sonia Sloan, NDC of Delaware, Jack O'Connor, Washington NDC, Marvin Gross, Mass. PAX, Mimi Kazon, NDC-NY, Igor Sikorsky, CCD.

Miriam Butterworth, CCD, Linda Davidoff, NDC-NY, Anne Feldman, NDC-NY, Sanford Gottlieb, Maryland NDC, Ealine Horowitz, NDC-NY, Bonnie Lobel, NDC-NY, Stan Glowiak, NDC of Delaware, Ann Montero, NDC-NY, Libby Moroff, NDC-NY, Bill Murphy, NDC-NY.



*Witnesses at the Platform hearings*  
Poverty, Race, and the Cities: New York,  
October 6, 1971

Dr. David Gordon, National Bureau of Economic Research; Howard Samuels, New York Off Track Betting Corporation; Senator Fred Harris; Professor Harry Becker, Albert Einstein Medical College; Steve Schreiber, Chairman, NDC-NY Health Services Committee; Jane Benedict, Metropolitan Council on Housing; State Senator Sidney von Luther; Dorothy Pitman Hughes, Committee for Community Control of Day Care Centers; Joseph A. Ruskay, National Board, ADA; Leon Davis, Local 1199, Drug and Hospital Employees Union; A. N. Harris, author; Victor Gotbaum, District Council 37, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; Senator Edmund Muskie; Senator George McGovern; Maria Lopez, South Bronx Community Corporation; Dr. Thomas Hartmann, Rutgers University; Mel Rivers and Fran Christman, Fortune Society.

*Slums and Suburbs: Philadelphia,*  
September 21, 1971

Paul D'Ortona, City Council President; Drayton S. Bryant, Planning and Housing Consultant; William Taylor, Center for National Policy Review; Yale Rabin, Urban Planning Consultant; Michael Davidson, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund; Augustus Baxter, Architects Workshop; Professor William Grigsby, University of Pennsylvania; Gordon Cavanaugh, Philadelphia Housing Authority; Nate Smith, Community Action, Pittsburgh; Glenn Claytor, National Urban League; Rose Wylie, National Tenants Organization; Paul Rie, Housing Authority of Chester County.

W. Roy Newsome, Department of Community Affairs, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; W. Wilson Goode, Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement; Richard Wade, urban historian, CCNY; Damon Childs, Philadelphia City Planning Commission; Louis Waldman, Department of Environmental Resources, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Annette Altschuler, Homeowners Association of Philadelphia; Fred Drudding, Whitman Park Civic Association, Philadelphia; Denise Venturi, architect and planner, Venturi & Rauch; Leon Weiner, Leon Weiner Associates, housing developers; David H. Moskowitz, Bucks County Legal Aid Society; Stephen C. Miller, Community Advocates Unit, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; W. Thacher Longstreth, Republican Candidate for Mayor of Philadelphia; Frank Weise, architect; Albert Letson, Commission on Human Relations, Philadelphia; George Gould, Community Legal Services.

*The Government and Its Citizens, Boston,*  
October 8, 1971

Stanley Jones, Governor's Citizens Committee on Corrections; Russell Carmichael, former Camp Chairman, Norfolk M.C.I.; David Spinney, American Friends Service Committee; Hiller Zobel, Hill & Barlow; Scott Harshbarger, Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights; Bob Gustafson, Native American Community of New England; Byron Rushing, Community Fellow, M.I.T. Whitney Young Program; Laurence Sidman, student, Boston College Law School.

Kathy Segal, Boston Women's Legal Group; Margery Rosenthal, Massachusetts Committee Against Repressive Legislation; Christopher H. Pyle, former Captain, U.S. Army Intelligence; Jack Lemoine, Vietnam Veteran; James Ahern, former Chief of Police, New Haven, Connecticut; Ken Bode, Center for Political Reform; Syd Hanlon, author; Alix Smullen, U.N.A.F. Voter Registration Project.

*Harnessing the Power of the Corporations:*  
Washington, October 12

Mark Green, Corporate Accountability Research Group; Philip C. Sorensen, Project on

Corporate Responsibility; Geoffrey Cowan, Center for Law and Social Policy; Jason Newman, Georgetown Law School; Pierce O'Donnell, Nader Task Force; James L. Phelan, student, Yale Law School; Jerry S. Cohen, co-author, *America, Inc.*; James Hightower, Agribusiness Accountability Project; Dr. Jerolyn Lyle, Department of Economics, American University; Frank Mankiewicz; Tom Riddell, Union of Radical Political Economists; Joel F. Henning; Eugene J. McCarthy; Richard L. Ottinger, Grassroots Action, Inc.

*Foreign Policy: Washington, September 14,*  
1971

Congresswoman Bella Abzug; Senator Birch Bayh; Eugene J. McCarthy; Gloria Steinem, writer, feminist; David Dellinger, antiwar activist, author; Marcus Raskin, author; Sanford Gottlieb, National SANE.

Shirley Chisholm, Congresswoman; Marcus Raskin, Institute for Policy Studies; Peter Weiss; David Calleo, author, European scholar; Charles Hightower, American Committee on Africa; Allan Solomon, Committee for new Alternatives in the Middle East; Dr. Betty Lall, faculty of Metropolitan District of N.Y., State School of Industry and Labor Relations of Cornell University; Brenda Feigen Fasteau, Member of steering committee of Women's Political Caucus; Congressman Ron Dellums; Congressman Les Aspin.

*Redistributing Corporate Power*

Through its enormous size, its control of wealth and power, and its concentration in relatively few hands, the corporate sector has achieved full domination of all "countervailing forces," including government, labor and consumers. Corporate self-interest, which disregards society's urgent needs, has been substantially dictating the economic, political, social and moral direction of this nation. Although the question of whether this power has been exercised reasonably or properly is important, it is only secondary to the basic questions; should this power be exercised by so few, and why are they accountable to virtually no one. We reject the concept of noblesse oblige. It is clear that the unrestricted power exercised by the corporate elite must be shifted to, and shared by, those whose lives are affected by it.

*Size and Concentration*

The size of the Corporate Monster is mind-boggling. A single example should suffice: total General Motors sales exceed the total budget of any country in the world, save the United States, Russia and Great Britain.

Most alarming, this movement of concentration of economic power into fewer and fewer hands is increasing at a geometric pace. In 1950, the largest 200 corporations controlled 47 percent of the total manufacturing assets in the nation. In 1965, these 200 firms controlled 55 percent of the total assets, and by 1969, they controlled 2/3 of the nation's total manufacturing assets. The top six firms included in "Fortune's 500" earned 25 percent of all industrial profits!

The obvious danger of corporate size is further magnified by the emergence of the "shared monopoly" as a pattern of corporate behavior. When a group of three or four corporations which together control more than 50 percent of an industry act in concert the effect is clearly inimical to competition of any sort. "Shared monopoly" is not an isolated phenomenon. It exists in virtually every major U.S. industry.

Furthermore, corporate power has been increased in countless ways—interlocking directorates, joint ventures and, of course, conglomerates run wild.

*Consequences of the use of concentrated corporate power*

When corporate power is concentrated our society has seen an unimpeded policy of

pushing price increases, lagging technical innovation, unemployment and decreased production. It is often suggested that corporate decisions which may lead to these results are justified because millions of shareholders will share in the profits of corporate America. This myth which is basic to the corporate philosophy must be exploded. A 1963 study pointed out that only 1.6% of the country's adult population owned 82.4% of all publicly held stock. The bulk of large corporate profits goes to very few, contributing to the imbalanced income distribution in this nation, and certainly supplying no justification for the previous injury corporate decisions aimed at increasing profits does to the economy.

Probably the most destructive effect of corporate power concentration is little realized by the American people. It results from the ability of corporations to determine the use of approximately 80% of the productive capacity of this nation (the portion of the GNP which passes through the private sector). Those whose lives are significantly affected by these decisions are excluded from the decision whether the nation's GNP shall be used for schools or for cosmetics, for hospitals or for high-styled automobiles. In this context, the endless debate about re-ordering priorities becomes almost meaningless, since that debate refers only to the remaining 20% of GNP which passes through the public sector. There is absolutely no way in which this 20% can be spread so as to finance the massive social programs so desperately needed.

Even the assumption that the remaining 20% is spent in the public interest is inaccurate. By use of devices such as campaign contributions, corporate America has gained virtual control of governmental officials. Hence we see the government spending billions of dollars of public funds for highways which help Detroit sell cars but refusing to help urban centers such as Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, with money for mass transit. Similarly, we see the government spending huge sums for military research and development and then spending billions to purchase these armaments from the same corporation it subsidized to develop them, instead of for such essential public services as schools, hospitals, health care, corporate control of the government.

The urgent needs in America for more schools, hospitals and mass transit can only be realized significantly if more of the productive resources, both public and private, now controlled by corporations are directed toward these areas. This can be accomplished only when a significant portion of the power to determine how national resources are to be made is placed in the hands of the people.

*Social consequences of corporate control*

The social consequences of corporate domination have been disastrous. Continued corporate growth depends on an ever-increasing growth of sales. Through persistent bombardment of the public, corporations not only brainwash the public into buying a particular product, but have inculcated into our society the compulsion to buy, buy, buy! The kinds of products, glittering automobiles and exotic cosmetics, rather than schools or health services—linked with intensive advertising which emphasizes constant acquisition, has undermined the national moral fabric. Everything is measured in terms of numbers and quantity, and not by life, love or quality. Materialism pervades every aspect of our lives.

*Corporations and war*

The health of corporate America demands constant growth. This means that corporations must produce more and more and more goods, and the consumers must purchase more and more of what the corporations produce. Unmatched as the best market in the

world today is the United States military establishment. Hence, those with a profound power to set our nation's direction have an enormous vested interest in maintaining and, indeed, in expanding the American military establishment. In this context a 20 year "cold war," a Viet Nam and all of the other foreign adventures become more comprehensible.

The monopoly power achieved by corporate America has left individuals with little power over their lives. Corporations decide the types of people they want us to be, mould the educational system to prepare us for their needs, manipulate the media and thus regulate the most minute details of how we live. Small wonder so many feel frustrated, alienated and powerless.

The basic ideals of a corporate society are technological advance for the sake of technological advance and growth for the sake of growth. In the process of technological advance social cost is not considered. Profits are realized by the corporations and society is left to pick up the social costs of environmental and human destruction.

Moreover, in defining growth as the increase in unevaluated GNP, corporations force our society to produce mindlessly, rather than to choose a better quality of life—to choose two cars in the garage, rather than more leisure or better air. We are not even aware that this choice—between hyper-increasing GNP and leisure—which should be ours, is being made for us.

#### *Corporations and crime*

Crime and violence is a terrifying problem in our society. Much of the problem is directly traceable to Corporate America. Given an economic system which dictates that its resources shall go to cosmetics and cars rather than schools and hospitals; which dictates an ever-increasing disparity of income distribution and then blatantly flaunts the disparity of wealth to the have-nots on TV, daily; which is bedrocked on fierce competition; which worships material values and acquisition over all else; which seizes all power and leaves our masses alienated and frustrated; which promotes its government, in its own economic interests, to set an example of senseless and brutal violence—given all this, the result is predictable—crime and criminals attempting to close the distribution gap.

There is yet another face of crime and violence in America—corporate crime and violence. More Americans die from automobile accidents in this nation annually, than in Vietnam. A major portion of such death and violence is clearly avoidable given a responsible automobile industry. The misery of miners in West Virginia; farm workers in California, is a direct result of corporate greed. The massive deception practiced upon the American consumer by the corporate empire is all too well known. It would not be difficult to state that corporations are the worst criminals in our nation.

#### *Corporations on the farms*

Rural America is, according to the myth, a heartland of small independent farmers free from corporate specter. This image, too, is false. The corporation has moved into agriculture with the same avarice it exhibited in industry. By 1964, small independent farmers totalled 56.5% of all farms, but only 7.8% of farm sales. Less than one percent of U.S. farms accounted for 24.3% of all farm sales in 1964. By 1969, this percentage was up to 1/3 of all sales. Such familiar conglomerate names as Boeing, Goodyear, Royal Crown Cola, Tenneco, American Brands, Dow Chemical, Bank of America, and Prudential Life—have moved in and taken control of all aspects of product processing and distribution of farm products. The results are predictable.

In the last 30 years, 100,000 small farms have been lost. By 1980 it is estimated one million of these farms will have vanished.

With the loss of the small farms, towns, and communities which services them also, disappeared, 75% to 80% of farm workers are employed by major food and industrial corporations, which are responsible for the low pay and humiliating working conditions brought to national attention by Caesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

The net results of such "agri-business" are well known. Cities are choked by migration of displaced farm workers who, in turn, are choked by the cities. And back in rural America, 14 million are left in abject poverty.

#### **PART II**

There are really two questions involved in assessing corporate power. The focus has almost always been upon the question of whether this power is being used reasonably. This platform rejects such an analysis. We accept the premise of Lord Acton that "Power tends to Corrupt" and address our recommendations to programs designed to shift decision-making power from the corporate world to the people.

#### **1. Deconcentrate corporate power**

Anti-trust laws have been on the books for many years. They have never been seriously enforced. As a result, corporate concentration increases. Moreover, the minimal anti-trust activity to date has primarily been directed against acquisitions rather than for divestiture. The result is the elimination of competition. Big companies stay big and small companies stay small or disappear. While we recognize that anti-trust activity alone is not the solution to over-concentration, we nevertheless urge that as a first step we must use the weapons we already have.

The problem of "shared monopolies" must be met by new legislation—vigorously enforced—which would require corporate divestiture when fewer than four corporations produce more than 50% of the goods or services for a particular market.

Federal corporate chartering must be instituted. Charters should include provisions limiting the size and scope of permissible business activities of corporations. Such charter limitations should significantly limit corporate concentration of all types—be it vertical, horizontal or conglomerate.

#### **2. Enactment of a strict federal chartering law**

The benefits of corporate status, particularly limited liability, are enormous. Like a liquor license or a driver's license, these benefits must be conditioned upon socially desired conduct.

Compelling such corporate responsibility is impossible in the present context wherein states are in frenzied competition to induce local corporate chartering (and the resultant taxes and business activity) by requiring lesser and lesser corporate responsibility. A strict, uniform federal chartering law is the only solution.

Such legislation would not only be used to prohibit corporate concentration. It would also require full corporate disclosure of all financial, non-personal employment, and stockholder records, as well as records of transactions with government and other institutions. It would require a comprehensive annual social and environmental report, a report on minority group assistance and employment, and also would require socially beneficial activity and expenditure in these areas. A federal chartering law would guarantee representation on the board of directors representatives of minority groups, women, consumer and local community in designated percentages. It would prohibit interlocking directorates; require consumer protection in the form of adequate product labeling, warning of dangerous products, reasonable guaranties, free service for unfit products.

Charters should be subject to periodic renewal. A broad range of sanctions, including loss of corporate status and limited liability, should be available.

#### **3. Shift a significant portion of the power to determine the use of national resources from the private to public sector.**

Every year about one hundred billion dollars of public funds are placed in commercial banks throughout the nation, much of it interest-free. Legislation should be enacted allowing the deposits of such public monies only in banks with substantial investments in programs carefully designed to assist minority enterprises, consumer borrowing, education, ghetto redevelopment and other high priority domestic social programs. Such investment programs should be administered jointly by government and by consumer and other socially oriented interests. Tax incentives, higher interest rates and other devices should be utilized to induce other institutional groups and individuals with investment cash to help by depositing their money in cooperating banks. The net effect would be to shift a massive amount of money away from current corporate control and into socially beneficial programs now starving for funds.

Another vehicle for moving funds from the private to the public sector is the creation of a massive Federal bond program similar to Liberty, Defense or War Bonds. The Government could borrow substantial amounts of money from its citizens and, rather than investing in war, could use the money for social programs. These bonds would be designed and marketed not only as a "patriotic" investment but also would be competitive with securities in the corporate market.

Yet another method of shifting substantial capital from the corporate sector to social purposes would result if the Federal Reserve Board selectively lowered the discount rate in "poverty" areas, requiring that deposits thus freed be used in the community for designated social purposes.

#### **4. Fix more realistic responsibilities and accountability for corporation and their officers**

One reason corporate crime continues unabated is that it is considered "merely white collar crime" for which corporate officers and directors generally escape prosecution and penalty. Civil and criminal statutes must be tightened and new ones enacted which require strict accountability for such crimes by corporate principals.

In addition, a flexible array of civil and criminal sanctions should be enacted which will allow suspension of corporate principals in appropriate cases; impose temporary bans on corporate advertising; make public details of corporate violations and misconduct; provide for an end to limited corporate liability and for suspension and revocation or the corporate charter itself where appropriate.

Although middle and upper management corporate personnel are frequently aware of such corporate misconduct as false advertising and harmful products, fear of retribution has discouraged such personnel from exposing or challenging such corporate misconduct. Statutes similar to those protecting union members against management retribution for legitimate union activity must be enacted.

#### **5. Termination of favored treatment of corporations**

Tax loopholes favoring corporations must be closed. They are too numerous to describe in full. A few examples should suffice: special tax privileges for the oil and gas industry, during the years 1963 through 1967, enabled that industry to pay an average tax of 4.9% on before-tax net profits of 21 billion dollars—far less than the percentage paid by the U.S. taxpayer. Corporate advertising is tax-exempt; we must prohibit government subsidy of clearly political advertising such



as the insurance industry lobbying against no-fault insurance through its ads, or the trucking industry advertising for more highways in its advertisements.

Other forms of special treatment enjoyed by corporations are found in the recent Lockheed loan (the corner grocery does not get such welfare assistance), and in huge amounts of free research and development done by government for big business.

#### 6. Shifting power to employees and committees

Corporations are unchecked in their power to make decisions which directly, continuously and massively affect the lives of employees and the communities where plants are located. Such powers must be shared. Internal machinery must be created to permit joint decisions in certain areas currently exclusively in the corporate domain. For example, when a corporation decides to relocate, thousands of employees may be affected. Their choice is to uproot themselves or to risk unemployment. They must be allowed to share in the decision to move. Similarly, when a proposed corporate activity will affect the environment of a community, that community's consultation and consent should be required.

#### 7. Encouraging strengthening consumer and community groups

The emergence of community groups advocating corporate responsibility is encouraging. They are, however, at a serious economic disadvantage when compared to a well-financed corporation.

They should be given tax advantages and meaningful access to the media. In addition, all media should be required to carry responsible citizens' reaction to advertisements which they believe involve matters of health, safety, environmental protection or consumer deception.

A federal fund should be created to assist individuals or consumer groups in legal and research costs where they make a prima facie showing of the government's failure to protect consumers.

In addition, bounties should be provided for the successful prosecution of such lawsuits.

#### 8. Public ownership

Public ownership through nationalization, or the use of the TVA model, should be employed in the following situations: When private corporations will not engage in activities necessary for the public meal; or refuse to locate in certain localities because they anticipate little profit; or when corporations particularly in a monopoly situation abuse their advantage by changing too high prices, or are providing inferior and inadequate services.

#### 9. Compel corporations to pay the social costs of their operations

Environmental and human decay resulting from corporate operation must be stopped. But, if such injury occurs, the corporations must pay substantially all of the costs—out of profits and not by passed-on increased prices.

#### 10. Save rural America

What appears as a blatant government effort to supplant the independent farmer with agri-corporations must cease.

Land grant colleges must be forced to reverse their preoccupation with agri-business efficiency and growth. The enormous public resources invested in these institutions must be redirected toward the needs and survival of the small farmer, farm workers and rural communities.

Federal procurement preferences, tax incentives and subsidies must be given to small farmers, and to industries which locate in rural areas offering employment at fair wages and under decent working conditions.

Immigration laws and their enforcement must be strengthened so that profit-hungry

corporations can no longer play poor Mexican workers against poor American workers.

Legislation must be enacted to make the beneficiaries of mechanization responsible to the displaced worker or the community abandoned in the name of modernization.

#### PART III—THE LABOR MOVEMENT

It is urgent that the labor movement play a major role in reshaping America. Rather than acting as a "partner" of big business, labor must constitute the means by which workers can share corporate decision-making, and thereby serve their own essential interests as well as those of society at large.

The labor movement in the past has served to improve dramatically the economic status of working men and women and their families, through collective bargaining and through the enactment of responsible labor laws.

The labor movement has emerged as the chief focus of opposition to Nixon's three-phased economic program: wage freeze, continuing inflation with unemployment, and inequitable taxation.

Yet despite its past accomplishments, and despite the presence in its ranks of outstanding unions and union leaders, the labor movement as a whole does not provide, and has not for some time provided, national leadership in the battle to end race, sex, and class injustice. The AFL-CIO Executive Council's continued support of a war that its own rank and file and the rest of society long ago abandoned, is tragic. Labor's record of achieving equal opportunity in its own ranks for all workers regardless of race or sex, has been spotty. Within the labor movement there has too often been concentration of power, that serves its own ends at the expense of working men and women.

#### Recommendations

1. The labor movement should be—but is not—vitaly concerned with the need to broaden workers' participation in the decision-making processes of the firms in which they work. Product priorities, production methods, plant location, and major financial decisions are the legitimate concern of workers in a plant, and a major goal of the labor movement should be the creation of new structures to bring workers into the decision making process.

2. Every effort must be made to insure the existence of a healthy and democratic union movement. The National Labor Relations Act must be strengthened and extended. Farm workers, domestics, the Gulf Coast wood pulpworkers, and others must quickly be brought within the protection of that law.

3. We oppose intimidation as a means of encouraging union membership and we oppose discrimination in unions, but we believe that progressivism should be encouraged from within the unions themselves. Therefore we oppose right-to-work laws, state and federal.

4. Public employees must be afforded the same rights as their fellow workers in private industry.

5. Federal and state laws to protect employees' safety and health must be greatly amplified and enforced.

6. Long-overdue national legislation must be passed to protect and make transferable between jobs, workers' rights to pensions and insurance. The disappointed expectations of thousands of American wage earners to honorable and self-supporting retirement constitutes a national scandal.

7. Workmen's compensation and unemployment benefits must be expanded and increased.

8. The labor movement, which has long espoused a policy of full employment, must broaden its identification with the unemployed and the unemployable poor. The policies of corporate America that are antithetical to the interests of laboring men and women

are the same policies that condemn those on welfare to lives of hopelessness and poverty.

#### CAMPAIGN SPENDING: CORPORATE CONTROL OVER PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Corporate freedom to proceed unhindered in the private sector, and its domination of the public sector, have largely resulted from skillful use of economic power to "buy" government's cooperation and assistance. The main tool utilized has been campaign financing. Under the present system, escalating campaign costs make substantial corporate money support an essential element of the electoral process. Unless this system of campaign financing is radically revised, there seems little hope that corporate domination of our society will be ended, and little hope, therefore, that we can deal with the vast array of social problems and inequities.

Corporate domination of the public sector becomes possible because the costs of campaigns are so astronomical. The various local and national campaigns of 1968 were estimated to have cost between \$300 million and \$900 million. Although the Federal Corrupt Practices Act prevents direct corporate political contributions, it has long been easily evaded. A United States Senator has estimated that 95% of the contributions at the Congressional level comes from business (80% from those whose net worth is over \$250,000). These direct contributions from corporate executives are frequently reimbursed by their companies through special bonuses or other benefits.

In view of the deep dependency many elected officials have on corporate financial support, it is not surprising that proposed legislation seeking to cope with the problem of financing campaigns has been so inadequate.

It is equally obvious why there has been no meaningful effort by our nation's public officials to challenge the power of the corporations to reverse the clear direction toward socialism for the rich and "benign neglect" for all others.

The relationship between corporations and the regulatory agencies constitutes a second major aspect of the problem. These "independent" regulatory agencies were the New Deal's answer to corporate greed and irresponsibility. The effort has failed completely. As one witness put it: the "independent" regulatory agencies have become victims of the "law of aerodynamics," that is, "weaker bodies (the regulatory agencies) becoming satellites of the stronger bodies (the corporate giants)."

One reason for this total abdication of responsibility is the absence of meaningful consumer roles within and before the agencies. Equally important is the co-opting of regulatory agency personnel by the same corporations those personnel are supposed to regulate. These "regulators," who are sympathetic to the regulated industry while they are in office, are assured lush jobs with those regulated corporations when they leave the government agency. Promises of private employment to public employees are not limited to individual regulatory agencies. They are also used by contractors at all levels and branches of government. For example, in 1967, 2,072 retired military officers were employed by the top 95 government contractors. Each of the top ten contractors had an average of 106 former military officers on its payroll.

In light of this accepted practice, it is no surprise that the I.C.C. provides two billion dollars annually in railroad subsidies; or that the C.A.B. in effect grants airlines two to four billion dollars a year in excess revenue by restrictions on competition. It also explains why final costs in military weapons contracts average 320% of original cost estimates; a recent study of 13 major aircraft and missile programs totalling 40 billion dollars showed only four of these contractors (with \$5 billion in contracts) performed at

as much as 75% of design specifications. Similarly, it is clear why the companies with the poorest performance records reported the highest profits, and, nevertheless, continued to receive the lion's share of government contracts.

## II

1. The only workable solution to the problem of campaign financing lies in substantial federal assumption of campaign expenditures at all levels, including primaries. Although campaign costs are staggering when viewed from the standpoint of an individual candidate's resources, they are minimal in terms of governmental resources. Certainly they are minimal as an absolute prerequisite to any meaningful progress toward equality in this nation. And tax check-offs or similar programs encouraging small contributions from a broad cross-section of the electorate could be helpful in helping to meet the expense.

In addition, the federal government could certainly help to reduce the cost of seeking elective office by requiring the television, postal and telephone industries to contribute their services to candidates so that the tools these three industries provide for reaching the voter are available on an equal basis to all viable candidates. Legislation must be formulated which readily allows candidates to mount campaigns regardless of personal wealth, or access to the corporate world. It must include appropriate guidelines protecting minority parties and insurgents, including reasonable campaign funding and precluding the use of television commercials as a vehicle for "selling" candidates, without reference to merit or position.

2. *Reconstitute regulatory agencies.* We have seen how the so-called regulatory agencies have been substantially co-opted by the industries they are supposed to regulate. We must have legislation which prohibits those who served on a regulatory agency from obtaining employment in related industries for a period of five years after leaving the agency. Similar legislation is required to assure that a corporate employee do more than superficially change hats when he or she starts to work for a regulatory agency. Agency jurisdiction must be restricted so that no agency is involved in both regulating and promoting a given activity.

In addition, we must have stronger legislation requiring effective institutional representation of consumer interests before regulatory agencies. Such broadening of these bodies should aid in insuring that control over these agencies does not again become vested in the regulated industries. Public hearings on matters affecting a local area should be held in the area concerned at a time and place that will assure the public an opportunity to be heard.

## REDISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND INCOME

The United States is the wealthiest nation in the history of the world. It is unconscionable that approximately 20% of our people live in poverty, while a few live in princely luxury. This incredible disparity results because of our economic system. In 1968, for example, we distributed 5.7% of the nation's income to the bottom fifth of our country's families and 40.6% to the top fifth. More alarming is the fact that this maldistribution has been getting worse instead of better.

The bottom fifth of our nation is not the only victim of the system. The great working and middle class are also penalized. Although they earn more than the lowest fifth, inflation has bitten massively into their "increased" earnings. They may have more tangible assets now than 20 years ago, but these assets are not luxuries—they are necessities. For example, a factory worker requires an automobile to get to and from work which is far from where he can find housing; twenty years ago he could get to his job by a short ride on a mass transit system which

was then safer, cleaner and less expensive. The so-called middle class finds itself barely able to stay afloat. It lives in fear of being unable to pay the medical costs of a serious illness, for example. There is an illusion of being well off, but there is an underlying chronic insecurity.

Government affects the distribution of wealth and income in two fundamental ways—the manner in which it collects revenue from its people and the manner in which it spends such revenues. In both cases, the present structures are heavily weighted in favor of the powerful and against the powerless.

It is clear that a realignment is necessary. The wealth of this country must be more evenly spread. Taxes should be levied in accordance with the ability to pay. Revenue must be spent on the basis of need.

## I. TAX REFORM

The lower, working and middle classes shoulder far too much of the tax burden.

### Fair and progressive income tax

A steeply progressive income tax coupled with a minimum guaranteed income above the level of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Lower Living Budget, must be enacted both to insure a fair tax burden according to ability to pay and to pursue a long-run policy of redistribution of wealth. One advantage of insuring a minimum income is that aggregate demand will be sustained above recession levels. There should be no reliance on regressive taxes. We particularly oppose the so-called value-added tax (a disguised national sales tax) which the Nixon administration is considering, because the lower one's income, the greater the burden.

### Abolition of favored tax treatment

All income, including capital gains, should be taxed at the same rate. The present income-averaging provisions should apply to such gains in the same way they relate to ordinary income.

The revenue laws are riddled with exemptions and allowances for deductions which favor special interests. They must be substantially eliminated. For example, we must do away with the fiction that mineral or oil depletion or capital gains are so important to economic progress that they deserve special treatment. We must eliminate all existing depletion allowances once the actual cost of the property has been recovered. The privilege of taking immediate deductions for intangible drilling and development costs should be terminated.

### Interest on State and local bonds

Interest earned on state, municipal and other local bonds should be taxed at regular income tax rates.

The federal government should ensure marketability of such bonds by guaranteeing and subsidizing them in part.

Similarly, the present exemption under which local governments may issue up to \$5 million tax free industrial development bonds should be abolished.

### Real estate depreciation

Accelerated depreciation on real estate should be abolished. The only exception should be the more favorable depreciation allowances retained in order to encourage investments in new housing by low and moderate income families. Preferential tax treatment for depreciation on resale should be ended.

### Estate and gift taxes

The entire estate and gift tax structure should be revised. A single comprehensive and integrated tax should be placed on all transfers whether made during lifetime or at death. Inheritance tax rates should be significantly increased. We should not permit fortunes to be passed over intact from generation to generation when so many are unable even to achieve a survival-level income.

## Special benefits for corporations

Favoritism toward corporations under our tax structure is pervasive. Expense account living can only be ended by stringent enforcement of regulations and the imposition of maximum limitations. The recently enacted investment credit tax will benefit corporations and their wealthy stockholders by 4 to 5 billion dollars. Yet in the view of most economists it will have little stimulating effect on the economy. The Administration has recently given a 3 to 4 billion dollar annual windfall to business through liberalized methods for calculating depreciation.

Favored tax treatment for savings and loan associations and other banking institutions should be ended, eliminating completely their use of excessive bad debt reserves to reduce their tax liabilities, and by ending other special immunities granted them and not to other corporate taxpayers.

## Defense industry

There should be an excess profits tax on all corporations or departments of large corporations whose primary business is production for defense.

## II. GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Revenue spending should be part of the general policy of closing the economic gap. We must put greater emphasis on spending programs that help rebuild the urban environment, eliminate poverty, provide a broader distribution of service in the areas of health, justice, housing, education, and mass transit, and help secure and maintain healthy environment.

This redirection of spending policies can only be accomplished when the Southeast Asian War has ended; we have succeeded in stopping the subsidies of redundant weapons systems, extravagant space explorations, loan guarantees for large bankrupt businesses, or the agricultural subsidies that only aid wealthy businessmen farmers; and when we have succeeded in placing under public control significant portions of the wealth now controlled by the private sector.

## Poverty

The status of the poor in America is the most tragic and convincing example of the inequities within our society.

Statistics, studies, data and reports on poverty are legion. The poor have literally been studied to death. What we need is not more good will studies but more will to make institutional changes. In every aspect of human life, the poor have demonstrably more difficulties than the affluent. We will cite just one example, the area of health care. All diseases afflict the poor far more severely than the rich—except diseases peculiarly associated with old age. Life expectancy among the poor is substantially lower than it is for the rest of the nation.

Infant mortality among the poor is shockingly higher among the affluent and in most other industrial countries.

Race, class, and poverty are interrelated and are closely aligned with malnutrition and ill health. While 47 per cent of all non-whites are poor, only 14 per cent of whites fall below the poverty line. Lack of access to good housing sustains poverty.

Approximately 25 million Americans live below the poverty line of \$3,900 for a family of four and nearly 50 million below the Department of Labor's poverty line. This large group of poor citizens, many of them Blacks, Indians, Mexicans and Latins, low wage earners in service and domestic industries, the pool of unemployed and underemployed workers, and, finally, the nearly nine million persons consigned to the welfare rolls, represent that segment of the population sacrificed to maintain profit margins within the corporate state. Among them, drug addiction and delinquency are rampant, and illiteracy rates the highest.

We now have failed to recognize the social and economic costs to society of such poverty



in its midst. If the poor were given a decent life and a stake in society, a good portion of the costs of crime and ill-health would be eliminated.

#### *The aged*

Hardly recognized is the fact that poverty is a major problem affecting the aged. Approximately 25 per cent of all poor are over 65 or, put another way, about  $\frac{1}{3}$  of all persons over 65 are poor. It is appalling that this nation, with its work ethic, allows so many of its people to be cast aside when their productivity is gone.

For too long the American ethic of individualism, competition, work and success have conditioned our response to the existence of poverty. The problem, it was assumed, was with the individual. If one could only educate him, train him, employ him, rehabilitate him, everything would be set right. It is time to recognize that the fault is rather with an economic and political power structure that sacrifices people to profits.

#### *Recommendations*

1. *A Federally Subsidized Full Employment Program.*—We must guarantee a job for every American, with government as the employer of last resort. A federally financed program aimed especially at our urban areas where poverty is most heavily concentrated must be instituted. Persons should be employed at decent wages to build and staff the hospitals, neighborhood health clinics, schools, playgrounds and housing which are so desperately needed. Training, education or day care for children should be provided as an integral element of such a full-employment program.

2. *New Concept of Social Security.*—All senior citizens or those who are unable to work should be the beneficiaries of a new concept of social security. This includes a guaranteed minimum income, a pension for all over 65, and a national health insurance program. Such a program should no longer be funded by employer and employees, but by the Federal government. All payments from these programs must be tied to rises in the cost of living.

3. We support a guaranteed minimum income for all Americans above the standard of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Lower Living Budget.

a. Total family income, where more than one member earns income, should be permitted to rise to a reasonable level without forbearance of maintenance payments.

b. Job requirement provisions of income maintenance programs should not interfere with the bargaining efforts of labor unions, nor should they undercut the prevailing wage structure in a particular type of employment; nor should they undercut minimum wage standards.

c. Under no circumstances should a mother be required to be separated from her young children under penalty of losing maintenance payments.

4. We support the resolution of the recent White House Conference on Aging calling for a minimum Social Security payment to support a level of living which is currently at \$4,500 annually for a couple and 75% of this for an individual (in line with the Bureau of Labor Statistics standard for an intermediate budget for the elderly), with automatic increases to meet the rising cost of living.

#### EDUCATION

##### *Recommendations*

1. Quality education must be a guaranteed right and therefore must be free for all citizens starting from pre-kindergarten through college and/or career training.

Although raising adequate revenues for education is a serious problem in all areas of the nation, it is most threatening to the larger cities. The population shift has left them with a less affluent population and a resource base which is not growing at a

rate sufficient to meet increasing needs. Because large urban areas have higher and more diverse public service needs, a much lower proportion of their expenditures can be devoted to education than in suburban areas. Unfortunately, urban education is also more expensive: expenses are higher in big cities and more children are in need of expensive supplementary educational techniques.

State regulations and state aid rather than compensating for these urban disadvantages more often than not act to exacerbate them.

The federal government has done only a little better. Federal aid to education in the aggregate has at best a barely discernible equalizing effect. With the exception of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, federal programs frequently provide more funds to suburban school districts than to central cities.

Although Title I funds tend to go to urban areas, the programs for which Title I funds are used appear to be largely ancillary and not aimed at improving the central portion of the curriculum available to disadvantaged children.

In addition, the total financial commitment of the federal government is simply too small to be of more than marginal help to financially imperiled education systems.

2. The federal government must not only restructure its aid program along more rigidly enforced categorical lines, so that federal money gets directly to specified programs, it must put massive new resources into the educational system.

3. The Federal Government should earmark funds to subsidize research and development in colleges and universities to improve knowledge and technology in areas of consumer and social goods, such as pollution control, mass transit, medicine, and housing.

4. It should use the "carrot" of aid to force state governments to redesign their own aid programs and begin to pick up a larger portion of educational costs on a more equitable basis.

5. De jure and de facto school segregation must be ended. All available evidence indicates that quality education for all children requires integration. Artificial geographic boundaries which operate to maintain segregated schools, must be eliminated. We support all efforts to achieve equal educational opportunity and to further integration, including busing.

6. The property tax as a means of financing education has already been judicially recognized as inequitable. Each state, with federal aid, must assume the full cost of public education in the state.

However, such assumption of cost should not carry with it an increase of state control of curriculum nor an increase in state regulation in educational practices. State assumption of costs should be designed to insure equal educational results.

7. Public funds should not be diverted to non-public or secondary general education systems.

8. Urban grant institutions to deal with urban problems should be established and funded at least to the same level as the state land grant agricultural institutions.

9. Federal and state aid to community and junior colleges, with their potential for serving the needs of local communities, should receive high priority.

#### HEALTH CARE

Our society is obligated to provide the best possible health care to all its citizens on the basis of their need for such care and not on their ability to pay.

Fragmented organization, inadequate number and location of personnel and facilities, poor financing arrangements and a narrow outlook make the present system of delivering health care incapable of delivering such services. Simply pumping more money

and medical manpower into the present chaotic health delivery system won't solve the problem.

Additional money by itself is not enough. The U.S. spends almost \$70 billion a year for health services, a higher percentage of its GNP than any other country in the world. Yet we rank 15th in infant mortality and 18th in male life expectancy.

Additional manpower alone is not enough. New York City, as an example, has 4% of the nation's population but 9% of its physicians. Yet there is a steady and critical decline of physicians available to treat patients in Brooklyn and the Bronx. Increasing the numbers of doctors does not assure that they will practice in the Mississippi delta or in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Medical thought and practice must also change, from the present crisis-disease-focused orientation to a preventive, comprehensive approach capable both of averting disease and fostering the achievement of mental and physical health. The question of health is related to many broader issues such as adequate diet, clean and safe housing, decent sanitation services, health education, clean air and water, safe working conditions, safe means of transit, and adequate recreational facilities.

#### *Recommendations*

Until we recognize that health care is a natural, inalienable human right rather than a commodity to be bought and sold, and act accordingly, we cannot fundamentally change the situation.

Fee for service, in any form, is antithetical to health as a human right.

All health insurance proposals so far advanced would perpetuate fee for service and merely shift the burden of payment. A rational, socialized health care system must be a basic political objective; our ultimate goal is free health service for all.

1. We must have a program of national health insurance for all, financed by the federal government. This program cannot be diluted by the availability of any form of alternate insurance sponsored by commercial insurance companies. A broadly representative board should control the cost of drugs, hospital supplies, equipment, and institutional services. National health insurance should include preventive, diagnostic, curative, and rehabilitation services.

2. There should be a major program for training of physicians' assistants. Such personnel should be tested and licensed to assure consistent, quality care to the population. Their training should be conducted under the auspices of existing medical education facilities, with the curriculum standardized on a national basis. Under the supervision of a physician, these assistants can perform many of the routine tasks now unnecessarily burdening the doctor.

3. We must have a massive increase in enrollment and training programs in the health professions. It is unconscionable that the present system has deliberately encouraged an influx of physicians from underdeveloped areas of the world to remedy our own failure to train sufficient doctors. One sixth of the active medical manpower pool in the U.S. consists of foreign-trained M.D.'s.

4. Incentives must be created to encourage medical services in undertended areas, such as forgiveness of student loans, formation of an expanded public health service, or draft exemptions. The maldistribution of physicians is more than geographical. Within the medical profession itself, the tendency toward specialization has greatly reduced the supply of physicians available as family doctors. Although it is generally agreed that at least 30% of our illness can be effectively cared for by a well-trained family physician, almost 85% of today's medical graduates are trained as specialists, and therefore reluctant to practice family medicine. We

need legislation to encourage the training of physicians who are capable of delivering comprehensive primary medical care with the family as a focus. Those broadly trained physicians, who might specialize either in pediatrics, or adult medicine would be knowledgeable in psychiatry, minor surgery and in the case of adult medicine, office gynecology. They would also be skilled in working with a health team utilizing to the fullest extent the services of such allied health personnel as social workers, nurses, psychologists, physical therapists, physicians' assistants, and community health workers.

5. The government should require the creation of local and regional community controlled health boards, with necessary technical advice provided by professionals. Such boards should plan for comprehensive health services in their areas.

6. Prepaid group practice offers an economical alternative to the physician as a solo practitioner, who charges a fee for each service rendered. Prepaid salaried group practice can lower costs both because it reduces the need for hospitalization through its focus on preventive care and because overhead expenses are shared by members of the group. However, every legislative means available should be used to prevent profit-making group practice corporations from using health to make money for their stockholders.

7. Until National Health Insurance is a reality there can be no full-scale program of preventive medicine. However, schools can provide vaccination programs and multiphasic screening (hearing, dental, vision, blood and other tests) for all children. Physical examinations should be provided for those children referred by teachers.

8. Nursing homes: federal law should require all nursing homes and similar institutions for the aged to have resident medical staff.

9. Present government programs dealing with mental health are totally unsatisfactory. We need a full commitment to the cure of the mentally ill, from patient care during hospitalization to rehabilitation services following hospitalization, to enable people to return to an accepting community and lead full and productive lives.

#### MASS TRANSIT

For many years, hugh federal and state subsidies have been a basic taxpayers' contribution to the automobile and trucking industries. Continuing these subsidies at this time increases pollution and the paralysis of our overcrowded cities. This funding of highways has been at the expense of mass transit which is disintegrating across the country. Yet mass transit is the only feasible method of transportation for many of our citizens. The almost complete absence of it and its high cost make it impossible for many to reach jobs which are now in the suburbs.

1. We recommend federal funding of mass transit. In particular, the practice of holding up funds which have been appropriated by Congress, must be ended.

2. It is also essential that funds provided by the federal government be made available for whatever transit needs the state and/or local community finds the most pressing. The present restriction of such funds to capital use must be eliminated.

3. Massive transfer of accumulated highway funds to mass transit requirements must begin promptly.

4. Mass transit should be free, a right of citizens.

#### HOUSING

In 1948 this nation made a commitment to provide decent housing for every family. Twenty-five years later we find housing conditions have worsened. Despite claims of record-breaking numbers of new housing units built in 1971, the nation is currently producing at a rate of about 70% of what it produced in 1950 in terms of numbers of

housing units per 1,000 population. The nation's production of housing falls far below the rates of many Western European nations.

The housing supply is not only insufficient, much of what exists is substandard. Most of the substandard housing is concentrated in cities. Escape from these ghettos is prevented by economics and racism.

Experience has taught us what happens to low-income housing concentrations. As the more fortunate families work their way up the income ladder and out of low-income neighborhoods, their places are taken by the outcasts of the social-economic system. Before long these projects become the victims of crime, drugs, and illness. Those who, in a different social environment, might have realized great potential, are overpowered by the defeatist attitude all around them.

Fifty-six percent of this country's black and minority group families live in cities, and of these nearly two-thirds live in neighborhoods marked by substandard housing. But the problem is not only that of minority groups. In 1966 over 4 million of the nearly 6 million occupied substandard units were inhabited by whites.

We must defeat the atmosphere of alienation which physical concentration in urban ghettos of low-income citizens creates by pursuing a housing policy that resists it.

A large proportion of the needed moderate-density, moderate and low-cost housing must be built in the suburban parts of metropolitan areas. We are no longer a rural nation; our industrial pattern requires that the housing be built in metropolitan areas. But the city centers are already overcrowded; only the suburbs can provide the large amounts of land needed to build new housing, at land costs low enough to permit housing to be built at decent densities and at low cost per unit. The suburbs also contain the overwhelming majority of the nation's new jobs. Over three quarters of the new jobs developed annually in the metropolitan regions of the nation are in the suburbs.

Not only people with low income are victimized by the housing situation. Middle-income families also suffer from insufficient housing, restrictive zoning practices, escalating rents, and high property taxes.

#### Recommendations

1. The Federal Government must supply the funds and pursue a policy that will insure the construction of enough housing units each year to meet the needs of a growing population and to replace the housing units worn out each year from age.

2. So-called low income housing should be abolished and replaced in all instances by middle-income housing supplemented by a subsidy where necessary. In addition subsidies must help low income families to buy homes in both urban and suburban areas.

3. We propose a national housing policy which requires that at least 10% to 15% of the units in all housing receiving any kind of public subsidy—federal state or local—whether hidden or visible—be allocated to low income people who will receive rent subsidies. The policy would apply to high rise apartment construction as well as tract development in the suburbs. It would apply whether the subsidies stem from financing, such as FHA loans, or from governmental assistance for sewers, streets, and/or utilities.

4. States and local communities must be required to alter zoning regulations to allow for scattered-site construction of new moderate income housing, with some low-income residents receiving rent subsidies. This new construction must blend architecturally with the surrounding community and must not be restricted to any one segment of any community.

5. To break down restrictive suburban zoning and other exclusionary practices, the federal government should:

cut off all federal funds for communities

which prevent the construction of moderate-cost housing through local laws.

grant incentive funds and impact-aid to communities which do accept new moderate-cost and low-cost housing.

6. To remove the incentive for local communities to zone out or otherwise exclude low- and moderate-income families, the federal government should move, through appropriate agencies, to urge the States to take on the full burden of financing public education, rather than leaving the cost to be raised by local communities through the real property tax.

7. The Federal Government must also legislate strict rent controls to prevent exorbitant profits in highly congested areas.

8. The veterans' housing loan program must be amended to authorize loans for cooperative and condominium apartments at the same interest rate and terms as those applying to single-family homes, including direct federal loans where banks refuse government-guaranteed loans.

The advantages of these programs would be substantial. Low-income families would live throughout a metropolitan area. In these new neighborhoods would be the effective social infrastructure which sustains communities. Those previously consigned to ghettos would benefit from better schools, competitive buying, good health facilities, extensive social organization, and safer streets and homes. The broader community would be saved the spiraling costs of welfare. Such a housing policy would quite literally "bring us together," closing the dangerous gap which now strains our national fabric.

#### WOMEN'S RIGHTS

While recognizing the particular problems of women in our society, magnified if not created by the imbalance of financial, political and corporate power, we feel that as long as any group is oppressed all people are oppressed. The women's liberation movement has as its goal the liberation of our entire society from the chains of past traditions, practices and prejudices which deny all our humanity and sisterhood.

To correct the imbalance in power, we must first move in the direction of recognizing that all options that come with being a citizen must be open to women, so they may be able to choose a life-style instead of having one foisted on them. Thus, we urge the elimination of sex roles which lead people into stereotyped behavior and deny them freedom to live in ways which are a personal expression of their individual humanity.

We support a challenge to hierarchical structures. We oppose dictatorships in political parties, schools, business and unions and urge instead the development of new forms of organization which recognize the contribution of the individual. We seek to create new programs and new methods of organizing group activity based on cooperative decision making rather than authoritarian super-structures.

We sadly reflect that a women's platform is necessary in 1972. Yet, close study of other sections of this draft platform reveals that discrimination against women in federal statute and policy has been largely neglected as a subject for protest. While we reject the separation of women's issues and the isolation of women's concerns as a special category, we urge the following recommendations be endorsed so that glaring inequities that remain in our federal statutes be immediately focussed on and eliminated.

1. *Equal Employment Opportunity:* Prompt enforcement of all federal statutes and executive orders barring job discrimination is necessary. All companies subject to federal law in regard to hiring practices should be required to begin creating immediately affirmative action programs to employ women where they are not adequately represented in the work force—especially in



management, professional and technical positions. Deadlines for affirmative action programs should be imposed without delay. The federal government should withhold contracts and deposits from firms guilty of discrimination.

The Equal Opportunity Commission should be strengthened to give it "cease and desist" powers. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act should be extended to cover instrumentalities of government, religious institutions and other employers now exempted. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 should cover all workers, including professionals, administrators and executives. The Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to grant minimum wage protection and overtime pay standards to domestic and service workers, farm laborers and employees of non-profit institutions.

Congressional hearings should be held to examine the nature and extent of job bias against women in industry and government.

2. *Abortion and Contraception:* We affirm a woman's right to control her own body and to decide whether or not to bear a child and call for the elimination of any laws in regard to abortion other than those already governing suits for malpractice.

The federal government should make low cost contraceptives available to women who want them and initiate a liberally financed public education campaign on contraceptives.

3. *Housing and Public Accommodations:* The Civil Rights Act of 1964 should be amended to eliminate discrimination against women in public accommodations, public facilities and all federally-assisted housing programs.

4. *Child Care:* The federal should provide child care centers as a matter of right to all children whose mothers want it. These centers should be educational or recreational or a combination of both in accordance with the mothers' choice. Existing child care facilities should be expanded with priorities for admission given to children of mothers who work, are looking for work, or who are enrolled in schools, colleges, or training programs.

5. The Internal Revenue Law must be amended to allow mothers who work, widowers, and divorced or separated men with responsibility for children to deduct all child care expenses.

6. *Equality in Education:* Federal legislation is needed to bar discrimination in education against women. The federal government should withhold funds or grants to schools found guilty of discrimination.

7. *Women's Rights Amendment:* The Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution should be passed without any weakening clauses or amendments.

8. *Women in Party and Government Office:* The Democratic Party should pledge to encourage more women to seek nomination for public and party office. Whenever and wherever possible women should be placed in major administrative and policy-making positions. To this end, we support a talent search for women.

9. *National Convention:* We support and endorse guaranteeing women representation as 50% of the delegates to the national party conventions based on their percentage of the population.

10. *Financial Discrimination:* All inequities in tax and social securities must be corrected. All companies subject to federal law in regard to hiring practices should be barred from discriminating on the basis of sex or marital status in fringe benefits, pension, health insurance and life insurance. Health insurance programs should cover abortions and maternity benefits regardless of a women's marital status. Women should not be required to take maternity leave against their wishes, nor should women be prevented from utilizing any paid accumulated sick leave in lieu of maternity leave;

nor should women be permitted to lose jobs because they take maternity leave.

Discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit by either businesses subject to federal regulation or by government agencies (e.g., the Federal Housing Authority) must be ended.

11. We support government funding for development of agencies at the executive level of states and territories to enforce equality and justice for women.

#### INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

For most in this nation whose skins are black, brown, yellow, or red, the "American Dream" is a cruel joke. The reality for these Americans is the highest rate of unemployment, the lowest wages, the most dilapidated housing, the worst education, the highest infant mortality rate and the shortest life expectancy. They have been the victims of the most irreparable damage physically, psychologically and economically.

In recent years, although our society has recognized this shameful situation, its efforts have been inadequate and paternalistic. They have been directed towards treating the symptoms of economic, social and moral dislocation as the causes of our ills. They have defined the victims rather than the victimizers as the problem.

In 1968 the Kerner Commission Report made a significant statement about the problem.

"What white Americans have never fully understood but what the Negro can never forget is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it . . . Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively in the past. It now threatens to do so again. . . ."

It is well that we have finally acknowledged the institutional aspect of racism, and that we can eliminate it only by changing these institutions. It's equally important to realize that for those who reap the benefits of our imbalanced society, these institutional structures are absolutely critical. For example, prior portions of this platform have revealed structures devised by the corporate sector to assure that more of the nation's resources go into high profit ventures such as highways, bombers and spaceships, rather than into health and housing.

Many segments of our society are geared and fixed to maintaining lucrative use of our institutions at the expense of any change in the status of our have-not citizens. Our educational system assures a large number of inadequately educated available to perform menial work. The constant high level of unemployment, considered a norm, assures labor peace. The use of corporate devices for pensions and medical care together with inadequate government programs in these areas assures labor discipline.

There are two parts to institutional racism, the institutions mentioned above and the racism itself, which is the vehicle for assigning non-whites to the subservient position in the institutional structure. This assignment is achieved by convincing the nation that these people are inferior and deserve no better; that they are in their plight because they are inadequate and lack motivation; that they, the victims, and not the victimizers are the problem. Racism is also used as a tool to pit poor non-whites against poor whites. While these groups fight among themselves for the crumbs assigned to them, their attention is skillfully diverted from the fact that the wealth of the nation is being drained off at the top.

Racist ideas produce the basis for legal, extra legal and violent repression of non-whites. This repression, in turn, reinforces racist thinking and provides the opening for repression of all dissension in our society.

Our nation has talked about meeting the problem of racism by creating equal oppor-

tunities for all. This approach is deceptive and inadequate. Those who have been denied an equal education and an equal family life, cannot compete equally, even with similar opportunity. It is clear, therefore, that to meet the problem the focus must be shifted from equal opportunities to the concept of equal results.

We must reject the concept that the only route for black, brown, yellow or red people to participate in the "American Dream" is to sell themselves, their heritage, their culture, their differences, and, in effect, to become carbon copies of white middle class society.

This pressure for conformity is unhealthy for the nation, as well as for the minority groups. We must reject the melting pot concept and move toward a pluralistic society in which all groups can develop in their own ways, thereby enriching us all.

#### II

1. The structures upon which institutional racism is grounded must be replaced. These structures have been dealt with at length in this platform. They include a grossly imbalanced distribution of wealth and power, and structures calculated to maintain and expand such imbalance. The power and wealth must be shifted and redistributed so that non-whites have an equal share.

2. The government apparatus must be forced to affirmatively challenge racism and the institutions upon which it is based. As one example only, federal grants to states must be conditioned upon their using significant designated portions to aid minorities; assured neighborhood participation in the use of funds; enforcement of civil right laws in the use of such funds; and incentives for the states, as a condition to receive the funds, to alter their tax structures in a progressive direction.

3. We must accept and fully utilize the concept of assuring equal results, rather than equal opportunities.

4. Racism as a component of our foreign policy must be eliminated. We deal with this use of racism in our foreign policy plank.

5. The second system in our two systems of justice, which is reserved for the powerless, must be eliminated as set forth elsewhere in this platform. All must be treated fairly, equally and humanely under the law.

6. The organized, devoted and consistent protection of the constitutional rights of racial minorities is essential to maintain the civil liberties of every one of us.

7. To end institutionalized racism requires the public and, in particular, political figures to offer open and creative leadership in opposition to racist ideas and practices. Mere acknowledgment of the existence of such ideas and practices is not enough and is an abdication of responsibility.

#### GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE

Misuse of government power has become increasingly apparent in recent years. A society whose structure is premised upon the consent of the governed has become one in which manipulation, deceit, intimidation, and outright repression have become the tools by which government controls its people.

All too often, the executive branch of our government falls even to make a pretense of dealing with society's problems within the framework of Constitutional safeguards.

Crime and violence in this nation are serious problems. There are steps which can be taken to deal with them. However, rather than viewing a rising crime rate as a symptom of our country's deeper ills, while yet dealing with it as it occurs, this Administration has sought to curb it through repression, force, and the substantial curtailment of civil liberties. In the name of "law and order" it has applauded the bestiality of the slaughter at Attica; it has sponsored and fought for such repressive meas-

ures as preventive detention and unrestricted power to spy on citizens through wiretapping and other electronic devices; and it has attempted to destroy the integrity of the Supreme Court by seeking to appoint to it men whose devotion to the sanctity of "law and order" seems far greater than their reverence for the Constitution in general and the Bill of Rights in particular.

The government's quest for law and order has extended far beyond the concept of "safety in the streets." It has included policies aimed at discouraging all who would dissent, or whose unorthodoxy appears to indicate they might not live according to "accepted" standards. These policies have been of a wide variety. We have seen outright political persecution as epitomized by the Berrigan indictment and the incarceration of Angela Davis; we have learned of the widespread use of political surveillance techniques to infiltrate, and entrap into criminal behavior, groups seeking what appears to be drastic social or political change. We have learned that many agencies of our government are busy compiling political dossiers on Congressmen, political and social leaders of minority groups, and upon thousands of us who have marched for peace and against injustice so often in the last decade. Another aspect of this repression of those who differ, or who are different, in which our government has wholeheartedly participated, is the long-standing deprivation of the most basic civil rights to homosexuals.

It is clear that our courts and District Attorneys have turned their greatest attention to prosecuting political dissenters and those without wealth or power. Those who possess wealth or power have been treated far too favorably by courts, prosecutors, and the laws themselves. Hence we see only the most minimal action against those who, in the pursuit of profit, have caused the death and disability of thousands of miners; who have allowed unsafe cars to be driven on our highways; who have manufactured and distributed food and goods which they know to be potentially injurious to users; who have avoided paying taxes.

We cannot comfort ourselves and exonerate our government by accepting its contention that the rights of political dissidents have been vindicated in the courts. While it is true that, largely because of the jury system, such dissenters as Dr. Spock, the Chicago Seven, Bobby Seale, and others have been acquitted, the huge expenditures of time, money and energy required to obtain these acquittals tend to sap not only the will of those on trial but also those who would otherwise have been carrying on the same work for which their leaders were being tried. The effect of this inappropriate use of our judicial structure to strike at those who express dissent is that the dissenters are discouraged and debilitated and their dissension effectively stilled.

Another type of government abuse appears to stem largely from the misguided motive that, if government is to be effective, it must utilize the tools technology has made available. Such proliferation of centralized data banks makes potentially available a vast amount of personal data on individual citizens. This is an unwarranted incursion on the individual's right of privacy and may inflict incalculable harm in the event they are inaccurate or misused.

It is not surprising that government has developed such a callous attitude toward those it governs. It has grown so far apart from the people it is inevitable that it should treat so many of them as adversaries and outcasts.

The very procedures under which government operates are calculated to keep the power away from the people and concentrated in the hands of the few. In the name of "national security," the Executive Branch has withheld essential information

not only from its citizens, but also from the Congress.

Just as "law and order" has become an excuse for repression and persecution, "national security" has become the Executive Branch's justification for hiding, manipulating, and distorting information. Congress is kept in ignorance through excessive and unwarranted use of "executive privilege"; the press and television are intimidated by scarcely veiled threats of reprisal; and the people in general are subjected to such a continued series of blatant untruths and half-truths that we no longer know what to believe.

Congressional procedures have made it cumbersome for that body to assert itself over the Executive Branch or even to speak out on issues where the majority's will is clear. The seniority and committee system under which Congress operates keep the power structure within the Congress untouched. They have the additional effect of dooming efforts to stop the unprecedented abuse of power by the Executive and of allowing the handful of men from one section of the country to determine the laws and direction for the entire nation.

Finally, the structure of our own Party is a mirror of the imbalances implicit throughout government and society. In 1968, the Democratic Party demonstrated for all to see that its procedures on both the national and state levels made it impossible to hold an open or democratic convention. The spectacle of that convention, and the deception and unfairness which it revealed, must be acknowledged as a significant cause for the election of a Republican President. 1968 revealed clearly the extent to which our Party has allowed itself in most states to fall into the hands of a small group who manipulated the rules of delegate selection to thwart democracy in order to safeguard their own power.

The McGovern (now Fraser) Commission created by the 1968 Convention to assure "all Democratic voters . . . a full, meaningful, and timely opportunity to participate" in the selection of delegates and thus in the decisions of the 1972 Convention itself, has mandated admirable guidelines for state parties to follow in preparing for the 1972 convention. While some state Parties have acted to comply substantially with the Guidelines, many state Parties have not. Moreover, in some states where legislatures are dominated by Republicans, the fundamental changes required by the Guidelines have been blocked.

#### Recommendations

The imbalance in power between government and its citizens requires sweeping reforms. The following recommendations are intended, as are most of the recommendations in this platform, to be illustrative of the total change in approach and focus which is required.

#### Crime and the courts

1. The fundamental cause of crime is the disparity in wealth and power between the rich and the poor, the black and the white, the rulers and the ruled. Until power is shifted and shared crime will remain an almost insoluble problem.

2. A large majority of those accused and convicted of crimes are black, Puerto Ricans, and Chicano. In contrast, the overwhelming number of those who administer justice—police, judges, District Attorneys, and parole officers—are white and do not speak the language of those accused and convicted. This ratio must be reversed immediately.

3. The criminal law must no longer be used primarily against the powerless and the dissenters. Crimes of the powerful—tax evasion, embezzlement, crimes against ecology, and consumer crimes—must be prosecuted with equal vigor.

4. The relationship between handguns and

crime must be recognized. National legislation must be passed immediately requiring the registration and licensing of every handgun and strictly limiting the sale of guns and ammunition.

5. Too many people are unnecessarily and improperly incarcerated in our prisons for too long a time. Inadequate and insufficient courtrooms, outmoded and time-consuming procedures, and too few judges result in crowded dockets with long months and sometimes years of incarceration for the poor before trial. Regulations should be adopted in all courts whereby charges must be dismissed if a speedy trial is not granted. The bail system should be revised so as to assure that those without means are not singled out for lengthy incarceration, and so that excessive bail is no longer required.

6. We must have an end to political trials in which the organizations are put on trial under vaguely drawn indictments based on vague, unconstitutional laws. So-called "conspiracy" prosecutions, against political dissenters, should be eliminated.

7. Laws allowing such practices as "preventive detention," "no knock entry," mass arrests without charges and arrest warrants and government surveillance, must be ended.

8. A re-examination of such behavior as marijuana use, homosexuality, gambling, and drinking as constituting "criminal" acts is required. Modern medical and social thought dictate that such acts are not inimical to society.

A redefinition of these acts to be matters of private concern, not subject to control by society, would be a saner reading of Constitutional intent, and would free the courts and the police for more necessary and effective crime control.

9. The heroin problem, the cause of much vicious street crime, must be treated as a medical problem. Funds and personnel must be provided to treat addicts, in a four-pronged attack involving a) therapeutic communities, b) methadone maintenance; c) non-addictive, and d) if the addict does not respond to any of these, a program of strictly controlled heroin maintenance, to remove the motive for theft and violence.

#### Homosexual's rights

Millions of women and men in this country are subject to severe social, economic, psychological, and legal oppression because of their sexual orientation.

We affirm the right of all persons to define and express their own sensibility, emotionality, and sexuality, and to choose their own style of life, so long as they do not infringe upon the rights of others. We pledge an end to all social, economic, and legal oppression of homosexual men and women.

Laws prohibiting loitering for the purpose of soliciting for a homosexual liaison are vague and unconstitutional. Nevertheless, they are frequently used as the legal cover for police entrapment of homosexual men and women. Prejudice and myth have led to widespread discrimination against homosexuals.

#### Recommendations

1. Federal laws must prohibit discrimination in housing, employment, public accommodations, and public services because of sexual orientation.

2. The President should issue an executive order prohibiting the military from excluding, for reasons of sexual orientation, persons who wish to join the Armed Services; and from issuing less-than-honorable discharges for homosexuality; and requiring the upgrading to fully honorable of all such discharges previously issued, with retroactive benefits.

3. The President should issue an executive order prohibiting discrimination in the federal civil service because of sexual orientation.

4. Tax inequities victimizing single per-



sons and same-sex couples should be eliminated.

5. Bars to the entry, immigration, and naturalization of homosexuals should be ended.

6. Where federal money is made available for sex education courses, these courses should include information about homosexuality.

7. The compiling, maintenance, and dissemination of information about an individual's sexual behavior for dossiers and data banks should be prohibited, and existing data of this nature should be destroyed.

8. Persons now incarcerated in detention centers, prisons, and mental institutions, charged with sexual offenses relating to victimless crimes or sexual orientation should be released, and adequate compensation made for the physical and mental duress encountered. Existing records relating to the incarceration should be expunged.

9. State laws prohibiting private sexual acts involving consenting persons should be repealed, as should laws prohibiting solicitation for private voluntary sexual liaisons and laws prohibiting transvestitism and cross dressing. Insurance companies and other state-regulated enterprises should be prohibited from discriminating against applicants because of sexual orientation.

10. Child custody, adoption, visitation rights, foster parenthood and the like should not be denied because of sexual orientation or marital status.

#### *Prison reform*

Three out of every four crimes are committed by recidivists—people who have been in jail as convicted criminals. This should be sufficient evidence that our prisons are not performing their role as "correctional" institutions.

1. Our sentencing and incarceration procedures must be changed so that prisoners are protected from one another and are able to spend their time in prison in meaningful ways, geared toward re-entering society as self-sufficient persons.

2. The concept of rehabilitation, rather than punishment, must be fully recognized, funded, and implemented. First, this means substantially more funds to prisons. Second, it means that prisoners are first of all, human beings, and should be treated as such. Third, it means that rehabilitation personnel and techniques and facilities, in substantial amounts, should be introduced into the prisons.

3. The basic demands of prisoners all over the country include an end to overcrowding; relevant vocational training; adequate pay for their work; an end to such inhumane practices as solitary confinement; and religious and political freedom. Substantially all of the 28 demands of the Attica inmates should be accepted as a starting point for prison reform. Essentially, they are all aimed at the goal of treating prisoners as human beings. A reassessment of our attitudes toward those in prison is essential.

4. Steps must be taken to assure that a former prisoner, once a sentence has been served, does not carry the stigma of having been a convict forever. This must include assuring the right to vote; and government aid in finding employment and decent housing.

5. Parole Reform: instead of political hacks, psychologists and other professionals committed to the rehabilitation of prisoners must be appointed to parole boards. Parole must no longer be conditioned on breaking the will of the prisoner, but on restoring him to a useful role in society.

6. Any state or local penal institution receiving federal aid should be required to meet minimum federal standards.

7. Juvenile prisons have proved totally inadequate. They should be closed and replaced with small-group residences or placement in foster homes. Such placement

would be less costly and more effective than institutionalization.

#### *Congressional reform*

Central to, and symptomatic of the federal government's failure to fulfill its role in a democracy, has been the growing abdication by Congress of its function as a responsible representative of the people. To assure the effectiveness of Congress we recommend:

1. An end to the seniority system and to the diminution of Congress' ability to act because of the grip which aged and conservative committee chairmen have on Congressional procedures.

2. Congress should have access to information in order to legislate responsibly. To this end, it is essential that the procedure for classifying and declassifying information be revised so that they really relate to national security, and not, as recent events have shown, to protecting government from embarrassment. To start, we recommend that all information presently classified be declassified and then reclassified. A blue-ribbon commission should be appointed to make the decisions about reclassification; the commission should include members of all three branches of the government, and citizen representatives.

3. "Executive privilege" should be reserved to the President alone, so that employees or representatives of the Executive Branch can no longer refuse to testify or produce documents before Congress because of "executive privilege."

4. Congress needs an independent analytical arm apart from the General Accounting Office, which as an integral part of the Executive Branch, is inadequate. Such a structure could provide members of Congress with access to information and an independent mechanism for analyzing it.

5. Congress must have a more effective role in long-range planning. This has become apparent particularly in recent floor fights over defense appropriations. If Congress is to be more than a rubber stamp for the President's budgetary requests, it must be supplied with long-term planning information which shows the future impact of current programs.

6. Congress must play a more active role in defining the nation's military policy. It will not detract from the President's need to act in an emergency, if explicit Congressional approval is required, within thirty days of a Presidential decision to commit troops. This approval could be renewed periodically, perhaps every six months so long as the troops remained in use. Even under its present limited options, Congress can and should make more imaginative use of so-called blanket authorization legislation. Congress can condition the authorization of defense funds so that the Executive Branch is required to make visible expenditures for which it will be accountable.

7. The people's access to information concerning the legislative process must be expanded. Members of Congress should not be permitted to "bargain" over questions of national support in "closed" committee meetings.

#### *Surveillance*

1. Electronic snooping instruments must be brought under strict judicial control.

2. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit political surveillance and the maintenance of data banks. Violation of such provisions should be punished by immediate dismissal from, and liability for, government jobs for a period of time.

3. Where the government or private industry maintains legitimate records about private citizens, these citizens must be apprised of their existence and have an opportunity to examine and rebut them.

*Executive Reform:* the Executive Branch should include a Department of Peace.

#### *Party reform*

The 1972 Democratic Convention must be a representative one. The delegation of any

state which the evidence indicates does not represent the freely expressed will of Democratic voters from that state should not be seated. It should be replaced with another delegation which has genuinely tried to be chosen in accordance with the McGovern/Fraser Guidelines.

#### *The press and media*

The concept of a free press as envisioned in the Bill of Rights has been grossly impaired by corporate control and governmental restriction. Through mergers and acquisition, large media empires have been amassed. These news cartels seriously endanger independent, competitive news reporting. Just as unhealthy is the increasingly frequent acquisition of newspapers, radio and television stations, and publishing companies by corporate conglomerates who are free to manipulate news coverage to their own business advantage. Most alarming is the general control of the media which corporations exert by virtue of their financial control through advertising expenditures. The use of this power to make us a super-acquisitive society has been dealt with earlier. The general censorship of the ideas and expressions which are and are not permitted to be carried over the airwaves is equally destructive.

Government's efforts to curb a free press have been most recently experienced in the case of the Pentagon Papers. Velled threats to the media and the press from the White House have been all too frequent.

#### *Recommendations*

1. Vigorous antitrust action should be undertaken to break up concentration of media and the press.

2. Commercial corporations should be prohibited from owning broadcasting and publishing companies.

3. Television and radio should be required to give more time to the presentation of issues, with reasonable amounts of time reserved for minority viewpoints.

4. Government intimidation of the press must cease. The concept of the press as a free and equal countervailing force to government must be established in law.

#### *The Draft*

As part of the effort to end the excessive influence of the military-industrial complex over our society,

The United States should not maintain the military draft in time of peace. Peacetime is defined as including a time of undeclared war.

#### *Recommendations*

1. We oppose any compulsory military reserve system in peacetime.

2. Compulsory participation in civil defense exercises must end.

3. We oppose any form of compulsory civilian national service.

#### *FOREIGN POLICY*

Foreign policy is typically the first plank of a political platform. In the context of this platform, however, we have chosen to place it last, because we see our nation's foreign policy as a product of the imbalances and inequities in our society which we have earlier discussed.

For example, the same gap between the powerful and the powerless which we have noted on the domestic scene is quite prevalent internationally. So are the related factors of racism and poverty. Accordingly, our approach internationally as well as domestically should be to support the needs and aspirations of the people in New York and in Saigon, the farmers of Kansas and of India, the disenfranchised of Mississippi and of South Africa, and the dislocated migrants of California and the dislocated refugees of the Middle East.

As we ask our government domestically to end its oppressive relationship to many of our citizens, so we must do the same in relation to other peoples and lands. America

must not be the oppressor or identify with oppressive governments.

Hence, while it is essential that we compel this nation to remove its armies and navies from southeast Asia, it is far more critical that we confront the active forces, attitudes and institutions which got us into Vietnam.

These deeply ingrained forces, attitudes and institutions are responsible not only for the death and destruction meted out by American troops, but they have also set an example for violence by the rest of the world.

Analysis of the underlying causes of our aggressive foreign policy must start with the nation's economic system. The health of corporate America demands constant growth. This means the corporations must produce more and more goods. It means that consumers must purchase more and more of what the corporations produce. The United States military establishment is unmatched as the best market in the world today. Hence, those with a profound power to set our nation's direction have an enormous vested interest in maintaining and, indeed, in expanding the American military establishment.

One should not be deluded into believing that this interest is limited to a small clique of corporate executives and generals. To the contrary, the broad span of the corporate structure in the nation depends heavily upon military consumption for its health. For example, a 1964 study established that at least 205 of the 500 largest manufacturing corporations were significantly involved in military contracts. This statistic reveals only the direct impact of the military budget upon the corporate sector. Given our highly interdependent economy—the indirect impact of military spending of subcontractors, upon manufacturers of intermediate goods and parts and upon suppliers of raw materials reveals that the large direct military contracts are only the tip of the iceberg.

Since such a great cross-section of business has so great a dependency upon military spending, it is obvious that the huge number of employees of such businesses has an equally great stake in military consumption.

Moreover, it should be noted that the more skilled and affluent portion of the labor force has the greatest stake in military spending. For example, a 1962 Department of Labor study of the electronics industry revealed that at the military-space oriented plants of that industry, about 60% of the work force were highly paid engineers, executives or skilled blue collar craftsmen. In sharp contrast, at the consumer-oriented plants in the industry, 70% of the employees were semi-skilled or unskilled blue and white collar workers.

In passing, it is also significant to note a study which reveals that one dollar of military spending generates one half as many jobs but 20% more in salaries than does one dollar of civilian spending. Not only does this demonstrate that military spending is a factor which adds to the maldistribution of wealth and income, but it further shows that the more skilled and affluent—and therefore more powerful—members of the labor force will support military spending and ventures against the interests of the more powerless members of the labor force.

In addition, we have recently been made quite aware that a large portion of the university population has also become deeply dependent upon defense studies and grants. Of course, the military establishment which has a direct need to perpetuate itself and to grow has a similar dependency.

Given the basic "needs" of this large cross-section of America, an ever expanding, giant sized military establishment is inevitable, and the aggression and violence that spring from it are predictable.

But the market provided by the military is insufficient in and of itself to satisfy the insatiable corporate need to produce more

and more goods. Accordingly, vital corporate interests become located in foreign countries because of the need for natural resources and cheap labor. These incursions on foreign soil have been massive. The might of this nation, political and often military, is then used by these corporations to coerce foreign governments to do their will. In this process our government creates and maintains reactionary puppet regimes which carry out corporate economic missions while depriving their own citizens of the most basic economic and political freedoms.

Our deeply ingrained national racist attitudes makes it easier for us to accept the corporate national oppression in other lands and contributes to our failure to back any condemnation of apartheid in Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, and South Africa with meaningful sanctions. An especially ugly example of American partnership with racism abroad is the fact that the racial classification, population registry and personal identity passbook system by which South Africa's police state controls and exploits its black and colored people is all computerized by IBM equipment.

Another contributing factor is our deep-seated national machismo, now being popularly referred to as the "Masculine Mystique." All of our institutions and attitudes teach us that we must be clear-cut victors in every conflict situation. Applied to foreign powers, this attitude must and does result in burning and blood shed. In addition those in our nation least affected by the racist tendencies and the "masculine mystique"—the nation's women and minorities—have been essentially kept out of the foreign policy making apparatus.

The needs of the corporate state in America which have constituted the basis for our foreign policy are duplicated in other advanced industrial countries, East or West, and in a similar way comprise the basic motivation for their foreign relations. The secret competition among nations, including wars, hot or cold, has been the nationalist expression of this corporate competition. This competition is too dangerous, self-defeating and self-limiting and represents the needs of a small minority of the peoples of the world. A saner and more productive basis for peoples and nations relating to each other would be a global concern and commitment to the needs of the oppressed have-nots everywhere.

Obviously, since other nations are militarily prepared as part of the corporate competition, we must have a military establishment, but one that is strictly limited to a self-defense posture.

The history of the cold war reads like a tragic, make-believe, self-perpetuating rationalization. It was complete with slogans, labels and fears, some pure fantasy and some with a real component that seemed to give validity to the whole cold war concept.

Convinced by our leaders following World War II that the world was divided between the forces of freedom and the forces of aggressive communism, the American people have willingly supported a foreign policy geared to the containment of communism, and implemented primarily by military means. Since 1946, through the cold war and two hot wars, the United States has invested over one trillion dollars in its military establishment.

In the process we have created and maintained a network of military alliances and bases around the world, produced nuclear weapons and delivery systems far in excess of rational needs in a costly and self-defeating nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union, kept the People's Republic of China out of the community of nations for a generation, subsidized an unsuccessful invasion of Cuba, and intervened militarily in Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, IndoChina and Guatemala.

Through the painful experience of the war in IndoChina, the American people have

finally begun to learn that even in a democracy the government lies to the people, that American armed might cannot always change the politics of other countries, that communism is not monolithic and may be animated by nationalism, that even the richest nation cannot simultaneously wage war and meet the needs of its people.

II

It is clear that before the direction of our foreign policy can be effectively changed, corporate domination, racism and the "masculine mystique" orientation must be terminated. These are, of course, some concrete changes in policy that we can effectuate while we make the long-range effort to correct these basic imbalances.

1. A key method of reducing the power of the military-industrial complex is the transfer of federal and corporate resources from the military to urgently needed civilian programs. Major reductions in the military budget are warranted now. Military cost overruns, duplication of weapons systems, over-extended military commitments, and the existence of a nuclear arsenal capable of annihilating any combination of potential enemies several times over, are all areas for potential vast savings that can immediately be directed to civilian needs in the public sector.

2. Presidential power in foreign policy-making must be curbed and the congressional role reasserted. To this end changes indicated in our section on government and the people should be effected. These include an end of concealment by the Executive Branch of information needed by Congress to legislate and appropriate intelligently.

3. Vietnam and amnesty.

a. The wars in Indochina must be ended by the immediate withdrawal of all American forces and weapons from Indochina.

b. Those who fought against this immoral war by going to prison, fleeing the country or the armed forces, should be free from the threat of any criminal or military penalties.

4. Since there is general agreement in the scientific community (with the exception of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon) (that effective supervision of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is possible without on-site inspection, there can be no justification for further delay in negotiating an agreement for a ban on all nuclear testing.

5. Our country should lead the way for the world to find an effective peace-keeping body to which all nations must cede significantly more of their individual power. In view of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the U.N., a strengthened and restructured United Nations whose ability to function cannot, by agreement, be threatened by any one large and powerful nation, might be the vehicle.

a. It should be the major forum for negotiation, mediation, or arbitration of all international disputes.

b. From it could come international agreements such as a halt to all nuclear testing; a substantial reduction in both nuclear and conventional arms; a disengagement of most opposing military forces in Central Europe and elsewhere; and in general to take all steps necessary to bring about general and complete disarmament, with the use of the resources thus released for domestic and social purposes both here and abroad.

c. While seeking this ultimate goal, and in order to enforce it, our country should lead in the struggle to secure and maintain a small all-volunteer army, committed only to international peacekeeping under the United Nations.

d. In order to bolster the U.N.'s preeminence as chief negotiator and peacekeeper, our country should refrain from giving any military aid, except in those rare instances when an ally's security cannot be assured by any alternate means.

e. As a minimal first and immediate step,



Congress should repeal the Connolly Reservation which permits the United States to decide whether it will submit in each case to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

6. We must bend every effort toward achieving a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East, guaranteeing the security of the State of Israel, a homeland for the Palestinian Arabs, and free access to all waterways of the region.

7. We condemn the United States government's position in the India-Pakistan war. We urge the immediate recognition of Bengla Desh and financial aid to those refugees returning to Bangladesh.

8. To raise living standards in all parts of the world:

a. We must make a vigorous commitment to multilateral economic and social aid programs, without strings attached, to replace the perilous bilateral arrangements for foreign aid we now have.

b. We should move toward freer trade and offer trade preference to those nations whose per capita income or gross national product is beneath a realistically designated living level.

c. We should legislate that American businesses which operate in underdeveloped countries must give control to local leadership as soon as possible, under the provisions of the Federal Chartering concept previously mentioned.

9. Discriminating trade restrictions or boycotts must not be used as a political weapon, except such as are approved by a world body like the United Nations or the GATT.

#### ALBERT AND MARY LASKER AWARD

#### HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edward D. Freis of the Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration Hospital, was honored recently as a recipient of the Albert and Mary Lasker Award for medical research in ceremonies in New York City.

A significant part of the research conducted by Dr. Freis and honored through this award was done in the Veterans' Administration Hospital in West Haven, Conn., one of 17 VA hospitals taking part in a cooperative study of drugs aimed at controlling high blood pressure. The director of that part of the study conducted in West Haven was Dr. Massimo Calabresi.

According to Willis O. Underwood, director of the West Haven VA Hospital, the findings of the study led by Dr. Freis will be important in the ability of the Nation's doctors to control stroke and heart attacks, for both of which high blood pressure is a predisposing factor.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Award, therefore, one of the country's most esteemed awards in medical research, honors not only Dr. Freis but also the contributions of the Veterans' Administration hospital cooperative research team around the Nation. The tradition of cooperative research in the VA system, as well as the strong alliances and affiliations developed between the VA system and the major university medical cen-

ters, make this kind of thorough and painstaking research possible.

Just as the diversity or pluralism of our Nation's medical care industry is a strength, despite the talk of those who would homogenize health care, so the diversity of federally supported medical research efforts is also a strength, giving room for researchers to attack fundamental problems from a variety of viewpoints. As Congressmen, we cannot know whether the next breakthrough in controlling heart disease will come from the Framingham study, from the intramural programs of the National Institutes of Health, from the VA system, or from one of our private or State supported medical schools. What we can see, however, is that each part of this system has a strong operating incentive and that collectively they make this country a world leader in medicine.

I know that the Members of this House will join me in saluting the accomplishment of Dr. Freis and the other researchers involved in this VA study, as well as the VA system itself and its tradition of cooperative research, and I extend a special salute to the contributions of the VA Hospital in West Haven in this and other pioneering medical research.

#### NO ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO POLLUTE

#### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I insert the text of an editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun of April 1, 1972, under the heading, "No One Has the Right To Pollute," appear at this point in the RECORD:

#### NO ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO POLLUTE

The House of Representatives, at the urging of the Nixon administration, has caved in to industry pressures on the question of water pollution. The bill the House passed retreats from the high ground the Senate took last year and calls into question the commitment of the nation to cleanse the lakes, streams and other waterways that used to and could again serve so many other needs besides those of simple sewers.

Leaving aside the several weakening modifications the House made in the details of the bill, the major cause for dismay is what it did to the concept of setting a deadline for industrial polluters. The Senate (by unanimous vote) called for industries to use by 1981 the best available technology for treating wastes that had to be emptied into waterways. The House refused to take the deadline approach, calling instead for industries to use the best available technology only if that use was deemed practical by an independent study and again written into a law by Congress. This would be a goal, not a deadline.

But in pollution control, goals are never going to be as effective as deadlines. Industries compete with each other. A plant management isn't going to install expensive pollution control equipment if it fears its competitors won't. Yet under the goal approach, there is no assurance that all plants will or

will have to install such equipment. Under the deadline approach, everybody is on an equal footing.

Some opponents of deadlines say that small plants simply can't afford pollution control equipment. This suggests that they have to use rivers, bays and the like to handle their effluents. But as the Senate committee report on its bill stated, "No one has the right to pollute . . . pollution continues because of technological limits, not because of any inherent right to use the nation's waterways for the purpose of disposing of wastes." As for the small businessman who would be hard pressed to convert to a pollution free operation, the Senate bill provides for long term, low interest loans for the new equipment.

A deadline nine years off, one that only calls for industry to use the best available technology and does not set any impossible standards, is the very least the country can do to show it means business in cleaning up its water. The Senate conferees on this bill deserve support.

#### THE ENGINEER AND WATER POLLUTION

#### HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my conviction that we can master most of the problems of environmental pollution in the United States by efficient, wide-spectrum application of our technological skills.

In this connection, I bring to the attention of the House an article by Joseph F. Lagnese, Jr., P.E., president of the Water Pollution Control Federation, which appeared in the March 1972, issue of Professional Engineer, as follows:

#### WATER POLLUTION CONTROL POLICY: A NEED FOR ENGINEER INVOLVEMENT

(By Joseph F. Lagnese, Jr.)

These are exciting days to be working as an engineer in the water pollution control field. After many years of public indifference, we now find ourselves in the middle of extensively increased interest and effort by all segments of society and levels of government not only to control water pollution, but hopefully to eliminate it. There should certainly be no argument against this increased interest and attention to the water pollution control needs of our nation. In fact, I believe that a true emergency and national crisis would have been imminent, if not already developed, had not this concern and national uproar of the past few years taken place. The problems, however, which have been created and which concern the water pollution control technical community, relate to the gradually increasing "middle" position to which the engineer is being relegated insofar as policy matters are concerned, and the apparent disregard for optimum solution objectives in favor of absolute and arbitrary goals.

We should be reminded that the concern for gradually decreasing engineering input to national policy matters cannot be pursued and should not be motivated by professional self-interest alone. The apparentness of such motives to the public and Congress could well prove to be counterproductive to our primary concern for the nation's benefit, as well as to any self-interest concern which may be inherently involved.

As to our concern for the pressures which are exerted for immediate and total remedies without consideration of the consequences, we must recognize and understand the frustration and deep conviction which arouses such single-mindedness. We must also acknowledge that the numerous successes of such efforts are some measure of our ineffectiveness to develop and promote the rational positions we claim to offer.

The necessary lesson for engineers in water pollution control is that we can no longer afford to communicate only with each other, as in the past. No longer can we decide among ourselves how to handle a problem and expect this decision to settle the course of action. We must also understand that both the problem and the decision are now not only of interest to us, but also to the entire country, and that we are only one of many contributors to the national debate. Accordingly, we must develop a capability not always found in engineers to effectively communicate, both with the public and the political institutions.

Although we must certainly become more effective in our discussion with all groups concerning the issues, time is running out, and we, therefore, must give the highest priority to our efforts with Government agencies and legislation. If these are effectively pursued, they might also prove to be helpful in developing a better rapport with those environmentalists who remain suspicious of engineering solutions and with the general public.

Ten years ago the Federal water pollution control effort consisted almost entirely of career professionals in the Public Health Service. These people were part of the field and worked in harmony with state and local government forces and with those in private practice. They had little power, and most of their efforts closely supported the state roles and filled in gaps where necessary. Today, the remnants of that program are almost unrecognizable. After about five reorganizations in as many years, the Federal water pollution control effort has landed, for the time being, in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Continued restructuring is under way, apparently to separate all facets of the water program into functional departments such as research, enforcement, and grants.

One far-reaching effect which has evolved from all of the reorganization has been the systematic elevation of nontechnical, non-experienced, usually legal, and many times political persons to positions of power and authority for each major responsibility, with the subsequent departure from or demotion of the experienced and scientific personnel. The career professionals who have remained are conspicuous for their presence and stamina. Obviously, we are told, this change was based on the logic that the past problems in water pollution control occurred when technical, experienced, nonpolitical persons were in authority; so, therefore, the replacement of the authority of experienced knowledge with the authority of law and politics would be helpful to improving water pollution control.

Although I suspect there was some benefit in this evolution of authority in that it provided evidence of change to soothe an aroused public which was demanding prompt action, I believe it is now quite obvious, even to those who fill these new positions of power in the Federal water pollution control bureaucracy, that changes in the qualifications for authority have not diminished water pollution in our country. The major debate centers on the extent of the harm and weakness that such changes provided to the national program. Our concern centers not so much on the influence of the legal mind, and even to some extent of the political one, in the development of national objectives and policies in water pollution control, but rather on the very minimal interest,

let alone influence, for engineering input to the development of these objectives and policies.

This is not to say that competent and dedicated lawyers and/or politicians could not serve as effective administrators in the program. I believe the present administrator of EPA, William Ruckelshaus, with his legal and political background is an example of such competent and proper leadership. It is to say, however, that neither training in law nor experience in politics should be the prerequisite for admission to the policy-making authority of the national water pollution control program. And it is further to say that engineering, to which final implementation is inexorably dependent, must be included. An examination of the leadership of EPA, the Council on Environmental Quality, the President's National Water Commission, and the staffs of the congressional committees concerned with water pollution control matters will reveal a nearly total absence of engineering participation.

Looking back, we can also see the changes which have occurred in the legislative area. The start of meaningful legislation for water pollution control was PL 660, enacted in 1956, which introduced the concept of Federal grants for construction of water pollution control facilities. Amendments were quick to follow. Groups like the Water Pollution Control Federal (WPCF) very cautiously initiated some efforts to guide congressional action in these areas. At first, we argued for adequate congressional authorizations. Then we learned that this step meant nothing without an equal level of congressional appropriations. After another battle, we discovered that an Administration could and did withhold funds that were both authorized and appropriated. Meanwhile, the municipalities, the states, and the entire design-construction field were being severely misled by depending on promised funds that actually were not forthcoming. A little political sophistication would have helped us a lot then. It also would have warned us that as the money would begin to come, so would the controls. And so they have.

Presently, Congress is giving consideration to the most comprehensive and far-reaching bill in water pollution control history. It involves Federal grant appropriations in the \$3-to-\$4-billion-per-year category and the requirement that pollutant discharges to waterways be totally prohibited by 1985—in addition to many other serious changes in present policy. As would be expected, this proposed legislation has provoked controversy, even involving EPA as an opponent to some aspects of the bill, particularly the zero pollutant objective. Nevertheless, the Senate approved its version by an 86-0 vote. Neither God, nor motherhood, nor country would likely have received such a favorable vote last November. To most of us in this field, this unanimous action on such a controversial bill, which generated warnings of some kind from practically all technical disciplines and all levels of Governmental administration, is an ominous warning of the hesitancy of Congress to take issue with matters dealing with the environment.

These altered circumstances helped convince me to make Government affairs the number one priority for my term as WPCF president. Let me quote from my keynote speech to the WPCF Board of Control concerning a proposed approach toward the administrative area of Government activity (which for water pollution control is the Environmental Protection Agency):

"First, we have to learn how to run while talking. EPA apparently sees the need to move very fast in all directions. I don't think we have any chance to have it slow up. Instead, I think we must learn to respond and to react more quickly now, and hopefully in the future, to anticipate its moves so that we may be more a force of action

rather than reaction. For now we will have to settle on being effective in our reactions. To improve in this area, we must first develop more contacts in EPA so that we can shorten the travel in both directions.

"Second, I would take advantage of Mr. Ruckelshaus' remarks (to the WPCF Conference, October 1971) when he agreed that prior review of contemplated actions, such as the turnkey policy, is in order. I propose that WPCF offer the sponsorship of one-day seminars in Washington, or regionally, to attract a good cross-section evaluation of all new policies under consideration, rather than to just offer so-called official responses. This would be offered not as a means to reject contemplated policies, but rather to give EPA the opportunity to improve on the policy position in question and, of course, to provide the opportunity for the experienced technical input.

"Third, we must find ways right now to provide, for example, the technical services and guidelines to the various new endeavors of EPA which it needs and in which we must acknowledge it has indicated some desire for help. Although we cannot be sure that it, in fact, would take advantage of all our desired input to its programs, I think we have to admit that we are not always prepared."

I believe the recent turnkey controversy is a good example of the dichotomy which continues to prevail between those directly involved in actual implementation of water pollution control facilities and the Federal agency responsible for the procedures by which the Federal funds are allocated for such implementation. Accepting EPA's contention that its proposal of the turnkey concept was to improve the implementation process (even though practically every segment involved in this process believes EPA is in error in this judgment), the more disturbing facet of this action is that EPA did not apparently realize the type of response which such a proposal would generate and did not recognize the potentially disruptive effect that it would provide to the current implementation effort upon which the entire national program is dependent.

One bright side to this entire episode is that it was successful in bringing together for the first time a very strong and effective alliance of practically all of the organizations representing the engineering profession, as well as other concerned with the national water pollution control effort. The joint seminar conducted by Consulting Engineers Council and WPCF at our annual conference in San Francisco this past October was the start of this joint effort. The dialogue is apparently not over, but I believe that the evidence against the turnkey concept must start to look disconcerting to EPA's continued consideration of this approach. In fairness to EPA, I do want to make clear that although we still see many areas of disagreement with this agency, we recognize it has an vastly improved attitude of interest and earnest concern for the views of organizations and individuals outside of the Federal establishment. The improvement is particularly notable when comparison is made with the attitude that prevailed in the Federal agency which immediately preceded EPA.

As has always been the proper and correct procedure for organizations such as the WPCF to deal with Congress, we have provided our input primarily to congressional committees and have stayed away from direct involvement with Congress or its members. Although proper in the past, many aspects have changed to such a drastic extent that I believe a reevaluation is in order. For one thing, the nature of the legislation has changed dramatically in that it is far more technical. It is also no longer limited to a role of guidance and incentives to the state's responsibility, wherein the normal process provided some opportunities to interpret and guide implementation. There is also great evidence now to indicate that the en-



vironmental subject has reached a high level of political sensitivity in Congress, such that the fear of being labeled antienvironmental has considerably lessened the essential critical review of all important legislation in this area.

There also appears to be changes in the manner and extent that individuals and groups are disregarding protocol and tradition in their zeal to appeal directly to Congress for action and programs beneficial to their causes. Whereas public involvement was discouraged in the past and only politely tolerated by Congress, the present time finds a complete new attitude of Congress toward public involvement in the affairs of Government, particularly in the environmental area, and to such an extent that we now see legislation which actually encourages citizen involvement.

Therefore, I think we should now consider going further in our direct involvement with Congress than we had ever dared in the past. I am suggesting to WPCF that we now consider the development of a plan which would enable us to more effectively provide members of Congress an interpretive review of all major issues relating to water pollution control, with particular emphasis being given to the technical aspects of the issues and the consequences of both the actions and inactions of Congress.

To be effective, of course, we must find ways to ensure that the members of Congress will at least listen to our viewpoints and, hopefully, give them fair evaluation with all the other viewpoints that are being put forth, realizing that the other viewpoints might have more short-term, political attraction. To do this, we must become more proficient in understanding the political process and learn to use it to advance those viewpoints which we earnestly believe are essential to the nation.

Recently in San Francisco, WPCF Executive Secretary Robert A. Canham, P.E., discussed the need for increased effective action from concerned professional organizations. Mr. Canham emphasized the need to provide input to legislation at the earliest stages. He pointed out that merely reacting to announced legislation is relatively useless because in many cases Congressmen are already committed in their positions when public debate begins and the bill first reaches the attention of the press. WPCF is learning; some success is now evident, particularly in our approach and rapport with the staffs of the congressional committees, which although lacking in significant engineering representation, have proven of late to be perceptive to most of the considerations which we believe important, although not always agreeing with our interpretation or conclusions.

The Water Pollution Control Federation also believes that our Annual Government Affairs Seminar has developed into a successful vehicle to improve communication with Congress. For the past five years, these one-day seminars have provided opportunity to bring together representatives of WPCF member associations and the elected representatives in Washington to discuss the current issues in the water pollution control area. This year, the seminar is to be held on March 14, in Washington, D.C., and the program will deal with the intent, the implications, and the implementation of the presently proposed 1972 amendments to the Clean Water Act, more commonly referred to as the zero pollutant act. Participants in the program will include representatives of Congress, congressional committees, EPA, state government, municipal government, and consulting engineers.

Of course, similar activities are possible, and probably equally desirable in their fields, for most of America's engineering and technical societies. I note that the National Society of Professional Engineers has announced a public affairs program aimed at

providing engineer leadership in the 1970's. Appropriately, a basic component of this plan is a mechanism for "environmental response" from the engineering profession.

There are, however, real draw-backs to involvement in policy for engineers and/or engineering organizations, and these should not be overlooked. It has been a very comfortable existence to deal only with the logical laws of nature. Dealing with people is less secure, especially if they are not of one's own persuasion. We must recognize that conflicts will arise, and we must be prepared to deal with unexpected disputes and harsh language as we are prepared to deal with the tricks that nature sometimes plays on us.

The inexperience of technical organizations in policy matters may lead to internal disagreements between men of good will and good sense. Again, we must remember that the engineer by tradition is a more reticent individual, with distaste for most things political, usually limiting his participation in controversy to differences in theory and technique. The argument for activism and involvement in areas of social and political controversy may certainly violate the conscience of some members of our profession. Although we should respect the rights of these individuals, we must not relent in our efforts to convince them of the seriousness of the issue to the profession and the nation, and the consequence of our inaction.

There is agreement that America faces a problem of major proportion to protect and reclaim our environment. There is also apparent agreement that this protection and reclamation, in the end, are dependent upon engineering. It is only the denial of engineering participation in the conceptual and policy areas that is in dispute. The engineering profession must, therefore, commit itself now to settle this dispute quickly by demonstrating both the need for its participation throughout the whole process and its capacity and willingness to be a useful partner, sensitive to all considerations of the interests involved.

#### PFC. MICHAEL DALEY

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have been following closely the case of Pfc. Michael Daley who is being court-martialed by the Army. There is strong evidence to suggest that the decision to deny Private First-Class Daley's request to resign from the Army was motivated by anger at him for engaging in legitimate protest demonstrations, which in no way hindered the efficient functioning of the Army.

On March 27 I inserted into the RECORD a series of documents relevant to that case. I am inserting here a later set of documents on this matter. They include a further exchange of correspondence between myself and General Armstrong, commander of Fort Devens, a statement by the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, a questionnaire prepared by Private First-Class Daley's attorney for his defense, and two letters from Private First-Class Daley to General Armstrong.

I am particularly distressed to note evidence that the Army is preventing Private First-Class Daley from collecting information which his attorney believes is vital to the conduct of his defense. In

preventing people from distributing defense questionnaires on the grounds of Fort Devens, the Army is taking an action which confirms the serious doubt I and many others feel about the legitimacy of its proceedings in this case.

At this point I wish to insert the following six documents:

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Fort Devens, Mass., March 30, 1972.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: This will acknowledge receipt of your inquiry of 26 March 1972 concerning the general court-martial case of United States v. Private First Class E-3 Michael R. Daley.

The Acting Commander's decision to deny PFC Daley's request for administrative discharge was based solely upon the facts and circumstances of PFC Daley's offense and his record as a whole. Each commander in PFC Daley's chain of command was required by regulation to indorse his request for administrative discharge and make a recommendation based on factors that commander considered significant. Each commander's recommendation was just that—a recommendation. The Commanding General or in his absence, the Acting Commander, makes the ultimate decision of any request for administrative discharge. That decision is made on a case-by-case basis.

There was no relation between PFC Daley's political protest activities and my decision to refer this case to trial by general court-martial. At the time I made the decision to refer this case to trial, I was completely unaware of PFC Daley's protest activities. The fact that the referral to trial took place on a date subsequent to a demonstration in which you indicate Michael Daley took part was merely a fortuitous coincidence. The delay incident to the referral of charges to trial in PFC Daley's case resulted from the necessity to gather evidence and records upon which a prosecution, or indeed a defense, could be based. Each case that is referred to trial by general court-martial is referred on an individual basis. There are no established guidelines imposed on this process by myself or anyone else. My decision to refer this case to trial was based on Michael Daley's protracted unauthorized absence totaling 438 days. The decision was completely within my discretion as the General Court-Martial Convening Authority, and was made after careful consideration of all facts concerning Michael Daley's offense.

As with the administrative process, subordinate commanders merely make recommendations as to the appropriate judicial level at which to dispose of a military offense.

There are no statistics available concerning the percentage of individuals granted administrative discharges versus those referred to trial by court-martial. These statistics are not kept. In many cases, individuals are referred to trial and then granted administrative discharges. Both the administrative and judicial actions are processed concurrently on an individual basis.

I hope this satisfactorily answers your inquiry. Be assured that your continued interest in PFC Daley's case is most gratifying and if I may be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

DEWITT C. ARMSTRONG III,  
Brigadier General, USA, Commanding.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1972.

Brig. Gen. DEWITT C. ARMSTRONG,  
Department of the Army,  
Headquarters, Fort Devens,  
Fort Devens, Mass.

DEAR GENERAL ARMSTRONG: Thank you for your prompt reply to my most recent letter.

I was on an inspection tour of Vietnam and Thailand when your letter arrived, and consequently this response is delayed.

While I appreciate the trouble you took in writing to me, I do not believe that your letter was fully responsive to the questions posed in my letter of March 26. I am particularly interested in learning which officers were involved in recommending the referral of PFC Daley to court-martial, and to what extent their duties would have brought them into contact with his protest activities, prior to the court-martial decision. I am equally concerned to learn why Colonel Theriault's obviously improper allusion to PFC Daley's protest activities was in fact "noted" by those who decided to deny his request for a discharge.

Finally, in your answer to me you note that the decision to refer PFC Daley for court-martial was delayed by the need to gather evidence and records on which the trial could proceed. I would very much like to know whether such documents were in fact in your hand at the time of the decision to proceed to a court-martial.

On a related point, I have been informed that representatives of PFC Daley who were seeking to distribute a questionnaire prepared by his attorney for use in his defense were prevented from doing so by military police at Fort Devens. I urge you as strongly as I can to see that this does not recur.

Certainly the Army does not wish to appear to be hindering the preparation of the most effective defense, a right which is guaranteed to PFC Daley by the Constitution. As the facts were related to me, I see nothing in the distribution of a defense related questionnaire which is in any way disruptive of the functioning of Fort Devens, and I can find no justification for an official refusal to allow it.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

FORT DEVENS, MASS., April 3, 1972.

Brig. Gen. D. ARMSTRONG III,  
Post Commander,  
Fort Devens, Mass.

DEAR GENERAL ARMSTRONG: I respectfully notify you that beginning Friday, April 7, 1972 through Thursday April 13, 1972, a group of friends organized in my defense plans to obtain information pertinent and crucial to my defense at general Court Martial.

This will involve the distribution of the enclosed questionnaire and the statement in the Congressional Record of March 27, 1972 by Congressman Michael Harrington.

I trust that your utmost regard for the executive branch of our government and President Nixon's view that—"servicemen are citizens first and soldiers second. In his speech at the United States Air Force Academy graduation ceremony in June of 1969,—will insure that this group of people be afforded every courtesy in compiling the necessary information regarding my defense.

We plan to set up a defense table in front of the main Post Exchange so as to enable us to better distribute this defense questionnaire.

Our purpose in distributing the foregoing questionnaires is to gather defense data and to obtain necessary defense witnesses.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Most sincerely,

MICHAEL R. DALEY.

DEFENSE QUESTIONNAIRE—PFC. MICHAEL R. DALEY

You may have information pertinent to Pfc. Daley's defense. Pfc. Michael Daley and his defense committee ask that you please answer the following questions and return this defense questionnaire to the Pfc. Daley Defense Action Committee.

(1) Do you have any information pertinent to how Brigadier General Armstrong can

state that Pfc. Michael Daley's political activities "although noted, were not a factor" in Col. Robert Pearson's deciding that Pfc. Daley should be court-martialed?

(2) Do you have any information or statistics revealing the extent to which Brigadier General Armstrong or Col. Pearson is prejudiced against persons who have been AWOL from overseas replacement station? Have you ever heard General Armstrong say that he considers persons AWOL from overseas replacement station in the same manner as he considers persons who desert on the field of battle?

(3) Have you ever heard General Armstrong or Col. Pearson or any other Fort Devens official make racist statements or use racist epithets or tell racist jokes or make a statement to the effect that Pfc. Daley should be hanged for publicly advocating black rights at Fort Devens (i.e., the general court-martial of Pvt. Roosevelt Clady)?

(4) Have you ever heard any official at this post make a statement to the effect that Pfc. Michael Daley should be hanged for exposing substandard, disease-ridden, filthy, rat-and-roach infested enlisted men's barracks at Fort Devens?

(5) Have you ever heard Col. Pearson, Deputy Post Commander, state that he does not intend to allow personnel at Fort Devens to "wash the Army's dirty linen in public," or words to that effect?

(6) Have you ever heard General Armstrong or Col. Pearson or any other Fort Devens official make a statement to the effect that they were going to throw the book at Pfc. Michael Daley for shooting off his mouth to the press?

(7) Are you satisfied with your living conditions (i.e., hot water, heat, privacy, food)?

(8) Do you have any information regarding Pvt. Roosevelt Clady's three medical profiles and what may have happened to them after a Congressional inquiry about his medical condition was initiated?

(9) Have you ever heard anyone, officer or enlisted man at this post or elsewhere, state that the military jury or the judge that is to try Pfc. Michael Daley was instructed by the Fort Devens command to convict him and give him a maximum sentence?

(10) Do you know anything of communications between or directions from the Department of the Army (Pentagon) and Fort Devens, Massachusetts, with regard to Pfc. Michael Daley, the general court-martial of Pvt. Roosevelt Clady, or the demonstrations protesting the living conditions at Fort Devens, Massachusetts?

(11) Do you wish to submit your name as a potential character witness for Pfc. Michael Daley? If so, please sign here:

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Rank \_\_\_\_\_  
SSAN \_\_\_\_\_  
Unit \_\_\_\_\_

(12) If you wish to join the Pfc. Michael R. Daley Defense Action Committee, please check below:

Officer \_\_\_\_\_  
Enlisted \_\_\_\_\_  
Civil service \_\_\_\_\_

Please return this questionnaire to The Pfc. Michael R. Daley Defense Action Committee, 116 W. Main Street, Ayer, Massachusetts 01432, or 367 Harvard Street, Apt. 1, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Feel free to call (617) 772-0084, or (617) 876-3876.

PFC. DALEY DEFENSE ACTION COMMITTEE,  
Cambridge, Mass., April 9, 1972.  
Brig. Gen. DEWITT ARMSTRONG III,  
Commanding General,  
Fort Devens, Mass.

DEAR GENERAL ARMSTRONG: On Saturday, April 8, 1972, two of my defense workers were assisting me in the lawful preparation of my defense of my pending general court-martial at Fort Devens. My aides were pass-

ing out "defense questionnaires," to members of your command in front of the Fort Devens Post Exchange. The purpose of the questionnaire, as I have previously advised you, was to secure evidence and additional military witnesses at Fort Devens to prove command fraud in your referral of my AWOL charges to general court-martial at Fort Devens.

On the afternoon in question my aides had hardly passed out thirty questionnaires to Fort Devens soldiers when they were suddenly set upon by your military police, and told that pursuant to your order they could not pass out the questionnaires at Fort Devens! They were arrested, hauled to the Provost Marshall's office, physically assaulted, finger-printed and mugged. My defense product (i.e., the defense questionnaires), was removed from their possession by force and one of my aides was actually handcuffed. After three hours of harassment and false imprisonment, my aides were released and the questionnaires returned to them—and they were ultimately escorted from the post.

On the previous day, Friday, April 7, 1972, as I am sure you are also aware, other defense workers in my case were summarily ordered to cease distributing the same defense questionnaire in front of the Fort Devens Post Exchange but they were not otherwise harmed or physically intimidated.

I must call your attention to the fact that I forwarded you a copy of the questionnaire on April 3, 1972, advised you of its intended purpose and furnished you the time and date that my defense committee would distribute the defense questionnaire at the Post Exchange at Fort Devens. Thus, I find it beyond comprehension that you would intentionally block the lawful gathering of defense evidence in my case through the simple expedient of force and physical intimidation.

I therefore request, respectfully, that the intimidation of my defense efforts and of my defense co-workers at Fort Devens be terminated, and that I be permitted to continue the lawful preparation of my defense without fear of bodily harm or command reprisal.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL R. DALEY.

VIETNAM VETERANS AGAINST THE WAR,  
Cambridge, Mass., April 5, 1972.

The Viet Nam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) deplors the decision of Brigadier General DeWitt Armstrong, Commanding General, Ft. Devens, Massachusetts, to court martial Private Michael Daley on charges of AWOL. We feel that the Army's motives in bringing Private Daley to trial are suspect and should be subject to the most rigorous examination by the press, by Congressmen, and civilian authorities in the Defense Department itself. We feel that the Army's clear oppression of Private Daley, through a punitive court martial, is because he has on several occasions participated in legal public demonstrations against living conditions and racial discrimination at Ft. Devens as well as the Viet Nam War. The VVAW strongly objects to this attempt by the Army to suppress lawful dissent and to use the threat of court martial as a means of intimidating soldiers from exercising their Constitutional rights. It is only through the most widespread distribution of Private Daley's defense questionnaire at Ft. Devens that the truth can be brought to light in this case.

In addition, we feel that Private Daley's refusal to fight in Viet Nam, on grounds of conscience, was a courageous act. Had more of us veterans taken similar action, the tragedy of the IndoChina War might have been averted and the 55,000 Americans who died in that conflict might be alive today.

It has long been our view that those who refused to fight in Viet Nam—either by fleeing to sanctuaries abroad, going AWOL from overseas replacement stations (as in



the case of Private Daley)—should be given full pardon and amnesty. In accord with this belief, we feel that all charges against Private Daley should be dropped and his court martial, now scheduled for April 13, halted.

This afternoon the VVAW will formally request Senator Sam Ervin (D-N.C.), chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, begin a full-scale investigation into the circumstances surrounding Private Daley's confinement, indictment, and court martial.

We request that the Armed Services Committees of both houses of Congress conduct an in-depth investigation into barracks conditions and instances of racial discrimination at Ft. Devens.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE  
JOEL T. BROYHILL ON THE 80TH  
BIRTHDAY OF CARDINAL JOZSEF  
MINDSZENTY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with my colleagues in congratulating a hero of Hungary, of the Catholic Church and of the fight for human rights and dignity everywhere, the aged but still active and spiritually unbroken cardinal-primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church, Jozsef Mindszenty, at his 80th birthday. I wish him many happy and healthy returns and a fruitful pastorate and further work toward the realization of individual and church freedoms in his native country.

He has celebrated, if we can properly use the word, in the twilight of his worldly career. Cardinal Mindszenty is still deprived from his office to which he was legally appointed by the Pope and the Hungarian Government in 1945, his unjust and unfounded sentence has still not been quashed by the Budapest government, and the conditions of his stay in Austria still forbid any political activity, even to the degree that his most recent pastoral letter was criticized by certain Austrian press organs more interested in appeasing the Soviets and the Communist Hungarian Government than honoring a great man in their midst.

Cardinal Mindszenty has, without complaint, assumed responsibility for his people during all his career. He refused to compromise with totalitarianism, be it from the Left or from the Right, he remained true and loyal to the Christian principles of neighborly love and the human dignity of each individual. Over and beyond this he remained a Hungarian patriot, not in a nationalist sense of the word, but in the sense of an all-encompassing love of his community and people. For this reason he has suffered more than many of his unfortunate countrymen, but for this reason, too, he has become a living symbol for Christianity and humanism in Hungary all over the world. His memoirs, which are just about completed, will span three generations of Hungarian and world history, so important in making the country what it is today.

All Hungarians, spread into all the

lands of the world, are a proud people with a history of many centuries of independence and struggle. They remain proud of their cardinal-primate who has fought for the independence of his country external and internally through sermons and personal example as well. They still look to him as their moral and spiritual leader to help them in their gradual struggle against oppression of a "foreign government."

At this time, it is fitting and proper to use the cardinal's own words as a message of hope, words he had spoken to his mother before submitting to arrest by the Rakosi regime. He said:

No need to worry, everything will be all right. All we need is to pray.

SOVIET JEWS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the suffering of Soviet Jewry continues unabated. Congregation B'nai Israel in my district has "adopted" the Hillel Butman family and is most concerned with their well-being. Hillel Butman has been interred in a labor camp.

I would like to insert at this point a report of a conversation between Mort Yadin of Congregation B'nai Israel and Mrs. Eva Butman and copies of the telegram which was sent to Ambassador, Hon. Anatoly Dobrynin that has so far gone unanswered.

I commend Congregation B'nai Israel for its concern and vigilance in exposing the cruelties and abuses suffered by the Jews under the Soviet system. The material follows:

CONVERSATION BETWEEN MORT YADIN AND EVA BUTMAN (WIFE OF HILLEL BUTMAN, INTERNED IN POTMA LABOR CAMP), MARCH 21, 1972

M. Hello, Eva. Did you visit your husband on March 17th?

E. Yes, I visited him on the 17th, 18th and 19th. On Monday, March 20th, after I left my husband with my escort, Oleg Secheravi, and we arrived at the Potma station in order to go back to Leningrad, we were taken to a militia station and detained on the basis of a fake document which was a provocative document prepared in advance. According to this false document, they said that we had some stolen diamonds and other valuables hidden on us. They conducted an internal and external search. Our request that they should call the prosecutor or produce a search warrant was ignored. And, I was beaten up.

M. Excuse me, were you beaten up?

E. Yes, I was beaten up. I was hit on the face, and my head was hit against the wall. All my face is disfigured and swollen.

M. Did they find anything on you?

E. No, on me, personally, nothing was found.

M. So they beat you up and let you go?

E. In some way they claimed that they found on my escort some notes that were allegedly written by my husband. I also wanted to tell that when I went to visit my husband, I took with me letters from our friends and relatives in Israel. Before going to visit my husband, I turned them in for an inspection so that my husband should be able to read them. After the visit, this correspond-

ence was not returned to me. During the search, all of a sudden, this correspondence was found in the personal belongings of my escort, Oleg Secheravi. Also, they found some notes which were allegedly written by my husband (the handwriting was not my husband's). The search lasted for six hours, 2-8 p.m.; and, of course, no diamonds were found. After the search, two K.G.B. agents arrived, Stochenko and Lovin. Stochenko interrogated me. He asked how it happened that these notes got into the possession of my escort. He said these notes were written by my husband and that my husband will have to pay for this and will get it. Do you understand?

M. Yes, I understand.

E. Today I will send a telegram to the camp commandant, Colonel Osipov.

M. I had a telephone conversation with Col. Osipov.

E. When?

M. On February 24th.

E. What did he tell you?

M. He did not give a reply to any of my questions. He said, "All questions concerning prisoners have to be addressed in writing to the Association of the Russian Red Cross. I cannot give any information concerning prisoners over the phone." I told him that in Washington everything is known and all the information will be relayed to President Nixon.

E. (she burst into tears). Please relay to the President that he should help the prisoners and that they, and we, should not perish here!

M. Do not worry, you will not perish; and we will not forget you. I will give all this information to the Press.

E. On February 11th, Penso's mother came to visit him.

M. We know of this incident. The authorities told her that the room for visitors was not ready yet; and after traveling all the way to Potma, she had to go back.

E. There was a four day hunger strike because Misha Shepshilovitch was not permitted a visit by his mother. For a hunger strike there is no prescribed punishment. You can only get solitary confinement. But they got punished anyway. Their extra food was taken away for a whole month. Extra hard labor, carrying of lumber, is done by Zaslavsky, Penso and Kirshner. They were working with their brigade and performing their quotas 100% and over. In spite of this, they lost their special allowance of two rubles, which they get when the prescribed work quota is done. With this they can buy additional food. Zaslavsky, Penso and Kirshner are not getting their two rubles. Misha Shepshilovitch is working in painting; and, although he performs his quota, he also does not get his two rubles.

M. What else?

E. Anatoly Goldfeld is being threatened that he will not receive his parcels which he is supposed to receive after three months. Even the two parcels which a prisoner can receive a year are being threatened. Lev Yagman's health is still serious, and it has to be brought to the attention of the International Red Cross. After he left the hospital, he was supposed to get light work, but the doctor did not give a sick ticket; so he has to do hard labor. The only medication that he gets is drops to relieve his heart pains. When he was in the hospital, the doctor promised to assign him to light work; but, when he left the hospital, the promise was not kept. Victor Bugoslavsky also had a heart attack. Now I can tell you about their diet.

M. Most probably borscht and black berad.

E. Breakfast: 1/2 litre of meatless, watery soup. Lunch: 200 grams of peas or oats, which are fit for cattle to eat, or some kasha, 200 grams, that's all. Supper: 20 grams of what they call fried fish (it does not look like fish) and some rotten potatoes (they even give them plates in which to throw the

potatoes because they know they're not edible) and 15 grams of sugar per day.

M. Did you receive my letter?

E. Yes, I received your letter where you informed me that Mr. Goldkind sent me a parcel. I have, as yet, not received the parcel.

M. You will, most probably, get it soon.

E. Thank you very much. I told my husband that we have such good friends in Washington.

M. Did you receive the photograph of Hillel's chair that I sent you?

E. Yes, I received the letter with the photograph.

M. I also sent you a letter on December 15th. You did not receive this letter?

E. No, the December letter I have as yet not received.

M. I sent you a letter on February 29th, and I got the return receipt dated March 10th, signed by you. Is it your signature?

E. Yes, it is my signature. It is very good that you sent your mail registered with return receipt.

M. This is what we always do. If the letter is not delivered and is not returned, the Soviet government has to pay a Fifteen Dollar fine.

E. Wonderful, wonderful. Very good. I told Hillel that we have wonderful "relatives" in Washington and that I found a good "uncle" who is concerned about us; and he was very glad to hear about our warm "relatives".

M. We will let the Press know what happened. Did you complain to the authorities?

E. Today I will write a complaint to the Minister of the Interior, Shokolov; and I will also send a telegram to Colonel Osipov, commandant of the camp where I will say that I was illegally detained and searched illegally, internally; and also that the K.G.B. agent, Stochenko, threatened to dispose of my husband in the appropriate manner.

M. How does Hillel feel, himself?

E. Fair. He does not have any appetite. I brought some good food. He looked at it, but did not eat any. He lost his appetite and his desire to live.

M. Do you know if the Prisoners receive the parcels that we send from America?

E. Let me give you an example. A food parcel was sent to Aron Shpilberg. The parcel was shown to him, and they said that they would store this parcel with his personal belongings; and when it rots, they would throw it out. Shpilberg asked that parcel be returned, but they said, "No, it will rot with personal belongings, and then we will throw it out." Hillel got a Fifty Dollar draft and made arrangements for me to receive his power of attorney in order to cash the draft; but I have not gotten the power of attorney. I think that I will receive it.

M. Some money has been sent to you. Did you receive this money?

E. Yes, yes, I received the money; and it is very helpful. I am very grateful, for I could not do without it. Please thank all my "relatives" for it.

M. I will give all your "relatives" regards, and I will also ask your "relatives" to relate your predicament to President Nixon.

E. Now, please listen. The conditions in the camp are unbearable. The prisoners live 40 to a barrack, and they are not allowed to visit their friends in another barrack. If, even by accident, they happen to be in another barrack, another prisoner comes out and reports this to the authorities. Usually this other prisoner is a former Nazi who was responsible for the deaths of thousands of Jews. Immediately, a prison controller appears, and our boys are punished severely for this prison infraction. There is a lot of anti-semitism in the camp.

E. It would be beneficial if our prisoners could be separated from the other prisoners, since they consider themselves foreigners. Our prisoners have no future in the Soviet Union and do not want to have any ties with the U.S.S.R. Their future and ties are with Israel.

In your conversations with your governments or organs of the Red Cross, please stress that these prisoners do not want to have any ties with the Soviet Union, and they are in the camps for reeducation. Why reeducate them when they want to leave the Soviet Union and have no ties with the U.S.S.R.? If they would be let out, everybody would benefit—our husbands, their families and the Soviet Union—since the prisoners no longer consider themselves citizens of the U.S.S.R. and do not want to live in the Soviet Union.

M. We are writing to the International Red Cross, but it is unfortunate that the International Red Cross does not have a representative in the U.S.S.R.

E. Is it possible to have come kind of International inspection of the camps?

M. We are trying. We are sending letters and telegrams. I think that President Nixon will help.

E. We have great hopes in President Nixon.

M. He wrote a letter to Ruth Averbach (Alexandrovitch) and told her that he sympathized with the Jewish problem in the U.S.S.R. and the condition of the prisoners and that he would raise the issue during his Moscow visit. This letter was broadcast by Voice of America to the U.S.S.R. Did you hear it?

E. No, I did not. Do you know the time and the waves of these broadcasts?

M. No, I do not know. Do you listen to Kol Israel?

E. Yes, definitely, every day.

M. Two times a week the Voice of America broadcasts to the Soviet Union on the subject of Soviet Jews. The broadcasts are in Russian. Do you work?

E. Yes, I still work.

M. Where do you work, and in what capacity?

E. I work as an engineer. This is my second job. I was fired from my first job, and I do not know how long they will keep me here.

M. You have my address. Please write me a letter and mail me photographs of Hillel, yourself and your daughter.

E. I will definitely write you a letter.

M. The next call will be on Saturday night, April 1st, which is Passover.

E. Have a happy Pesach and wish all our "relatives" a happy holiday.

M. Be healthy and do not lose your spirits. We will not let you down!

#### [Night letter]

Ambassador ANATOLY DOBRYNIN,  
Embassy U.S.S.R.,  
Washington, D.C.:

On March 20, Eva Butman wife of Jewish prisoner Hillel Butman was interrogated, searched, threatened and beaten by KGB agents Stochenko and Lovin after visiting her husband in Potma prison camp. As congregation which adopted the Butman family we protest this Hitlerite terror tactic against defenseless woman and request assurances it will not reoccur. Committee of this congregation requests meeting with you to discuss matter. Please advise convenient time and date of such meeting.

HENRY SEGAL, Rabbi,

WILLARD MAZIE, President,

B'nai Israel Congregation.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

#### UNEMPLOYED PH. D.'S

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious and all encompassing

problems plaguing our Nation today is that of raging unemployment. The statistics clearly show that unemployment is a condition known to all segments of our society, including the very highly educated. Indeed, there is an increasing number of unemployed Ph. D.'s, especially those holding degrees in the disciplines of the sciences. After having assumed that their degree would hold the key to an exciting career, these doctorate holders find that they are unable to realize their job expectations for there are a decreasing number of opportunities available to them in the biological, physical, and engineering sciences. The oversupply of Ph. D.'s is most certainly a disturbing fact and reflects the more general current economic crisis.

While the surplus of Ph. D.'s continues to grow, so does the shortage of medical manpower. Just 2 years ago the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education characterized this shortage as being the "most serious in any major occupational group." The Commission estimated that 50,000 more physicians were required to meet the Nation's health needs. It went on to recommend that there be a 50-percent increase in enrollment in medical schools over the period of the next 10 years.

Perhaps the primary reason for this critical shortage lies in the fact that there is, quite simply, a "lack of space." To build more medical schools and expand existing institutions. However, The obvious solutions to this problem are these steps take considerable time to implement. Certainly this is necessary, even imperative, but because of the intensity of the problem, a shorter ranged answer is demanded. The concept of reducing the period of time that it takes to earn a degree in medicine is an excellent interim answer.

In line with this approach, a survey was recently conducted by the Association of American Medical Colleges which showed that while many schools offer informal programs of acceleration to their students on an individual basis, about 26 schools offer a more formal program wherein a student can receive his degree in less than the normal 4-year time allotment. These schools include:

Length of time required for M.D. degree	Years
University of Alabama	3
Albert Einstein	3
Baylor	3
University of California (Irvine)	3½
University of California (San Francisco)	3½
Dartmouth	3
Duke	3½
Indiana	3
Loyola (Stritch)	3½
University of Kansas	3
Meharry	3½
University of Minnesota	3
University of Nebraska	3
University of North Carolina	3
Medical School of Ohio in Toledo	3
Ohio State University Medical School	3
University of Pennsylvania	3
Rush	3
University of South Carolina	3
Stanford University	3½
SUNY (Syracuse)	3½
University of Tennessee	3½
University of Texas (Houston)	3
University of Texas (Galveston)	3
Medical College of Virginia	3
University of Washington (Seattle)	3



Generally speaking, the student response has been more than enthusiastic, and the number of graduating physicians will increase as a result. These schools are to be commended for their successful efforts.

A more dramatic alternative has been offered by the University of Miami School of Medicine. This school has launched a unique training program which bridges both the problem of the shortage of medical manpower and the problem of the unemployment-underemployment of Ph. D.'s. This program, which was initiated in July of 1971 and is under the direction of Dr. William J. Whelan, chairman of the department of biochemistry, seeks to retrain Ph. D.'s holding degrees in the biological, physical and engineering sciences and brings them to M.D. status within a 2-year framework. It is based on the belief that several of these Ph. D.'s, who are otherwise unemployed, have already fulfilled most of the requirements of the first 2 years of medical school by virtue of their Ph. D. requirements. Dr. William J. Harrington, chairman of the department of medicine says:

What it takes to get through medical school is not so much background, although that is important, but the learning discipline. If a person has had to do a lot of studying on his own, which is true of most graduate students, he becomes highly disciplined, well-structured in his learning habits. What we're teaching here are medical concepts, and these Ph. D.'s have the ability to learn the details on their own.

Those accepted into the special program pursue a preclinical curriculum tailored to their individual needs which brings them up to the proficiency level of the regular third year students, enabling them to obtain degrees of doctor of medicine within a total period of about 18 months. Currently 20 students are enrolled in the program and all are reported to be progressing extremely well. The students are right on schedule and it is expected that all of the 20 students will graduate in December of this year.

The program's success is attested to by the fact that some 5,000 have expressed interest in the program for next year, and 1,000 have submitted completed applications for a maximum of 20 slots. Fifteen other medical schools have shown an interest in this experiment and although they are in more or less a "watchful waiting" stage, these schools are eager to see the Ph. D./M.D. program succeed.

The advantages to the program are plentiful. Not only does the program create a channel through which the number of doctors can be increased expediently, it provides an opportunity to cope effectively with the surplus of Ph. D.'s in the sciences. Too, this project is an excellent example of converting from a defense to a civilian-oriented economy in that many of the individuals who would conceivably enter this program are the same individuals who might, and did, do research for the defense industry. The University of Miami School of Medicine is to be congratulated for its ingenuity and creativeness with regard to the program.

But there is no reason for this program to be restricted to the University of Miami, and the staff there fully

agrees. They do not want to monopolize the program. They are more interested in reducing the physician shortage and in certifying the greatest number of doctors as soon as possible without jeopardizing the quality of education.

I would like to see this program instituted at as many of the existing 113 medical schools as possible. If each school would undertake this project on a formal basis, we would have over 2,000 newly qualified physicians, over and above the normal number graduating, in a relatively short period of time.

However, this undertaking costs money to implement, and more often than not, there is not enough money available to carry out creative and innovative ideas, such as this one. That is not the case here. In November of last year, the Congress acted on the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act, which among other things, provides money for programs like the Miami one. The act specifically states in section 770 and again in section 772 that—

The Secretary may make grants to assist schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, and podiatry in meeting the costs of special projects to—

"(1) effect significant improvements in the curriculums of any such schools (including projects to shorten the length of time required for training in such schools), with particular emphasis, in the case of schools of medicine or osteopathy, upon the establishment of new, or expansion of existing, programs for training in family medicine;"

It is clear that the money is available; now it is a question as to whether or not the funds will be expended for this purpose. I strongly urge Secretary Richardson to see to it that they are.

There is a great shortage of doctors in this country now and the shortage will become more acute. At the same time there is a pool of talent in our Ph. D.'s that is not being used to its potential. The Ph. D./M.D. program offers a real alternative to help alleviate both problems. I would hope that the Secretary would act diligently to see that the available funds are spent for the purpose of converting these doctors of philosophy to doctors of medicine.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS NEEDED IN OUR SCHOOLS

#### HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware that the value of occupational training cannot be overemphasized. In my service on the House Education and Labor Committee for the past 3 years, and as chairman of the Republican Task Force on Education and Training, I have been deeply impressed by the need to encourage vocational education in this Nation. The evidence overwhelmingly indicates that our most pressing manpower needs for the 1970's will come in

the subbaccalaureate skilled, technical, clerical, and paraprofessional occupations. As the National Advisory Council of Vocational Education stated recently:

At the very heart of our problem is a natural attitude that says vocational education is designed for somebody else's children. . . . We have promoted the idea that only good education is an education capped by four years of college. This idea by our values, or aspirations and our silent support, is snobbish, undemocratic, and a revelation of why schools fail so many students.

With these thoughts in mind, I was very impressed by an article which appeared in the Community Forum section of the South Idaho Press, on March 10, 1972. Lovell Turner is the principal of Burley Junior High School, and in this article he addresses himself to the problem I have noted. It speaks for itself, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I insert the article in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS NEEDED IN OUR SCHOOLS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is another in a continuing series of weekly columns written by local and area people on topics of current or general interest. This column was prepared by Lovell Turner, Burley Junior High School principal, and tells about an area of education that is seriously lacking and vitally needed in Cassia County and other areas of the state and nation.)

I express my appreciation for the invitation to offer my small contribution to the community forum this week. It was suggested that I discuss vocational education which is coming more to the front in our educational system. I am sure this is coming about because of the fact we have continuously become more and more academic and college oriented.

Let's look at one subject area, such as mathematics where we have used for the past several years, the Orleans Prognosis Tests to predict probable success of students about to enter algebra and geometry. While teaching algebra eight years ago we used a raw score of 26 points on this test and this would divert 25 per cent of the students into general math and thus delay entry into algebra pending a year's maturity. This score was common throughout the county.

With the advent of modern math coupled with the dropping of some of the basics of algebra and geometry into grade seven and eight, it took only five years to raise this 26 score to 53. In other words 75 per cent of our incoming ninth graders had more than doubled their score on the same nationally validated test in a span of about five or six years.

Yes, I am quite sure all of our Cassia County schools are doing a better job than ever, for our academically oriented, or college bound student. Because of this emphasis and the extreme competition, we are finding an increasing number of our students, upon reaching junior high age, unable to achieve the success enjoyed by these better scholars. We find much the same condition developing in other subject areas of the core program.

We at Burley Junior High attempt to solve these problems through various programs of developmental reading, special achievement, or special education, and in addition, do some grouping in upper and lower levels in some subject areas. In spite of all we do, we find many academic classes with a group of high level achievers and another group who needs special help. It is difficult for a teacher to reach both levels. There are many reasons for low achievement, among these are slow development, maturation, poor attendance, illness, motivation or a general indifference to school. Nearly every boy who withdraws

from school has previously received one or more failing grades.

In years gone by, our school activities were the most exciting thing we did all day, but we find now that due to transportation, communication, television, and availability of money to participate in their many activities, school is not now as exciting in comparison. I agree with many who say that the most important contribution to a student's education is a good teacher in a classroom, but I find it necessary to add to this a "relevant and meaningful curriculum."

Yes, we have a surplus of degrees, and white collar workers and it is time to place emphasis and importance on the skilled and semi-skilled blue collar workers in the trades and industries. It is time to expand our vocational educational programs for all students. Junior high school is the exploratory age and the state recommended program in industrial arts is set up in six-week blocks, enabling a student to get just a little insight and experience, and the high school program is expanded to a semester basis, for each offering. Space will not permit an outline of a full vocational program, so I shall select only one area to consider, and this is industrial arts. These programs are presently limited in the state for the following reasons: 1. Educational philosophy of the community. 2. Resources available (money, facilities, etc.) 3. Needs of the community. 4. The capabilities of the teacher.

Typical offering in industrial arts are as follows in a junior high: (six weeks courses)—planning art sketching, wood craft, art metal, plastics, leather craft, basic electricity, (nine weeks)—mechanical drawing, bench wood working, bench metal, electricity, grade nine (nine weeks each)—mechanical drawing, metal power work, mechanics, graphic arts. An industrial education sequence is presently being expanded in the state's high schools but let's look at a few areas recommended for high school seniors. (Two periods a day) metal working, advanced welding, new materials and processes, advanced electricity, electronics, radio and television, electronics, circuits and devices, advanced drafting, architecture, illustrative drawing, and descriptive geometry.

"Industrial-vocational education is a branch of vocational education which is concerned with preparing persons for initial employment in a wide range of trade or industrial occupations. Special industrial education is a branch of the industrial vocational program consisting of courses which provide occupational training for students with special academic, social, or economic needs. Industrial arts provides a broad, comprehensive study of industrial fields and materials that enables students to identify and develop interests and abilities for a wiser choice of further education, whether it be vocational, technical, or professional."

In Idaho, industrial arts does not receive special funding, however, three vocational areas do. These areas are vocational ag., home ec., and business education. Burley High School initiated an excellent vocational education two years ago, offering auto mechanics, advanced welding, metal work, etc. Inadequate facilities and equipment prevents it from being state funded as a vocational offering and places it under the industrial arts program. Eighty boys are in the program and 76 boys were turned away because of limited facilities, and many are turned away from the junior high industrial arts program for the same reason. The state is presently writing up and ready to fund vocational educational programs in auto mechanics, consumer electronics, body and fender consumer appliance (repair) and general industrial mechanics. Only a few large high schools in our state will get these programs because they require very expensive equipment, and facilities along with special instructors which are in short supply,

coupled with the fact that for obvious reasons, class loads are generally kept to less than 20 students. Yes, these programs are costly, but we need to provide for all students. We need to expand our present efforts in vocational education and make our schools more meaningful and purposeful for more of our Cassia County students. We all need to re-assess our educational objectives and place the skilled or semiskilled worker in the trades, the proper perspective, and lend prestige equal to that enjoyed by our white collar workers. Auto smoke, welding rod, electrical solder, and tape have a much greater holding power for many students than does chalk dust, erasers and textbooks.

An average sized comprehensive high school of about 1,000 students could offer both the vocational and college preparatory, where students could group their classes in one or the other areas, or combine both areas into their educational program. For instance, a prospective engineer could take physics as college prep and also get electronics from the vocational department. It is time to gear our elective programs more closely to student needs and interests. I am sure it will be a paying investment which will produce self-sustaining adults, willing and able to contribute to the nation's economy.

#### HANDICAPPED STUDENTS MAKE OLD PHONE CORDS GOOD AGAIN

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again report to you another successful venture involving the employment of handicapped persons by the Occupational Training Center in St. Paul, Minn.

This center, Mr. Speaker, is providing many handicapped people in the Twin Cities area with their first fulltime job. This is done in addition to the other services provided for the handicapped. The value of the center in terms of the handicapped persons self-respect and in giving him the opportunity to be a contributing member of our society is immeasurable.

What is also important is that the Occupational Training Center is answering two important questions in its work.

One, the jobs that the handicapped are performing are worthwhile and useful. Mr. Speaker, they are not dead end, make-work jobs.

Second, the center is not seeking charity by taking jobs normally performed by nonhandicapped people off of the general job market. Rather they are identifying areas and services that are not presently being done by any other businesses.

One example of this was the subject of another report on the center I made to you and our colleagues. This was the recycling center that was established in cooperation with Hamms Brewery and the Coca-Cola Bottling Co.

The subject of my report today is a joint venture between the center and Western Electric through the local offices of Northwestern Bell.

I now, with pride, insert on the RECORD a full report of this successful operation as it was reported in my district:

#### PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS—MAKING OLD TELEPHONE CORDS GOOD AGAIN

A unique program in St. Paul is helping Western Electric salvage more than 300,000 telephone cords a year for Northwestern Bell—and preparing many mentally retarded and physically handicapped persons for their first full-time jobs.

Each month, some 50,000 telephones are returned to Western Electric's Repair Center from NWB's repair groups throughout Minnesota and North Dakota. Damaged cords on these phones are removed and taken to the Midway Learning and Manufacturing Division of St. Paul's Occupational Training Center.

Before the salvage program was started in 1969, Western Electric supplied new cords for many of the telephones sent to them for repair. That was the most economical thing to do at the time. Now, the Occupational Training Center refurbishes 60 to 70 per cent of the old cords and returns them as good as new. They've helped reduce NWB's maintenance expenditures for replacement cords almost 80 per cent.

The student workers who handle the jobs of repairing, cleaning, recoiling, testing and packaging telephone cords use the work situations to prepare for regular jobs outside the training program.

The 65 workers are paid for their efforts. For many, it is the first opportunity they have had to earn any money.

"We try to build hand-and-eye coordination, competence in using public transportation, telling time and using machinery within the work situations," says Rick Twedell, shop supervisor for Midway Learning and Manufacturing. "But it's just as important to encourage and develop the self-esteem and self-confidence of these handicapped people, because they've often been kept away from activity of decision-making of even the simplest nature."

Twedell says the students repaired about 300 telephone cords a week when the Western Electric contract started, but he estimates that they are now handling up to 5,000 each week.

"We don't want to take work away from anyone who is employed already, so we seek useful tasks, like repairing the telephone cords, that nobody's doing. The production gives meaning and purpose to these workers," Twedell says.

Because of the success of the cord project, Western Electric has given the Occupational Training Center an additional contract for refurbishing cable splicing cases.

FRANK S. MEYER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of Frank S. Meyer leaves all who love freedom, all who have grappled with the intellectual movements and currents of the 20th century, all who study the past in the hope of effecting the future, with an overwhelming loss.

Frank Meyer, author, senior editor of the National Review, and a leader in the conservative movement, died Saturday, April 1. His own life and career was a dramatic pilgrimage through the movements and ideologies which have influenced our time. He learned a great deal through that pilgrimage and, in his writing, he attempted to communicate what he had learned to others.



Earlier in his career, Frank Meyer had been active in the Communist Party, which he left in 1945. In his important book, "The Moulding of Communists," Frank Meyer describes in detail the manner in which the Communist Party creates the kind of political cadres necessary for its work of subversion and world domination. His concluding words in this volume are these:

The Communist's support of humanitarian causes, or of Hitler's savagery; his bland appeals for peace and disarmament, or his rocket-rattling threats and brutal ultimatums; his solicitude for the Alabama Negro and the Bolivian tin-miner, or his ruthless smashing of the Hungarians and the Tibetans; none of these and all of these represent his true being. What he is in his reality no policy, no maneuver, no tactic, no strategy can disclose; he can only be understood if we understand the end to which he is devoted as the compass is drawn to the magnetic pole: the conquest of the world for Communism—with any weapons, so long as they are effective, by any means if they achieve his end . . . and at any cost.

Confronted by this "man of a special mould," tempered in his belief and in his will, infinitely flexible in his methods, the West faces a crisis greater and more demanding than any in its history, greater and more demanding than when in its youth it threw back the armies of Islam. Against this vision, the devotion, the determination of Communist man, there is no recourse in compromise, reasonableness, peaceful co-existence. Only a greater determination can avail, for Communist man poses two stark alternatives for us: victory or defeat.

It may be an unfortunate symbol of the fact that the American society has not heeded the lessons taught to it by men such as Frank Meyer that today we speak of tyrants such as Mao Tse-tung and totalitarian governments such as that in the Soviet Union as "partners" with whom we can, somehow, construct a decent and worthwhile world. In the sense that we no longer understand their own commitment to tyranny and to world domination, to that extent the work described by Frank Meyer in "The Moulding of Communists" has been successful indeed.

In a review of his last book, "The Conservative Mainstream," published in 1969, Guy Davenport, a poet and critic, wrote in the New York Times Book Review:

Frank Meyer calls eight or nine people at night . . . to announce a new inroad of the barbarians and to remember our old tumultuous freedom; and once a fortnight . . . he rises from his breakfast and paces the floor of his study in Woodstock, New York and dictates an essay for *National Review*, of which he is senior editor. *The Conservative Mainstream* is a gathering of 127 of these essays. They are sharp-tongued, sharp-eyed, and of explosive compactness: a string of firecrackers going off all at once.

At one time Chicago educational director for the Communist Party, Frank Meyer testified in New York in 1949 at the conspiracy trial of 11 members of the party's national executive committee. He testified against the former Jefferson School of Social Science at Federal hearings in New York in 1954 and before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1959. He testified against the Communist Party before a Senate investigating panel in 1957.

As a result of his own experience, Frank Meyer understood better than most the nature of the Communist threat we face. He understood that world communism, in this era, had embarked upon a new tactic designed to immobilize and disarm us. Writing in *Modern Age* in the spring, 1961 issue, he states:

The fundamental concept of these tactics is the concept of co-existence, a concept which is central to all operations of the Communist movement today, to be achieved by every possible method—by propaganda, by diplomacy, by cultural exchange, by infiltration, and above all by influencing opinion in the West so that our clarity of vision and our will to resist will be paralyzed. The tactic of co-existence is an absolutely necessary corollary of the strategy of "socialist encirclement."

It has been sad for Frank Meyer to observe the recent drift of our foreign policy away from its firm international commitments, away from a clear realization of the nature of the enemy, away from a dedication to keep our defense forces the most powerful in the world. But if America has turned away from the realities of the world, it has not been because there were not those to tell it what those realities were. It has been said that men are never prophets in their own countries at their own time. This may have been the fate of Frank Meyer.

It is not only what a man is against, however, but what he is for, and why, that defines him. Frank Meyer opposed communism because it was an attack upon the integrity of the individual, and the individual, he argued, was by nature free.

Writing in the *National Review* of May 7, 1960, he took issue with those who advocated a free society simply because freedom is that circumstance in which men can best achieve the ends they have chosen. Freedom is based, he believed on far firmer ground, on man's nature itself.

He noted that—

Freedom as an essential right of man is founded not upon preferences, but upon the nature of men and the very constitution of being. It is inalienable and indefeasible as a right, not for any reasons of utility, but because it is the true condition of man's created being.

Admitting that the argument with collectivists, both at home and abroad, can be conducted on their own level of utilitarian reasoning, Frank Meyer understood that far more was involved. He wrote:

The final struggle with collectivism can only be waged in terms of an understanding of the nature of man. It is because freedom is the truth of the order of things that the conservative, who is first of all one who respects the inborn constitution of creation stands for freedom.

Born in Newark on May 9, 1909, Frank Meyer graduated from Oxford University in 1932 and studied at the London School of Economics and the University of Chicago. He joined the staff of the *National Review* in 1955 and was also an editorial adviser to *Modern Age* and had been a consultant to the Lily Endowment, Inc. He was a vice chairman of the New York State Conservative Party, and a director and former treasurer of the American

Conservative Union. In addition to these activities, he was a director of the United States Chess Federation.

In his search for a better world, Frank Meyer entered the Communist Party. He came to understand the treachery with which it was imbued and the tyranny it intended to impose upon the world.

He devoted all the years of his life after leaving the party to informing the American people about its nature, as well as about the nature of the freedom we possess and are in danger of losing if we are not vigilant in its defense.

With teachers such as Frank Meyer, any lack of understanding on our part is our own responsibility. We cannot say that there were not wise men who went before and sought to ease our way and make us aware of the value of what we have and the nature of those who seek to destroy it.

The most fitting memorial for Frank Meyer would be to heed his words. He would ask for no more.

#### A NOBEL PRIZE-WINNING SOVIET WRITER FAVORS RADIO LIBERTY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a "Dear Bill" letter directed to Senator FULBRIGHT which appeared in the Washington Post on April 9, Chalmers M. Roberts has made one of the most telling arguments in behalf of the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty that I have yet seen in all the debate on this issue.

Mr. Roberts does not engage in polemics, but has constructed a very rational and logical defense of these programs based on the comments and observations of a Nobel Prize-winning citizen of the Soviet Union, writer Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn.

I believe Mr. Roberts' argument is too cogent to require additional comment and that it deserves the full and thoughtful attention of every Member of Congress. I therefore include the letter at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1972]  
LETTER TO FULBRIGHT—IS RADIO LIBERTY A COLD WAR RELIC?

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
Foreign Relations Committee,  
The Capitol, Washington.

DEAR BILL: I see by the papers that you are persevering in your efforts to sink Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty on the grounds that they are "remnants of the Cold War." What causes me to write you this open letter is Robert Kaiser's recent interview in Moscow with Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn, the Nobel Prize winning Soviet writer.

I was intrigued by this paragraph in Kaiser's account of the interview and I wonder if you spotted it:

"He criticized the Soviet press for its lack of fairness and completeness, and had a good word for Radio Liberty, the station financed by the U.S. government which broadcasts in Russian from West Germany. 'If we learn anything about events in our own country,' he said, 'it's from there.'"

There are a number of passages in the partial text of the interview, as printed in *The Washington Post*, that also should interest you. For instance, Solzhenitsyn said that "you Westerners cannot imagine my situation." And: "No one dares to stand up and object to a party propagandist, because if he does, the next day he may lose his job and even his freedom." And: "In general, in our country we seem to bait people not with arguments, but with the most primitive labels, the coarsest names, and also the simplest, designed, as they say, to arouse the fury of the masses." And, finally: "It really never occurs to them [those directing the campaign against Solzhenitsyn] that a writer who thinks differently from the majority of society represents an asset to that society, and not a disgrace or a defect."

The day this interview was printed you were quoted as saying your committee intends to have hearings covering "the critical early period of the Cold War" in order to get at the origins of American involvement in the Vietnam war. A great deal of material is now on the public record and it can serve a useful purpose to go back and examine it with perspective. You may have noted that Solzhenitsyn also is trying to do some historical research, into Russian history, but that he had been blocked from many documents and sources and that he complained in the interview that his defamers "refuse to acknowledge the complexity and richness of history in its diversity."

It seems to me, Bill, that you and he are both trying to probe the origins of national attitudes though from different perspectives and that that is all to the good. Fortunately, as the interview shows, it is much easier for you to do than it is for him. He has no congressional committee to help, for one thing. In terms of contemporary affairs and their bearing on future problems in Soviet-American relations he must depend on word of mouth, underground publications and Radio Liberty. But you want to deprive him of Radio Liberty and deprive others like him in Eastern Europe of what they likewise can learn of their own nations from Radio Free Europe.

Of course I realize that you believe the Cold War is over or at least is an anachronism. But wishing does not make it true. What Solzhenitsyn says to me is that he is caught up in the Soviet Union in the internal part of Moscow's own Cold War attitude. The worst phase of the American version of the Cold War was the period of McCarthyism and Solzhenitsyn seems to be fighting a Kremlin version of McCarthyism.

You may respond that what goes on inside the Soviet Union is none of our business; let Solzhenitsyn fight his own battles. He is doing that, of course, but why deny him the help of the American radio stations? Many Americans are exercised about the Soviet government's treatment of its Jews and of its many other minorities. This seems to me a valid concern and the evidence is that the expressions of such concern, short of the extremists here who carry it to the point of violence, have had an effect on Soviet policies.

That does not seem to me to be a Cold War exercise but rather a valid expression of human concern for mankind anywhere and everywhere. You object that such concern has turned the United States into the world's policeman and led us into Vietnam, the Dominican venture and so on. But isn't that because we failed to draw a sensible line, that we crossed over from the mental to the physical form of activity?

I don't have much faith in the theory that American and Soviet policies are moving toward convergence. On the other hand, I do think that what Moscow and Washington do affects the other's actions, internally as well as externally, to some degree.

There is a paragraph in the Solzhenitsyn

interview that seems to express your own philosophy:

"The study of Russian history, which has now led me back to the end of the last century, has shown me how valuable peaceful outlets are for a country, and how important it is that authority—no matter how autocratic and unlimited—should listen, with good will to society, and that society should assume the real position of power; how important it would be to have righteousness, not strength and violence, guide the country."

Isn't this what you, too, are working for? The Iron Curtain of Churchill's time may be shot full of holes but it has not disappeared. The Cold War has been mitigated but it is not ended. How many Russians come here as Fulbright fellows? How many Americans study in the Soviet Union?

I have been a long-time believer in East-West contacts, as you have. I cannot see the logic of your wanting to end the contact provided by Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. They are not calling for revolution; we are long since past John Foster Dulles' "liberation." But they do provide contact, as Solzhenitsyn is my witness.

CHALMERS M. ROBERTS.

## BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER

### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent message to the Congress, President Nixon ably emphasized the need to stimulate minority enterprise across the country. For many minorities, business ownership lies at the heart of increased economic opportunity—for the individual and the community—yet, for too long, minority entrepreneurs have been held back by a lack of adequate technical and financial assistance. Here in the Washington metropolitan area, details are now being worked out on a federally funded "Business Resource Center" which would provide a base of operations for a working coalition among the area's black and white business communities.

WRC-TV recently presented an editorial commending this center. I would like to add my voice in support of this project, and bring its existence to the attention of my colleagues at this time:

#### BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER

A significant development of major economic importance to the minority business community in the Washington Area is close to fruition.

It is a federally funded Business Resource Center aimed at building an avenue to bridge the gap between the white and black economic communities. White expertise and money would be used to work with minority entrepreneurs.

The details are being worked out by officers and representatives of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade and the D.C. Chamber of Commerce, a group of black businessmen.

There are three main programs in the operation of the Business Resource Center.

The first step would be the creation of a People's Bank. This would be a group of technical experts and advisers recruited from established Washington business firms. They would be loaned to developing enterprises as needed.

The second step would provide a new source of funds for minority businessmen. The Business Resource Center would find it by acting as liaison between banks without expertise in the minority field, and those businessmen who need financial and advisory help.

The third step is the dissemination of information on businesses for sale, franchise opportunities, dealerships and other ventures.

It is a great idea and WRC-TV hopes all the remaining problems can be worked out and the Center funded and put into operation as quickly as possible.

What is perhaps more important is the fact that black and white businessmen have been able to unite in a project that will benefit both organizations and the Washington community.

## SPACE PROGRAM

### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, in light of the much-deserved praise and often uncalled for criticism that our space program has recently received, I think it appropriate to enter in the RECORD an exclusive interview with my good friend and colleague, OLIN "TIGER" TEAGUE, which appeared in the February issue of the North American Rockwell publication, *Skyline*.

Because of his brilliant war record and the extremely important role he has played in the advancement and success of our space program, TIGER has justifiably earned his nickname.

Both his commitment and expertise in this area enhance the value and interest of this informative exchange. I, therefore, urge a careful and thoughtful reading of TIGER's eloquent discussion of the relevance and significance of our role in space for the Nation and the world:

#### SPACE PROGRAM

##### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Through the 1960s, there was a continuing, strong sense of public pride in our space program; an exhilaration that culminated, magnificently, with Apollo 11 in July 1969. Since then, however, with the brief exceptions of subsequent moon flights, apathy has set in, or worse—the program has been subjected to abuse and attack. People either aren't interested at all, or openly challenge why space money isn't spent elsewhere. In the restructuring of national priorities, space has slipped close to last.

What are the causes of this phenomenon?

A. It is important to point out that, in my view, several space myths have grown up in the last several years. First, I am convinced that the general public still strongly supports our national space program. The apathy, abuse and attacks come from a small group of people. However, that group is vocal and articulate, and it has seriously damaged our space efforts reducing the support available to it and delaying the start of crucial new programs.

There is much talk of national priorities and of restructuring them. I believe our priorities should be put into perspective. Space expenditures have never exceeded four and one-half percent of total annual federal budget outlays, and this percentage has steadily declined since 1966. Today, funds for the national space effort are less than one and one-half percent of total federal outlays.



Q. Even so, why shouldn't the space priority be down-graded throughout the seventies, or until the time more pressing domestic problems can be remedied? If we diverted all space money to these problems, wouldn't it solve them?

A. The vast majority of our federal funds are directed to the solution of our national problems. In 1971 over \$70 billion was, I believe, necessarily spent on national defense. In the areas of health, commerce, transportation, education and welfare benefits and other services and agricultural development we spent approximately \$95 billion.

In 1971 we spent about \$3 billion in space research and development.

I do not see how we could further down-grade space in terms of national support. It already commands a relatively low level of effort. Solutions for our domestic problems require a large amount of money along with new ideas and technology. This in turn is dependent upon a strong and expanded economic base. To promote an expanded economic base requires adequate support of research and development to create the new and more efficient processes, materials, tools, and techniques needed to solve our day-to-day problems.

Those nations in the world which do not persevere in research and development programs are, at the same time, those which fail to develop an economy which adequately feeds, clothes, educates and houses its people.

To those who ask 'why should we spend money to explore space when there is so much to be done right here on earth,' I reply there was plenty to be done in Europe when Columbus first sailed. And there is still plenty to be done there. *If Columbus had waited until Europe had no more internal problems, he would still be waiting!* But the opening of the New World did more to revive the European culture and economy than any internal actions could possibly have done.

Our nation's accomplishments in space should serve to inspire a reawakening of the American spirit and a rebirth of our national pride.

Q. What then needs to be done to rekindle interest and support of the program?

A. What is needed to get public support is for people to realize the vast amount of knowledge, skill, and new technology which has been made a part of our daily lives in the last decade as a result of the space program. We also need to let people know what the consequences of not remaining the technological leader of the world will mean.

If we provide the proper leadership to the program, public support will be there. Notwithstanding this, NASA and the aerospace industry need to bring the message of the contributions of our national space program more forcefully to the public.

For instance, NASA has a continuing technology utilization program. It provides a means by which space-generated ideas, equipment and the techniques can be made available to American industry. We need to do more, however, in this area.

There are at least two things that industry can do to help achieve this: first and foremost—to do a good job on the programs they are undertaking now. Nothing can take the place of work well done. In this regard I believe that the aerospace industry deserves high praise. Industry also needs to bring the space program, its difficulties, and achievements to the public. By freely providing this information I am convinced that the American public will support our national space effort.

Q. As taxpayers, then, what specifically are the American people getting for their space dollar? Can such benefits be tangibly measured? What do you tell your Congressional constituents who doubt?

A. First and foremost, every dollar spent on our national space program is spent right here on Earth. At its peak, 420,000 people in

industry, universities and NASA were working on our space effort. If you apply the standard multiplier of approximately five, that represents about two million people directly or indirectly benefiting, and I believe that is a conservative estimate of the short term gains from our space program.

Perhaps the best way to discuss this is to consider our largest exports which are jet aircraft and computers. Both of these products come from the aerospace field and have depended on the research and development from the aerospace industry. For the United States to continue to be a world leader in these industries requires continuous growth in research and development. Our aerospace industry provides that growth. More importantly these are jobs creating industries. To many this is the way to measure what the significance of our space program is—by the way it creates jobs not only directly in the space program but in the industries which surround it.

In talking with the constituents in my district I try to tell them these things, and, frankly, most of my mail is in support of the national space program. The mail that I receive is not just from my district but from people throughout the country, and in general it says, "Let's get on with the space program."

Q. You mentioned earlier the need to inform the public of the consequences of the United States not remaining the technological leader of the world. If the space budget is slashed to the bone, what could be some of the consequences?

A. I am convinced that the space budget *already has been* slashed to the bone. We are not doing the things either for the short range or the long range that need to be done to maintain our technological edge and to assure the maximum benefits from the investments we have already made.

As a nation, we are in a position to capitalize on our first decade in space by providing this country and the world with a low cost transportation system that will open new opportunities for Earth oriented applications as well as the additional scientific investigation. Near-space can become a place of commerce. For example, it is well known today that several manufacturing techniques could be developed in space and would be profitable, perhaps not alone but in combination. Crystal growing for industrial applications . . . refining of certain materials for industrial applications . . . improvements of vaccines by "zero G" processing—these techniques use the unique characteristics of a "zero G" laboratory which cannot be achieved here on Earth.

This new capability, I believe, will provide advances in processing materials that today we cannot envision. All of these will have high potential and high return if we choose to develop the ability to manufacture in space. In addition to this, Earth resources surveys both with automated and manned spacecraft can directly improve man's living.

It is time we proceeded with these important, and ultimately essential programs which will not only improve the living of the people in our country but the people of the world. Continued reductions in our national space effort, in my view, eventually will make the United States a second rate nation.

It should be recognized, too, that this nation needs a sound technological base—sort of a technology bank. This bank must be replenished on a regular basis. Our space program is a major contributor to accomplishing this aim. Without this nation continuing to penetrate the technological frontier, our ability to improve our living standards and compete in the world market will be damaged.

Q. You have been quoted as saying "space vehicles could be used for interception and inspection, surveillance and other missions

for which high performance aircraft are now used." What should be the future of the military in space, and what are the consequences of not developing this capability?

A. Our National Space Act of 1958 specifically directs NASA to furnish the results of its research and development to the Department of Defense. With the reduction in the military space effort as well as that of NASA, remaining space research and development becomes of even greater importance. Certainly the military has a role in space.

I am convinced that because the United States has been a major sea power we have contributed to open use of the seas by all nations. I am equally convinced that *only* so long as the United States is a major space power will the free use of space be available to all mankind. Space today is the "high ground" militarily. To abrogate the field to a potential enemy is to court disaster.

Q. With Sputnik, 14 years ago, Russia shook the U.S. and triggered our active involvement in space. We then passed the Soviets with a great technological surge and beat them to the moon.

Now our space effort is slowing and theirs is accelerating—the tortoise and the hare. If they leap frog us and we declare a crash program would not that be far more expensive in the long run than if we continued at a steady pace? Can we not profit from history?

A. Yes, I think we have to profit from history and remember the shock of Sputnik. But the pace of technology has accelerated since the days of Sputnik and attempting to catch up will be more difficult in terms of human and natural resources. What I am saying is that if we continue to fall behind in our technological efforts, particularly in space, it may become so expensive and time-consuming that we will not be able to retrieve our position.

Q. In this vein, should we declare a new national space goal, such as Kennedy did in 1961 when he announced the manned lunar landing commitment?

A. I believe we should be establishing several goals which comprise building blocks for a strong continuing space program. The key-stone to those building blocks is low cost transportation to space—the space shuttle.

(Editor's Note: Shortly after Congressman Teague was interviewed, President Richard Nixon gave NASA the okay for development of the space shuttle system. He said the shuttle "will revolutionize transportation into near space by routinizing it. It will take the astronomical costs out of astronautics.")

Beyond this can be built a number of important scientific and technological programs which include planetary exploration, additional lunar exploration and use of the moon as a space observatory and space base and near-Earth applications such as communications, weather prediction and ship and aircraft navigation.

Q. After Apollo, why will we need man in space? The Russians sent unmanned craft to the moon. Why can't mechanical satellites do the job as well and cheaper, as, for example, they do via communication and weather satellites? Why is man necessary to the further exploration—and exploitation of space?

A. I really think that is a wrong question. It seems to me that the right one is: "What is it we wish to do in space and how best can we do it?" In some cases, such as communications and weather satellites, it has made sense to use a completely automated spacecraft. That may or may not be true in the future. In other areas, such as resource surveys and applications, some may lend themselves to automated or manned effort.

It makes more sense to me to decide it on the basis of the missions to be accomplished rather than on some arbitrary and artificial division between manned and automated spacecraft. *The essence of exploration in my*

mind indicates the anticipation of man. He is not preprogrammed. He can make decisions, changes, and can generally adapt to unknown situations. Man, therefore, is an integral part of exploration.

Q. You have mentioned the need for a manned space shuttle system, a whole new transportation concept. Why do we have to have a new system? Why can't we extend the ones we have?

A. I have heard it said many times that every major high-technology program stands on the shoulders of past scientific and engineering giants. This certainly is true of our space program. In 1961, as a layman, I was convinced from talking to those who were experts in the program that we could not build a space shuttle. It was technologically beyond our capability. By having developed hydrogen-oxygen rocket engines, by having developed the ability to operate and navigate in space, by having the ability to operate complex ground based systems, we have established the building blocks necessary for a more complex technology.

My understanding of the shuttle is that it will be simpler to operate, even though it will be a more complex vehicle. This is much like our colored TV sets today which are more complex than our black and white sets, but have been simplified as far as operation is concerned. The shuttle represents a reduction to practice of the complex concepts that we successfully utilized in our first decade in space. It seems to me, in fact, that the low cost shuttle is the answer in our space program. Not only does it eliminate a large inventory of costly throw away vehicles but it introduces a new degree of flexibility into the way we do our work in space.

Whenever we provide greater access and mobility in a new frontier, whether it be the far West of the 1800s or space of the 1970s, new ways are found to utilize that frontier. A low cost transportation system is the major part of the answer to a low cost scientific exploratory and near-space applications programs.

Q. Development of the shuttle system has aroused some criticism in Congress. What chance does it have for approval?

A. Criticism of the shuttle from a limited group has been loud. I believe that if NASA provides consistent and understandable goals for the shuttle as well as other space programs they will receive Congressional support. However, this will not come without hard work and effort on the part of NASA, the Administration, and Congressmen who believe in a strong national space effort.

Q. What about cooperation with the Russians? Will we team up on future space flights?

A. Both the Soviets and the United States have learned a lot about space in this last decade. Eight years ago I would not have considered it useful for the Soviets and the United States to attempt close space cooperation. However, since then NASA has cooperated with over 78 countries in space research and flight programs. This cooperation has been a useful two-way street to the nations involved.

As you know, NASA and their Soviet counterparts have been seriously discussing and exchanging information on a possible international docking capability. This could lead to an American spacecraft docking with a Russian spacecraft or space station or the Soviets docking with one of our spacecraft or space stations in the future.

I feel this is an appropriate time to fully explore this possibility so that we may have joint rescue capability in space and may be able to find mutually significant reasons for cooperation in space on a direct basis.

No matter what we may do, it is worthwhile to note that the Soviets consider this an important undertaking. There is good reason why they value their national space

program. It would be a serious mistake for us to do less.

Q. A final question: Will space ever return its investment on the same magnitude that the development of commercial aviation did?

A. Yes, in many ways. One that we all see today is the communications satellite. In less than 10 years we have revolutionized worldwide communications. Communications satellites represent a direct dollars and cents improvement over earlier methods of transmission of information. As our population expands and our needs expand in the future the only way that we can fulfill our communications needs will be with the application of satellites. Navigation satellites also are available today to our Navy and it is only a matter of time before our traffic control and commercial sea-going vessels will use navigation satellites.

It is interesting to note in the communications area that our Comsat Corporation had operating revenues of almost \$60 million. Yet it was less than a decade ago that Comsat was organized for the purpose of developing a commercial communications satellite system. Already slightly over \$200 million has been invested in Comsat—an entirely new industry providing new jobs and opportunities in this nation and throughout the world.

Through Earth resources surveys it is possible from low Earth orbit to determine the size of oil slicks at sea and with only slight modification Earth satellites can report world-wide air pollution. Information on the gulf stream has already provided fishermen with improved fish catches. Photographs from the earlier Gemini program have helped identify large reserves of natural oil and gas in Saudi Arabia.

However attractive these may be, a low cost transportation system to space is needed to make them reach their full potential.

Another return that is difficult to measure is the added capabilities that we have achieved through communication satellites and weather satellites which I have already mentioned. Here we add a whole new dimension to world commerce.

Jobs and new income are created by it. In these kinds of areas there is a multiple return on the investment which we have already received and which appears to me to far outstrip the relatively small investment we have made to achieve it.

I have great faith in the return on investment achieved and promised by our national space program. We have only to look back the length of two generations to see what has happened to commercial aviation. From Orville and Wilbur Wright's initial flight to the 747 is technologically the same kind of jump as from Sputnik to the Apollo 11 lunar landing.

#### CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

#### HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to those of my colleagues to Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, who recently celebrated his 80th birthday.

He continues to be not only the spiritual leader of millions of Hungarian Catholics, but the personification of the quest for freedom and the spirit of hope for the return of human rights for all the people of Hungary.

It is my understanding that Cardinal Mindszenty is now working on his mem-

oirs and on a history of Hungary, both of which, I am sure, will provide additional insight into the brave struggle of the Hungarian people for freedom.

For many years Cardinal Mindszenty sought sanctuary in the U.S. Embassy rather than submit to the forces of totalitarianism which had taken over his country. From there he continued to give leadership and encouragement to his fellow Hungarians who were under the yoke of Communist rule.

His efforts have kept alive in the people of Hungary the determination that they shall one day be free to determine their own destinies.

At this time the cardinal is living in Vienna where he is continuing his efforts on behalf of religious and human freedom for the people of Hungary.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I offer the distinguished cardinal my congratulations on his recent birthday and my sincere best wishes for a long and rewarding life.

GIL HODGES

#### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, like sports fans throughout our Nation, I am deeply saddened by the death of Gil Hodges, the manager of the New York Mets baseball team. All of us who thrilled to the pennant drive and World Championship of the "Miracle Mets" in 1969 know what a debt we owe to Gil Hodges.

The sportsmanship and generosity he showed to his players, his opponents and the game of baseball set the example for others to follow.

One of his fellow managers was quoted as saying:

Everybody loved him . . . he was one of the greatest guys in baseball.

I think the millions of fans whom Gil Hodges kept glued to their televisions sets would wholeheartedly echo those sentiments.

Gil Hodges has been a warm and valued friend to me since his days as manager of the Washington Senators. I got to know Gil in my capacity as manager of the Republican congressional baseball team. That contact grew into a close mutual friendship. I admired and respected him for both his knowledge of baseball and his understanding of human nature. He was a fine and courageous human being.

Courage has been described as "grace under pressure." Baseball enthusiasts are very familiar with the public courage of Gil Hodges, which was demonstrated time and again under the intense pressures of World Series competition. We must also pay tribute to the private courage of Gil Hodges—that strength of spirit which enabled him to fight back from a heart attack in 1968 to manage the World Champions of baseball in 1969.

I have mentioned his managerial skills; we cannot fail to recognize his accomplishments as a player. He hit more home



runs, 370, than any other right-handed batting first baseman in National League history. Gil Hodges established a still-standing career record of 14 grand-slam homers. He had seven successive seasons of 100 or more runs batted in, and was one of only six players to hit four home runs in one game.

So Gil Hodges was one of the greats of baseball, however you measure it—as a player, as a manager, and as a human being. To the public judgment, I must add my private estimate, for Gil Hodges was a thoughtful and true friend to those who were privileged to know him.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to his widow, his son, Gil, Jr., and his entire family. The only comfort I can add at this time of loss is the knowledge that hundreds of thousands of Americans are sharing in this sadness.

### THE MASTERS MUST BREAK THE COLOR BARRIER

#### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the attention of the sports world was focused on the greens and fairways of the Augusta National Golf Course in Georgia as Jack Nicklaus swept to his fourth victory in the Masters Golf Tournament.

Although this is an outstanding achievement for Mr. Nicklaus, for which he should be heartily congratulated, the honor bestowed upon him cannot help but be tainted by the fact that after 36 years the color barrier still has not been broken at the Masters. Once again a black professional golfer was denied the opportunity to participate in this prestigious golf tournament.

There are very few black professional golfers, but it certainly seems to me that at least Mr. Lee Elder should have been extended an invitation to play in the Masters. I understand that the reason Mr. Elder was not invited was because he did not meet the tournament's qualifications, which were changed by the Masters committee last year. However, a certain number of players, mostly foreign, were invited to play although they, too, failed to meet the prerequisites.

This state of affairs calls for a searching reexamination and reassessment by tournament officials of their rather stringent rules which simply perpetuate this form of subtle discrimination. I believe the present policy is a stigma on both the Masters Tournament and the image of professional golf and that prompt and affirmative action must be taken to remove it.

Last week I called upon the tournament director, Mr. Clifford Roberts, to take such action. I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Mr. Roberts and an article which appeared in last Thursday's Washington Post:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1972.

Mr. CLIFFORD ROBERTS,  
Tournament Director,  
Masters Golf Tournament  
Augusta, Ga.

DEAR Mr. ROBERTS: I am writing to express my very deep concern and disappointment over the fact that, once again, a Black professional will not be afforded the opportunity to participate in the Masters Golf Tournament. I am particularly distressed, after you seemed to indicate last year that, after 35 years, the color barrier may at long last be broken.

While there are only a limited number of Black touring professional golfers, it seems to me that at least one—Mr. Lee Elder—should have been extended an invitation. I realize that Mr. Elder may not have fully met all of your prerequisites. I understand, however, that a number of other persons were invited who did not meet the qualifications. Also, this situation may call for a careful review and reconsideration of some of your requirements.

This form of subtle discrimination certainly taints the image of the Masters Tournament and I believe it is incumbent upon you and other tournament officials to give this matter a thorough reassessment and careful consideration. I assume that it is too late to take any affirmative action this year but, in developing your plans for the 37th Masters Tournament next year you should carefully weigh this policy and take steps to remove this blot upon the name of your organization and professional golfing. Certainly if a man like Lee Elder can play in South Africa with that country's racial policies, there is no reason why he and others of his race cannot play at Augusta during the Masters.

I urge that you give this matter full and careful consideration and I will appreciate your comments.

HERMAN BADILLO,  
Member of Congress.

LEE ELDER: "YOU COULD SAY I AM PRETTY DISAPPOINTED"

(By Leonard Shapiro)

The sooner a black plays in the Masters, the happier I will be. . . . Some of the more dark complected boys are not only extremely capable but also extremely popular."—Clifford Roberts, Masters Tournament Director, April 7, 1971.

Mrs. Lee Elder was overjoyed to read last year that the Masters golf tournament was intent on allowing a black professional to tread the hallowed turf at Augusta. So much so, that she reeled off a letter to Mr. Roberts, telling him exactly why her husband should be the first of his race accorded such honor. "He never answered me," Rose Elder said yesterday as her husband stood a few feet from her, in a downtown Washington restaurant. "Of course I never expected he would, but you can't say we didn't try."

So, as the 36th annual Masters starts today, the only blacks visible will be those totting the bags. Whites simply do not caddy in the Masters.

Lee Elder, who had qualified for every other PGA event because of his \$50,000 in winnings and 48th place on the points list last season, must content himself with playing in the Old Dominion Open at Newport News this weekend. It is a United Golfers Association event, the UGA being the black man's answer to the PGA.

Not even the presence there of Flip Wilson, or Gary Player, who will arrive Monday after the Masters, will be able to ease some of the hurt Elder now feels because, once again, he and the eight other professionals on the tours have been excluded by the Masters.

"Yes, you could say I'm pretty disap-

pointed," said Elder. "They invited the winner of the French Open and the Dutch Open. I won the Nigerian Open last fall, and it carried more money than those other two. I honestly thought this was the year I would be invited."

The man who made history last fall, when he played on South African courses on which black men had never dared tread, had every reason to expect he would be accorded an invitation to an event in his own country.

He did not qualify under any of the 13 prerequisites put forth by the Masters Committee. But presumably he has as much right to be in Georgia as some of the dozen or so foreigners invited each year.

Elder is a proud man. Now, he says, he will not play in the Masters unless he does actually qualify on the committee's terms.

"The only way I'll go is if I win a tournament," he said yesterday. "I will not accept any other invitation except by my winning. I will earn it myself."

Under rules adopted last year by the Masters, the champion of each major tour event automatically qualifies.

"I think by changing that rule, they actually made it harder for black golfers," Elder said. "It is getting very difficult for anyone to win on the tour."

Under the old qualification system, a player in the top 12 of the point standings at the time of the Masters was accorded an invitation. Also, former champions were allowed to vote in one candidate.

"I really felt that this year, if they hadn't changed the rule, the former champions would have voted me in," Elder said. "I've talked to Gary Player (a winner in 1961) and a lot of the other champions, and I think they would have done it."

Ironically, George Johnson, another black professional, won the Azalea Open last year, an event that had qualified Dale Douglas, a white professional, in 1969. Though the \$60,000 total prize money was \$25,000 more than 1969, Johnson was unable to qualify for the Masters because the Azalea was considered a satellite event.

"George was the guy who really deserved to play in the Masters this year," said Elder. "I think he earned the right. That's all we're asking."

"We don't want them to waive the rules for us. We just want a chance to play."

### CHINA'S PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL TREATIES

#### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent international developments, the atmosphere for Chinese cooperation in the field of narcotics control has cleared considerably, and the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations Single Convention on Drugs would be a most welcome and timely development.

China is not a party to the opium protocols and the Single Convention—the major covenant of the United Nations on international narcotics control. Since the People's Republic of China has not been a member of the United Nations until recently, she has heretofore not been a signatory to these treaties.

A special session of the Single Conven-

tion is scheduled to meet in Geneva March 6 through March 26 and this would be a most opportune time to prevail upon China to join the pact. Now that China is an integral part of the United Nations machinery, no time should be lost in enlisting her support for these critical worldwide efforts at drug suppression.

As I pointed out in my report last October to the Foreign Affairs Committee, entitled "The International Narcotics Trade and Its Relation to the United States"—a report which was reissued on February 17, 1972—there is reason to believe that opium produced in Communist China, particularly in the Yunnan Province, does enter the Golden Triangle—Burma, Thailand, Laos—drug conduit in Southeast Asia.

It has been difficult, because of China's great wall of isolation, to document the extent of her opium production in relation to her own consumption and to her medicinal requirements. Several experts have estimated, however, that the minimal medical need for her huge population would require about 100 tons of opium production per year. It is known that the People's Republic of China has the capacity for large cultivation, particularly in the southern provinces, but at this stage it can only be assumed that she maintains tight internal controls.

There have been numerous rumors that a good portion of China's vast crop finds its way into illicit channels. This should be a welcome opportunity for the People's Republic of China to dispel these allegations and to join the other great nations of the world in the difficult task of suppressing the lethal heroin supply. Every effort must be made to enlist this nation's cooperation in the worldwide struggle against the narcotics scourge.

It is for this reason that I requested President Nixon to include in his historic discussions with officials of the People's Republic of China the critical issue of that nation's participation in existing international drug control efforts. I have also urged United Nations Representative George Bush to raise this issue in the appropriate United Nations channels, and to arrange discussions for me with members of the Chinese delegation.

If we are to halt the lethal flow of hard narcotics into the United States, we must see to it that all the leading nations of the world participate in the major international agreements on drugs. The time has come to encourage the People's Republic of China to join this critical worldwide effort.

#### I. F. STONE ANALYZES NIXON ANTIBUSING POLICY

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know how strongly I feel that the Nixon administration's policy on school busing is precipitating a constitutional

crisis and damaging the cause of equal opportunity in our Nation. In my judgment, Mr. Nixon's policy has brought on not only a constitutional crisis, but a moral, racial, and educational crisis at once. It is my profound hope that Congress will respond not on the basis of the fears and frustrations that run through our society today, but on the basis of careful, rational judgment about our constitutional obligations and the urgent need to bring this Nation together, not to divide it further.

With this in mind, I present for the consideration of my colleagues a perceptive and thoroughly rational analysis of Mr. Nixon's busing policy and program. It was written by I. F. Stone and published in the New York Review of Books. It is one of the most valuable contributions to the debate over school busing and it deserves our careful attention.

The analysis follows:

#### I. F. STONE REPORTS: MOVING THE CONSTITUTION TO THE BACK OF THE BUS

During Reconstruction, when the Southern states were still under military occupation, a Mississippi editor who was an "unreconstructed rebel" published an editorial in the Vicksburg Times called "The Scoundrellism of Satraps." It severely criticized the Yankee general in command of that area. The editor was arrested and held for trial before a military commission under the Reconstruction Acts. He sought his freedom on a writ of habeas corpus, and when this was denied by the circuit court, appealed to the Supreme Court.

The radicals in Congress, fearing that he would win and that the Court might hold the Reconstruction Acts unconstitutional, as indeed a majority seemed about to do, took an extraordinary step. Though the Court had already taken jurisdiction and heard argument in the case, Congress over President Johnson's veto passed a rider amending the Judiciary Act of 1789 to withdraw jurisdiction in habeas corpus appeals from the Supreme Court. Thereupon in *Ex Parte McCordle* (7 Wall. 506) the Court, in 1869, regrettably dismissed the editor's appeal on the ground that authority to hear it had been withdrawn.

This obscure, dubious, and difficult case is the nearest thing to a precedent in American constitutional law for a bill Nixon has submitted to Congress. This declares a "moratorium" on all busing decisions by the federal courts until July 1 of next year or until the passage of its companion measure in his anti-busing program, the "Equal Opportunities Educational Act of 1972," if that should be passed earlier. The effect of *Ex Parte McCordle* was to prevent the Supreme Court from enforcing a basic constitutional right, that of habeas corpus. The purpose of "The Student Transportation Moratorium Act of 1972," as submitted to Congress by Nixon, is to prevent the Supreme Court and the lower federal courts for a time from enforcing, as they deem necessary, the constitutional right of blacks and other minorities to nonsegregated schools under the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The constitutional question raised in both cases could hardly be more fundamental. Can Congress by legislation block the courts from enforcing fundamental rights? This casts a shadow far beyond the issues of school desegregation or of busing as one means of implementing it.

This is the second time in less than a decade that the Republicans have put forward this particular ploy to undercut Supreme Court decisions they dislike. In August, 1964, the late Senator Dirksen, then minority leader of the Senate, offered a simi-

lar "moratorium" rider to suspend for two to four years the historic "one man, one vote" reapportionment decision of the Supreme Court two months earlier. This brought a sharp protest from fifteen of the country's most prestigious law school deans and law school professors, including Erwin N. Griswold, then dean of Harvard Law School and now solicitor general.<sup>1</sup>

What they said then of the Dirksen rider applies equally to the busing "moratorium" rider the Administration is now seeking. They said the effect is not merely "to limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts." It is "to declare by statute, without constitutional amendment, that for a period of time certain constitutional rights may not be vindicated in any court, state or federal." Only once before in our history, the law professors said, citing the *McCordle* case, had Congress "acted to prevent a constitutional decision which it anticipated." Most historians and legal analysts, they went on, "have regarded the *McCordle* case as an unfortunate episode in our history" which "ought not to be repeated in this even more drastic form."<sup>2</sup>

What happened in *McCordle* and what Nixon proposes now are linked in the painful history of the attempt to achieve full emancipation from slavery. The difference is that then a radical majority sought to enforce the rights of the freedman. Now a conservative white majority under Nixon's leadership seeks to hand his descendants a setback. For the issue is not busing—busing for better white schools and busing for segregated black schools are accepted and familiar devices. The issue is not to have to go to school with slum children, black, brown, or white. As an outraged white resident of Coy, Alabama, put it to a reporter for the *Wall Street Journal* (see the article by Neil Maxwell, March 20), "as long as we don't have niggers on there, it's not busing. Busing is making white children get on with niggers." That is the naked issue and that is the real feeling to which Nixon, Wallace, and Democratic opportunists like Humphrey have been pandering.

A constitutional, a moral, a racial, and an educational crisis are intertwined in the controversy Nixon has precipitated by his anti-busing program. It comes at a time when he has been engaged for several years in shaping a new Supreme Court majority which will be as mediocre and compliant as the choices he can get past the Senate. It comes when the Senate is even now wrestling with the question of whether to confirm as attorney general a Goldwaterite Republican indifferent both to civil liberties and minority rights.

A sketch of Richard Kleindienst in the *Harvard Law Record* of March 3 (he was graduated from Harvard Law School in 1950) recalls that in November, 1969, when 300,000 people were expected in Washington to protest the war, Kleindienst in a planning session advocated mass arrests in case of violence. "When questioned about the constitutionality of his plan, he brusquely replied," says the account in the *Record*, "We'll worry about the Constitution later." That seems to be his attitude still as the President's acting attorney general in formulating this new anti-busing program.

At the White House press briefing on March 17, the acting attorney general showed the same lack of candor and the same talent for the disingenuous that he has demonstrated so fully before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was asked at the briefing to address himself "to the overall question of constitutionality and particularly the constitutionality of the moratorium legislation." Instead of beginning with an honest admission of the constitutional complexities and of the fact that even *Ex Parte McCordle* isn't precedent enough, he began by trying to

Footnotes at end of article.



give the impression that there was no difficulty whatsoever. Only slowly and reluctantly did he admit some of the truth.

This was his progression from bland misrepresentation to damaging admission: First he said that "there can be no legitimate doubt whatsoever" that Congress under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment and Article III of the Constitution had the power to enact the new anti-busing legislation. This can only be described as the most whopping oversimplification of the year. He said that "many constitutional lawyers had been consulted" and "the opinion of all that I know" agreed that when the moratorium bill was combined with the longer range "equal educational opportunities act" Congress "certainly . . . has the power."

All one can conclude from this is that the acting attorney general's acquaintance among constitutional lawyers must be extremely limited. Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment gives the Congress power "by appropriate legislation" to "enforce" the amendment's grant of equal protection. But any legislation framed not to enforce but to undercut its great purposes would be held unconstitutional by any Supreme Court that did its duty. As recently as 1965 in *Katzbach v. Morgan* (384 US 641), the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Brennan, said that Section 5 "does not grant Congress power to restrict, abrogate or dilute" the amendment's guarantees of equal protection and due process.

Nor can Article III readily be used for the purpose Kleindienst would assign to it. Article III says the Supreme Court, aside from certain enumerated types of cases, "shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make." But few if any constitutional lawyers today would agree that this regulatory power can be used by Congress, as in *Ex Parte McCordle*, to prevent the Supreme Court from enforcing fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution or from operating as an independent check on the legislative and executive branches of the government. If it could, we would have parliamentary supremacy, as in England, rather than a government of separation of powers with "checks and balances." In that case minorities would have no judicial protection against majorities.

The real meaning of Article III and the extent to which it may give Congress power over constitutional adjudication is a recurrent subject of controversy whenever Supreme Court decisions displease a substantial body of opinion. In the Thirties radical New Dealers, myself among them, looked to Article III and re-examined *Ex Parte McCordle* to see if these offered any hope of curbing the "nine old men" of the Supreme Court who were striking down one New Deal reform after another.<sup>3</sup> FDR tried his "court packing" plan as a remedy when it became all too obvious that the "exceptions" clause of Article III and *Ex Parte McCordle* were wan hopes. How wan they remain today was demonstrated just before the White House briefing in which Kleindienst participated.

If he had indeed consulted "many constitutional lawyers" and obtained their advance approval, who and where were they? Why were they not produced to back him up at the White House briefing? Two law professors, Robert Bork of Yale and Charles Alan Wright of the University of Texas, were on hand to give their views but ducked out when told they would be talking on the record with two dozen reporters. They had been told they would be talking only off the record and to a picked few. If the constitutionality of the Nixon anti-busing program is as clear as Kleindienst says it is, one wonders why the only two professors he could marshal refused to say so in public.<sup>4</sup>

The full flavor of Kleindienst's presentation is best savored from the climactic portion in the transcript. After he told of the lawyers he had consulted, he was asked a plain question but tried his best to evade a plain answer:

Q. Is there a precedent in case law for this kind of action?

Mr. Kleindienst: The Congress has dealt with the question of remedy in the courts going clear back to 1793 in one way or another. So, to that extent, there is a precedent, and that, I think, is what permits constitutional lawyers to say that Congress has that power. *There is no precedent in exactly this kind of situation.* . . . [Emphasis added.]

Even after that admission, he fuzzed the picture and tried to mislead the reporters by going on to say, ". . . but the Congress, for instance, in the National Labor Relations Act, determined a national policy that was to apply between employees and employers in representation. That, again, is a question of remedy. The Supreme Court has said what the remedy would be under certain circumstances. So, constitutionally, I think there is ample precedent."

This confuses statutory with constitutional rights. The National Labor Relations Act established certain statutory rights and the remedies to enforce them. In representation cases appeals to the courts are restricted to protect the rights of workers and the authority of the National Labor Relations Board from interminable interference by injunction.<sup>5</sup> When Congress establishes statutory rights, it can provide, change, or withdraw not only the remedies but the rights themselves. But rights created by the Constitution are not subject to restriction or withdrawal by Congress. Constitutionally the precedents for what Nixon is trying to do are not only not "ample," to use Kleindienst's word, they are nonexistent. Even *Ex Parte McCordle* didn't withdraw the right of habeas corpus from that Confederate editor. He appealed for the writ in the circuit court and lost. All Congress did on the face of it was to withdraw the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction so he could not get a reversal in the Supreme Court. The radicals could argue that neither the right to habeas corpus nor the remedy was withdrawn. Kleindienst was mumbling through his hat.

This is where the constitutional problems begin with Nixon's long-range measure, his "equal educational opportunities" bill. In some ways the unconstitutionality of this bill is even plainer than his other bill for a temporary "moratorium." For the longer range measure seeks to restrict the remedies the courts may apply in school desegregation, especially busing, and thus nullify their power to enforce constitutional rights created by the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

But before we go into the legalities, I would like to call attention to the vagueness of the factual presentation on busing in the White House briefing. If the Administration were going into the Supreme Court in a plea against busing, the first requirement would be evidence for Nixon's TV assertion that busing had reached "massive" and unreasonable proportions. In this respect the briefing was not only unsatisfactory but confusing. At one point toward the end the question was asked:

If, as the experts have testified here, we do not even know the extent of busing involved in the desegregation process, then what is the hard evidence that supports a Presidential call for a moratorium on busing?

To this Mr. Ehrlichman could only furnish a long, emotional but inconclusive answer the gist of which was, "Every place you go around this country" this is "the front-burner issue in most local communities." But there are some figures and they do not support the hysteria whipped up during and since the Florida primary.

The latest issue available of the *Digest of Educational Statistics*<sup>6</sup> carries a table on the number and percent of public school pupils transported at public expense. This shows a sharp rate of increase in public transportation in the quarter-century before the school desegregation decision in 1954. The percentage transported was 7.4 percent in 1929. In the next ten years it more than doubled to 16.3 percent in 1939. In the next decade it went up by three-quarters to 27.7 percent in 1949. In the school year of the Brown decision, 1953-54, it had risen to 32.8 percent. In all those years there was no outcry against busing. Busing made possible the transition from the one-room schoolhouse to the consolidated school. The outcry against busing only began when it was used to mix white with colored, affluent with poor.

In the years since *Brown*, the percentage of bused schoolchildren has risen to almost 45 percent. But less than 3 percent of the total, according to a speech in the House on March 22 by Congressman Stokes (D., Ohio), chairman of the Black Caucus, "are bused for purposes of desegregation."

The figure is startling and it is up to the Nixon Administration to rebut it. It begins to seem less startling when one looks at the statistical tables that accompanied the Stokes speech. These originated with an HEW release of last June 13 on the progress made in desegregating schools. The figures show that in 1970, 71.8 percent of all black pupils were in schools where 80 to 100 percent belonged to a minority race. The percentage of black pupils going to schools where more than half the students were black or brown was 83.9 percent. The figures show that Nixon was, as Stokes said, "tragically and grossly incorrect" when he declared in his TV address on busing that "the dismantling of the old dual system has been substantially completed." Only 16.1 percent of all black pupils were in schools where more than half the pupils were white.

Busing may be far from satisfactory but the courts have been driven to it by years of skillful evasion of desegregation decisions. To abandon it in the absence of better remedies is to risk a deepening of racial disillusion and bitterness. The new Nixon legislation, under cover of the anti-busing hysteria, would invite resegregation. At the White House briefing the press was assured that no "rollback" was intended, but that is exactly what Section 406 of Nixon's "equal opportunities" bill invites. It says:

On the application of an educational agency, court orders or desegregation plans under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and intended to end segregation of students on the basis of race, color or national origin shall be reopened and modified to comply with the provisions of this Act.

Just to make the purpose clear to the least discerning, this provision carries the heading "Reopening Proceedings." Segregationists and white supremacists will be down like a swarm of hornets on any school board that does not take advantage of these provisions. The proposed act holds multiple attractions for those who would like to turn back the clock. Title IV, Section 402, "Remedies," spells out all the old dodges school boards have used since *Brown* to avoid integration and provides that no busing may be ordered by a court "until it is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence" that "no other method set out in Section 402 will provide an adequate remedy." Since one of the methods spelled out is "the construction of new schools," this is another route to "separate but equal," the old *Plessy v. Ferguson* Jim Crow doctrine the *Brown* decision in 1954 was supposed to have outlawed.

Nixon's bill would upset almost two decades of adjudication and sprinkle the path of integration with new legal pitfalls. An example is in Section 401, which says that a

Footnotes at end of article.

court can impose "only such remedies as are essential to correct particular denials of equal educational opportunity." What does "particular" mean? It might mean that each separate "denials" would require separate judicial action.

Looked at as a whole the two new bills clearly represent an attempt to turn back the clock and to override the Court's authority in enforcing constitutional rights. It would take a Supreme Court packed with lawyers like Carswell, Rehnquist, and Kleinfelder to rubber stamp this program as constitutional. Certainly Nixon must go far to the right of his own Chief Justice Burger and his own appointee Blackmun to obtain judicial approval. For Burger wrote, and Blackmun joined in, the unanimous opinion last April 20, 1971, *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, which for the first time explicitly approved busing as a tool of integration and unleashed the white racist hysteria to which Wallace, Nixon, Humphrey, and many others who know better have been pandering.

Nixon's own chief justice seems to be replacing Warren as the target of rightist slander. When Nixon, with sly demagoguery, talked in his TV address of March 16 about busing children "across a city to an inferior school just to meet some social planner's concept of what is considered to be the correct racial balance," he was caricaturing and distorting Burger's decision in *Swann*. The below-the-belt quality of Nixon's rhetoric is brought into sharp focus when one recalls that the chief justice explicitly rejected the idea of a "correct racial balance" in favor of a pragmatic and flexible approach.

"The constitutional command to desegregate schools," Burger ruled in *Swann*, "does not mean that every school in every community must always reflect the racial composition of the school system as a whole." It would be amusing to know what the chief justice muttered to Mrs. Burger at this point in Nixon's TV address.

In all Nixon's career there has rarely been a trickier performance than in the presentation of his anti-busing program. Its unveiling on TV was misleading, its offer of new funds for "quality education" was deceptive, the gap between his presentation and the fine print in his legislative program becomes deeper the longer it is studied. "Mr. Nixon," Congressman Conyers of Detroit told the House on March 22, "is playing a game which threatens to tear at the already delicate legal and social balance in this country. He has chosen to cater to the fear of the powerless and to manipulate the power of the fearful." To the President's untrustworthy promises of quality education in the ghettos, this leading spokesman for the Black Caucus replied that even if Nixon were really offering new and adequate funding (which he is not):

Quality education is more than airy classrooms, well-paid teachers, and lots of books. There can be no quality education without integration. Quality education means an educational experience which will lay the foundation for intelligent participation in a democratic society. Children who are raised in isolation can hardly be expected to understand their society and its workings.

Integration has its hardships. Black as well as white children do suffer in adjusting to it. But these are the pains of movement toward multi-racialism. To stop the progress after so much sacrifice and disruption, to move back toward the past, to play on people's worst instincts is to risk America's future for the lowest kind of politics. The problems of education in our society are complex and appealingly difficult. No one has a full, much less an easy, answer. But the way toward it will not be found by diverting emotion and energy to the false and peripheral problem of busing. The price of failure is to drift further toward a country irreconcilably split

into two hostile nations, a giant Ulster bound sooner or later to erupt.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The list of signers and the full text may be found in the *New York Times* for August 10, 1964. Also see the discussion on pp. 387-8 of *The Constitution and the Supreme Court: A Documentary History*, Vol. II, edited by Louis H. Pollak (World, 1966).

<sup>2</sup> "There is a serious question," Justice Douglas wrote for himself and Justice Black in *Gilliden v. Zdanok* (370 US 530), "whether the McCordle case could command a majority view today."

<sup>3</sup> For the most comprehensive argument along these lines see Louis B. Boudin's *Government by Judiciary* (1932, reprinted by Russell & Russell, 1968), a two-volume work of enormous scholarship by a man who was in his time a distinguished Marxist scholar and a leading New York labor lawyer. The most recent study of the problem is *Congress v. The Supreme Court* by Raoul Berger (Harvard University Press, 1969), which is written with distinction. He concludes that the framers intended the Supreme Court to wield the ultimate weapon of the judicial veto and that they never intended the "exceptions" clause of Article III to become a Congressional "check on the Court's constitutional decisions."

I now agree with Burger but perhaps that is because circumstances have changed. Constitutional exegesis, too, depends on whose ox is being gored. The radical Republicans a century ago argued that the Reconstruction of the rebel states to ensure full equality for the freed blacks was a political and not a judicial problem. This was also Dirksen's view of one man, one vote reapportionment. This is, in part, a semantic dodge when the Supreme Court disagrees with one's "politics."

<sup>4</sup> According to John P. MacKenzie in the *Washington Post*, March 18, Bork's colleague at Yale, Alexander Bickel, recently told the House Judiciary Committee that a bill similar to the Administration's would fail a modern test. Congress "can assign large tasks to the Federal courts," under Article III "and take the tasks away," Bickel said. But he acknowledged that it can't "pick and choose" by stripping power when it doesn't like what the courts have done.

<sup>5</sup> Kleinfelder's labor law is also deceptive. The predecessor labor board, established by executive order, had never been able to bring about a labor representation election where the employers balked because they found it so easy to enjoin the board in the courts. The hearings on what became the Wagner Act show that Congress restricted appeals from orders for representation elections to remedy this situation. Appeals to the courts were provided only where an employer, after such an election, refuses to bargain. He can then be haled into court by the board for an enforcement order and thus obtain a judicial review indirectly.

Even here, however, the courts have provided their own remedies outside the statute by holding in a few cases that the board could not enforce its orders if evidence showed that it had clearly exceeded its statutory authority. This is the meaning of Kleinfelder's opaque reference to the fact that "under certain circumstances" the Supreme Court "has said what the remedy would be." How much greater is the Court's power to apply its own remedies, like busing, to enforce constitutional rights!

<sup>6</sup> Publication No. OE 10024-70 (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970). See Table 43, p. 36.

<sup>7</sup> This, the standard proof required for fraud in civil cases, is far more strict than any of the more familiar standards for regulatory agencies. It represents another hurdle to successful integration suits.

## ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today Vice President AGNEW addressed the inaugural meeting of a new luncheon group, the Headliner's Luncheon, sponsored by the Capitol Hill Club in the new club headquarters here on the Hill.

The group will meet on a regular basis and will feature speakers who are newsmakers on both the domestic and foreign scenes and it is our hope that one day this affair will reach the status enjoyed by the now famous luncheons at the National Press Club downtown.

Just as he did 2 years ago in spotlighting the slanted reporting of the news by the television networks and some major national publications, the Vice President in his remarks today went straight to the heart of still another serious problem—the threat to academic freedom resulting from a disturbing trend for publishers of encyclopedia and other reference books to convert these sources of information into vehicles of propaganda.

Although the Vice President was speaking to a Republican audience, his message has meaning and significance for everyone, regardless of political persuasion, who is concerned about the freedom and objectivity of American education.

I commend his words to my colleagues and insert the text of the Vice President's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, CAPITOL HILL CLUB LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 11, 1972

My subject today is a threat to academic freedom—specifically the threat to the availability of scholarly, diverse research products which arises because some intellectuals are attempting to impose an ideological conformity on American education.

Over two years ago, I directed public attention to the lack of diversity in the process of deciding what news should be presented to the American people, and in the singular ideological conformity of those who make news judgments for the television networks and most major publications of national impact.

My topic here is of equal, if not greater, importance to the future of our system. For if, in the words of Epictetus, "Only the educated are free," then the politicizing of the learning process and the substitution of indoctrination for education strikes at the very roots of a free society.

This politicizing process takes many forms. At its worst, it can be described as nothing less than anti-intellectual Yahooism on the part of members of the academic community who, however few in number, have at times been permitted to disrupt or have encouraged disruption of the process of free discussion and inquiry.

A notorious example of the activities of these academic Yahoos occurred at the convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Philadelphia several months ago.

At that meeting, tomatoes were thrown at a United States Senator, while other speakers had to be given police protection. All this,



keep in mind, was the result of the tactics of fewer than one hundred persons given permissive rein to disrupt the proceedings of a convention of 5,000 scholars representing an organization of an estimated 180,000 members.

To his credit, one of the vice presidents of the organization, Dr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, denounced members of this militant Yahoo minority, charging them with "political harassment that has no place in a scientific meeting."

"I'm a political scientist," said Dr. Moynihan, "and I smell fascism."

Less credit, however, is due officers of the association who sought to appease the incipient totalitarianism in their midst.

One of these officials was quoted as saying, after the tomato-throwing episode—and I quote directly: "If there weren't these disruptions it would mean these meetings are not significant."

Let me submit, ladies and gentlemen, that the death of free speech and inquiry is never a unilateral act. It comes in two parts.

First, there are those vicious members of a community who would kill freedom; second, there are those fatuous leaders of a community who, by their acquiescence and lack of intellectual fortitude, stand by and permit the murder to occur.

This threat of dogmatism and intolerance of diverse opinion in the academic community is a matter of concern to every American.

For history has demonstrated that there can be no more dangerous form of anti-intellectualism than that kind practiced by highly educated, self-righteous intellectuals who consider themselves superior to the point of infallibility.

Indeed, we know that the worst excesses of the mob during the French Terror were carried out under the leadership of "men of learning" who thought themselves the ultimate products of the Age of Reason and Science; that the ideological precursor of Mussolini's fascism was a poet-philosopher; and that the Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment of Hitler's Germany held a Ph.D. from one of his country's most respected universities.

In this regard, Frederic Lilje, in his book, *The Abuse of Learning*, pointed out how the politicizing of the universities during the years of the Weimar Republic laid the groundwork for the rise of the Third Reich. Wrote Professor Lilje of the German academic scene during the Weimar period:

"The universities were unable to remain islands on which the unpolitical scholar and scientist could live in seclusion from the fierce agitation on all sides . . . already, years before Hitler was made chancellor, groups of nationalist conspirators and, later, Nazi students began to foment unrest and provoke violence inside the universities."

That "strong-arm bullying" has become a feature of many scholarly gatherings here in America during recent years is attested by Bruce Blossat in a recent report. Beyond what Mr. Blossat describes as "disreputable shouters who make a specialty of mindlessness," there are those, the columnist asserts, who carry their ideological bias onto the school grounds and the campus.

Scholars-with-a-cause, they too often permit their devotion to that cause to outweigh their dedication to scholarship, or even to the elementary principles of free inquiry.

We find such narrow-minded academic ideologues, says Mr. Blossat, engaging in faculty boycotts or harassment of fellow scholars "who, in the past decade or so, have dared to labor for the federal government."

We are all familiar with notable cases of this kind in recent years. In my opinion, such boycotting and harassment have written a shameful chapter in the annals of American education. It is a chapter made all the more hypocritical by the participation or acquiescence of many educators who in the past in-

toned their views regarding "academic freedom," deploring what they viewed as Right-wing efforts to "intimidate" the free academic system.

A similar debasement of scholastic professionalism occurs when political academics fill the air—to quote Mr. Blossat—"with confusing and exaggerated statements on major public issues."

An example of this facet of academic Yahooism, cited by Dr. Jean Mayer, has been the pseudo-scientific clamor surrounding recent national debates over the anti-ballistic missile, the supersonic transport, and the underground nuclear tests at Amchitka.

Yet, well-publicized as are these examples of the politicizing of the academic community, they nevertheless do not reveal the disease of academic anti-intellectualism in its most pernicious form.

That occurs when the ideological virus is brought into the classroom and the teaching process itself.

Recently Professor Sidney Hook addressed his attention to a deeply disturbing aspect of this problem: the conversion of formerly authoritative and objective sources of encyclopedia information into vehicles of propaganda.

This is not to say that all such sources have been so converted. But as has occurred in the area of news reporting, recent years have witnessed a growing tendency toward the "interpretive" rather than the "objective" in a number of research publications as well as textbooks of significant circulation.

Professor Hook's special concern was the transparent ideological bias shown by the new editors of one major encyclopedia who refused to publish a previously accepted study by the respected conservative scholar Ernest van den Haag.

Writes Professor Hook of this incident: "Signs are multiplying that partisan criteria utterly irrelevant to genuine intellectual achievement are being brought to bear on the evaluation of scholarly findings. Judgments on scholars and on their work all too often now reflect ideological prejudice rather than scrupulous evaluation of contributions."

Unless checked, such opinion imbalance, similar to that which affects our national news media, holds ominous implications.

For if biased segments of the news media can distort the view of the world in which we live, it necessarily falls to the educational community, in its pursuit of truth and fact, to assure that today's distortion is not perpetuated in tomorrow's history books.

Nevertheless, the incident of editorial bias involving Professor van den Haag would seem to be only a single exhibit evidencing the fact that the Sander Vanocurs have their doctrinaire counterparts in the groves of academe. This is substantiated by an examination of the kind of politicized material that is getting into standard works that teachers and parents rely on as general reference books for today's students.

For example, one major encyclopedia company—other than that which refused to publish the van den Haag study—produces an annual yearbook that can be found in school libraries and homes throughout the country. It bears a respected name in the publishing world. Yet, the New Leftward bias of its current editors can readily be ascertained by any fair-minded teacher or parent who takes the time to read its contents.

To illustrate this point, let me compare the manner in which this particular yearbook dealt in its annual "People in the News" section with two Americans prominent in the news during the year 1970.

First, consider what young readers will learn about a person to the editors' ideological liking—the Radical Left Attorney William Kunstler:

"The American legal system has given rise over the years to a remarkable breed of

courtroom lawyer—the sharp, resourceful, selfless defense attorney, who often at the risk of reputation and pocketbook will take up unpopular causes, defend unpopular individuals, and, in the folklore at least, emerge triumphant . . ." the yearbook tells students.

"One of the most remarkable of this breed is William Moses Kunstler, who fights with conviction for causes that he feels are relevant to social and political justice in America. . . . What makes William Kunstler a different type of lawyer is that he has come to feel he and his colleagues are the last line of defense against the destructive forces of tyranny and, in particular, that the lawyer has a duty to help pave the way for important social changes to overcome the tyranny . . .

"Kunstler has been criticized for his over-dramatic manner, for his faulty preparation of cases, and for his phenomenal ego. But his sincerity and his devotion to his clients and to his causes have never been in question. This selflessness has made him a kind of folk hero to the young. . . ."

To be sure the advanced student of propaganda can only pay tribute, however grudging, to the skilled manner in which the writer of that paean to Mr. Kunstler makes the point that his subject is an admirable individual whom the young reader might emulate, regardless of what he might hear around the family dinner table.

Nor should this artful technique be considered accidental. The same yearbook features equally laudatory biographies, some verging on the ecstatic, covering such New Left folk-heroes and heroines as the Berrigans, Angela Davis and Jane Fonda.

On the other ideological hand, there are less admirable Americans whose "sincerity" and "devotion to causes," not to mention "selflessness," are less apparent—at least to the editors.

Indeed, a comparison only of the opening line in the Kunstler biography with that given the President of the United States is sufficient to draw the pejorative inference the editors intend:

"Richard M. Nixon is president of the United States," they tell the young reader, "but he is above all a politician."

Now if that, for a starter, doesn't open a youngster's eyes, there follows sufficient innuendo to do so, including even the Radical Left canard that the President once labelled all students "bums."

In this regard, since it bears strong witness to the matter of anti-intellectualism in the academic community, let me take this occasion to lay that blatant distortion to rest once and for all.

Here we see a prime example of the big lie technique perfected by Hitler's propaganda and enlightenment ministry. For the fact is—and it is readily ascertainable fact—that the President's mention of "bums" in the spring of 1970 was made with specific reference to arsonist vandals who had destroyed the life-work of a foreign scholar at Stanford University—and I, for one, believe that, if anything, the President was restrained in so describing the perpetrators of such a senseless, despicable and cruel act of destruction.

The President has never applied that term to protestors or young people, however. The contention that he did is simply one of many gross falsehoods in the propaganda arsenal of those latter-day Goebbels of the Radical Left who daily assault, not simply this President, but rather the institution of the Presidency itself—an assault strengthened by the ready and all-too-willing cooperation of their ideological allies in the national news media and, as we see, the academic world.

Nor is that the only Left-inspired untruth the editors of this encyclopedic yearbook set forth as objective fact. In addition, they included in their 1970 yearbook the misrepresentation that "twenty-eight (Black) Panthers have been killed in police clashes since 1968"—a propaganda myth now thor-

oughly discredited but which still remains, unretracted, in public and home libraries, as part of encyclopedic history.

Unfortunately, Professor Hook informs us, such examples of politicized standard reference works are no longer isolated cases. Rather, they represent what he terms a "disquieting phenomenon" of our times.

The fact is that teachers and parents can no longer take it for granted that scholarly objectivity and thoroughness will be the standards in much of the material students use for basic reference.

To discover, in Professor Hook's words, that once "reputable and time-honored" reference works have "now fallen into the hands of editors who have ideological axes to grind..." is indeed disquieting, not only in itself but in its symptomatic meaning to the entire American educational system.

Disquieting as it may be, however, no American can ignore the danger such politicizing presents to our education system.

I have therefore spoken out on this issue today because responsibility for maintaining the academic integrity of our educational system is a matter of major concern to every American.

What I have urged is not the imposition but the *elimination* of ideological conformity; not censorship but *freedom of inquiry*; not the interjection of the politics of the Nixon Administration or any other administration, but the *removal* of current politics from American education; not book-burning but more books, covering every point of view and not just the propaganda of the view favored by the professor.

Yet, I have little doubt that despite this purpose, there will be criticism in the days to come that the Vice President seeks to "intimidate" or "repress" dissenters at scientific meetings, not to mention limit the latitude of encyclopedia editors. At the very least, we will be advised by self-serving spokesmen that in discussing the ideological bias of such individuals I have somehow had a "chilling effect" on academic freedom.

So be it, I myself have no intention of being intimidated, repressed, chilled or deterred by the propaganda techniques of those who desire that they and they alone shall choose the parameters of public dialogue on issues that affect the American people.

Through nearly two centuries, we Americans have considered education to be a major social priority—in the words of the 16th President who died 107 years ago this week, "the most important subject which we, as a people, can be engaged in."

As a free people, we have rejected the totalitarian concept that education should be a weapon of the state or of a single ideology.

Thus, despite the political passions that have characterized given periods in our history, we in the end always have recognized that solutions to human problems and differences can best be found not in the heat of ideological warfare but in the light of rational discourse.

For this, we can credit a tradition of free inquiry nurtured and sustained by the American educational community.

Upon American educators in this critical period, therefore, the burden of that tradition now falls. Today, as in the past, the people of America—and most especially, young Americans—look to them for responsible scholarship and an academic atmosphere free of political zealotry.

This then is one of the most critical challenges of our time: to assure for this and succeeding generations of American youth an educational system based not on the ignorance of superstition or ideological stricture, but on the principle of free inquiry and rational dialogue in a society of diverse and competing opinion.

## RESULTS OF 38TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—CALIFORNIA—POLL OF PUBLIC OPINION

### HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, at the end of February and beginning of March, I conducted a poll of public opinion in the 38th Congressional District of California—Imperial County, Riverside County, four-fifths of San Diego County, and a small portion of San Bernardino County.

Over 255,000 poll cards were sent to each household in the district, which is about evenly divided between rural and urban-suburban populations.

For the possible interest of my colleagues I insert below the poll questions, the tabulated results, and brief commentary that were mailed back to all who responded.

#### The results follow:

#### TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED FEBRUARY 1972

1. What should we do about the Vietnam War? (Check one only, please)

(a) Withdraw all U.S. forces immediately, and let South Vietnam fend for itself; 18%.

(b) Congress should set a firm date to withdraw our forces; 16%.

(c) Continue the President's policy of Vietnamization (i.e., withdraw in stages and turn the combat over to the South Vietnamese); 57%.

(d) Strive for a military victory; 9%.

Although about one-fifth of those responding want to end the war now, a clear majority supports the Vietnamization policy against all alternatives.

2. Would you support a major increase in federal funding of public schools as a substitute for local property taxes? Yes, 58%; No, 42%.

Most of those opposing an increase of federal funding for public schools did so because: (a) they were afraid local property taxes would not be decreased and their federal taxes would simply go up, or (b) they fear that more federal funds mean more federal control.

3. Do you think that federal regulation of prices and wages since last August is satisfactorily curbing the rising cost of living? Yes, 22%; No, 78%.

The key word was "satisfactory." The cost of living statistics show that the rate of increases is 20 percent slower than last year, but that obviously does not satisfy anyone buying groceries.

4. Should Congress force settlement of labor disputes where the national interest is involved such as transportation or dock strikes? Yes, 95%; No, 5%.

The overwhelming majority of people are fed up with strikes that cripple essential services and want a way to prevent stoppages that will be fair to all. Interestingly, more people answered this question than any other on the poll.

5. Should the federal government establish national standards for and regulate blood banks? Yes, 75%; No, 25%.

Although our local blood banks are far better than in most of the country, this nation suffers a minimum of 50,000 cases of serum hepatitis and 3,000 deaths per year. This arises chiefly because contaminated blood bought by commercial blood banks on skid rows is used to fill the gap between voluntarily donated blood and our soaring demand. The Federal Government and the

States have not controlled the spread of hepatitis. Last November I authored the National Blood Bank Bill (co-sponsored by 80 Members of the House and Senate) to correct this situation.

6. From what you have read, do you believe our military strength is adequate for our needs? Yes, 44%; No, 56%.

There is no reason for overspending on defenses by one dime with so many other worthy programs crying for funds, but our armed might must be adequate for our commitments and our survival.

7. In the area of national health insurance, which do you prefer? (Check one only, please)

(a) An expansion of federal health care for the working poor and unemployed; 8%.

(b) Tax credits to purchase private insurance protection; 18%.

(c) A federal program to help pay catastrophic medical costs; 23%.

(d) Government financed health care for everybody; 29%.

(e) No new federal legislation in this area; 22%.

Although four-fifths of those responding feel the Federal Government must do something to cope with the problem of medical costs, there is no clear-cut agreement on which of the four major proposals we should follow. This confirms national polls. It may be months before the Ways and Means Committee agrees on a specific bill.

8. Should the U.S. expand trade and diplomatic relations with Communist China? Yes, 75%; No, 25%.

President Nixon's recent trip to China and the attendant news coverage apparently increased approval of the above proposition.

9. Do you support busing of children as a means of improving the quality of education in the schools? Yes, 12%; No, 88%.

Very few believe that busing school children out of their neighborhood will improve the quality of their education. Most people would prefer to use scarce local funds to improve schools instead of buying and operating a fleet of buses.

10. Do you think social security payments should increase automatically with a rise in the cost of living? Yes, 88%; No, 12%.

Continued inflation is a cruel tax on those least able to pay, our Social Security retirees. Last year the House included automatic Social Security hikes to cost of living increases in H.R. 1, which is still pending in the Senate.

11. Should the U.S. sell additional arms to Israel? Yes, 60%; No, 40%.

Most of those who opposed selling arms to Israel were fearful it would ultimately involve us in a shooting war in the Middle East.

12. I normally vote (check one please) Democratic 29%; Republican, 53%; Other, 5% no response, 13%; and would like to see that party nominate as its Presidential candidate (write just one name, please)

Republicans who indicated a choice: Percent	
Nixon	90
Agnew	3
Reagan	3
Ashbrook	1
McCloskey	1
Other	2

Democrats who indicated a choice:	
Muskie	25
McGovern	16
Wallace	15
Humphrey	10
Kennedy	8
Jackson	6
Other	20

This was the least answered of all questions. Only two-thirds of those who indicated a party preference selected a favorite candidate. Some said they vote for the man, not the party; others simply confessed they



had not yet made up their minds. A few felt it was none of my business how they voted or who they favor. They would be right, of course, if I were to use their responses for political purposes. I wanted to give you the opportunity to exert your influence on the selection of candidates by your party . . . no matter which one.

**TRIBUTE TO MRS. EMILY NELSON  
RITCHIE McLEAN OF FREDERICK,  
MD.**

**HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 22, the citizens of Frederick, Md., will honor the memory of one of Frederick's most distinguished ladies. On that day, Mrs. Emily Nelson Ritchie McLean will receive the tributes she has so long deserved.

As a charter member and seventh president-general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. McLean did much to add to the prestige of this venerated patriotic organization. Significantly, the group's current president-general will lead a delegation from Washington to the grave of this great woman.

In light of the appreciation that the city of Frederick is showing in its past heritage, I ask unanimous consent that the fine editorial entitled "A Most Famous Daughter," published in the Frederick Post of March 28, 1972, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Frederick (Md.) Post, Mar. 28, 1972]

**A MOST FAMOUS DAUGHTER**

One of the cardinal tenets of the Great Buddha's combined religion and philosophy as enunciated more than 2,500 years ago, but still with its more than 132,000 adherents in Japan, India, China, and countless other nations of the Far East, was his faith that the "greatest test of any civilization is the respect and veneration it accords its honored dead."

Certainly weighed in the balances by this criteria, Frederick City is justly proud of its prestigious record of 237 years as a recognized political entity of the Free State of Maryland.

However, we must hang our head in shame in our neglect not only of a prestigious woman born within the city's boundaries—but far more callously—tolerating the almost incredible vandalism in our Mount Olivet Cemetery in which unknown thieves have desecrated her hallowed grave by stealing her very gravestone.

It is sadly indicative of the progressive erosion of the patriotic and moral standards formerly so proudly cherished by our American society, that the final resting place of Mrs. Emily Nelson Ritchie McLean should not only be vandalized, but that the crime did not even cause a ripple of indignant horror in her native city to whom she brought such national prestige.

Mrs. McLean, as a charter member and the seventh president-general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution—excluding perhaps Barbara Fritchle—holds the unchallenged distinction of

being Frederick City's most distinguished woman in all of our history.

It was not until patriotic members of several Frederick Chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution brought these shocking facts to the attention of the national officers at the DAR's national headquarters—that architectural gem in the nation's capital so fittingly named "Constitution Hall"—that a great spontaneous and still growing outburst of righteous indignation set into motion overnight highly commendable steps to remedy this.

On Saturday, April 22, as a very highly rated part of the program of the 1972 Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, traditionally convening in Constitution Hall on the week of April 19 in patriotic tribute to the Battle of Concord and Lexington, Mrs. Donald Spicer, the organization's current highly prestigious president-general, will come to Frederick.

Mrs. Spicer will head a contingent of her associated officials and members traveling by bus to Frederick City's Mount Olivet Cemetery to unveil, dedicate and lovingly strew with flowers, the hallowed soil containing all that is mortal of their seventh president-general and charter member of probably the most admired and socially honored woman's organization in all America.

It is our intention—in reverent tribute to this great woman native of Frederick City—within the limitations of our feeble abilities—to at greater length review a career of a dedicated woman who brought to her native community prestige of such magnitude nationally as to neither previously nor since her untimely death in 1916 even been approached.

When Frederick City's native Mrs. McLean became the seventh president-general of the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1905, she succeeded Mrs. Charles W. Fairbanks, wife of a Vice President of the United States.

And also numbered among her six predecessors in this, perhaps, most highly coveted and socially prestiged office available to any American woman, were Mrs. Adlai Stevenson, sharing with Mrs. Fairbanks and the exalted status of being the wife of a second Vice President of the United States; and the founding president-general, Mrs. Rutherford B. Hayes, wife of the President of the United States.

Mrs. McLean was elected president-general of the DAR for the two-year term ending 1907, and was subsequently re-elected by the Continental Congress as its president-general for the ensuing two years ending in 1909.

This justly honored and No. 1 patriotic organization in the United States, spontaneously and with absolute faith and admiration in her unrivaled powers of leadership, placed in her hands a proud heritage which with complete justification they were absolutely confident that her tenure as president-general would enhance.

It seems to us that when these national leaders of the Daughters of the American Revolution headed by president-general Mrs. Donald Spicer come to Mount Olivet Cemetery on Saturday, April 22, in a spirit of great consecration and patriotic dedication, that they should be instantly aware that this great patriotic community in which we take such pride co-equally shares with the DAR a deep and patriotic pride in our native "daughter" who rose to such lofty national status, even though as an active member in New York.

We think that Mayor E. Paul Magaha should officially proclaim a day in loving tribute to her memory, and that he should be flanked by members of the Board of Aldermen as a reception committee to greet the delegates and officers of the National Daughters of the American Revolution traveling from Constitution Hall to Frederick

City to mark the grave of Mrs. Emily Nelson Ritchie McLean.

We also feel that members of the Sertoma Club whose volunteers project it is of decorating the streets of our city with American and Maryland flags on national holidays should similarly do so on this occasion.

And we feel deeply that delegations of school children from all of Frederick City's elementary schools, their arms filled with floral tributes, should form a lane of honor at the entrance to Mount Olivet Cemetery ornamented by the statue of Francis Scott Key, author of "Star-Spangled Banner," at the dedication of which in 1898, Mrs. McLean, then serving as Regent of the New York City Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, returned to her native Frederick City to be one of the principal speakers at the dedicatory exercises.

We think it highly commendable that Frederick City's own member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth District of Maryland, Goodloe E. Byron, has spontaneously intervened with His Excellency, Governor Marvin Mandel, to have the Frederick-bound caravan of leaders of the DAR met at the Washington-Maryland line at Chevy Chase by a delegation of State Troopers constituting a "Maryland Guard of Honor" by riding ahead of the buses over Route 70-S to the entrance of Mount Olivet Cemetery.

It is time that we—as loyal and patriotic citizens of Frederick City—demonstrate anew, as our forefathers have so repeatedly done over the past 237 years, the intense pride we take in our heritage and proudly light and hold aloft that great torch symbolic of our freedoms.

**THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AGREES TO SCHOOLBUS SAFETY REFORMS**

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Transportation agreed in a letter to Senator WARREN MAGNUSON of Washington, the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, to institute some basic and long-overdue schoolbus safety reforms. In response to a letter of inquiry from Senator MAGNUSON, DOT agreed to set schoolbus safety standards for eight of 10 areas specified in the schoolbus safety bill (H.R. 13639), sponsored in the House by myself and 79 other Members. Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin is the principal sponsor of the bill in the Senate.

The DOT letter to Senator MAGNUSON states that among the eight proposed standards that it will be issuing are "ones related to bus seating, window retention and release, and tires. The proposal on bus seating would require stronger seats and seat anchorages, substantial padding in the immediate seat area and increased seat back height for improved occupant protection. It would also require the elimination of lethal surfaces." The Department of Transportation promised that the specific standards would be formally proposed by June 30, 1972.

I am pleased that DOT has agreed to institute these much-needed schoolbus reforms. This is a significant victory for

safer schoolbuses. It took a lot of pushing and shoving, but the DOT bureaucracy has been moved. But there is no question that there is much that remains to be done to improve schoolbuses. Unfortunately, DOT did not agree to several other provisions in our legislation. One provision not agreed to by DOT would require schoolbus manufacturers and dealers to test drive all schoolbuses before they are sold. A second provision would require DOT to build a prototype schoolbus. A third provision would require DOT to investigate all schoolbus accidents resulting in a death.

In short, Mr. Speaker, while I am pleased that DOT has agreed to institute some schoolbus safety reforms I must remain skeptical of DOT's commitment to safer schoolbuses and will carefully scrutinize the specific schoolbus safety standards proposed, in order to make sure they have some real teeth to them. DOT's past record in the area of schoolbus safety has been characterized by indecision, weakness, and delay. It remains to be seen whether DOT's new commitment to safe schoolbuses is real or merely cosmetic.

#### AN INCREASE IN CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

**HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the Survey Center of the University of Michigan has recently reported that consumer expectations regarding prospects for business conditions and employment during 1972 have risen substantially. The center stated that its index of consumer sentiment now stands at 87.5, based upon a survey taken in late February, compared to 82.2 in the fourth quarter 1971. This is an increase of more than 6 percent in one quarter.

One economist with the survey attributed the upturn primarily to good news about economic trends and a growing awareness of recovery in the economy. The center itself stated that the improvement in the index was due mainly to an upturn in "opinions and expectations about general economic trends," one of three areas included in the survey.

This increase in consumer confidence was reflected in the February consumer credit figures released by the Federal Reserve Board last week. During February, consumer installment debt outstanding grew by a seasonally adjusted \$966 million, well above the \$637 million increase of January. The February increase was the third largest gain on record.

In March, the major retail chains showed hefty sales volume increases. Sears, Roebuck & Co. posted a 12.8-percent gain for the 5 weeks ended April 1; J. C. Penney reported March sales up 19.6 percent, the strongest monthly gain in more than a year; and Montgomery Ward and Co., reported a 13.1-percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, the February consumer

credit performance and the March major retail chain performance lend added support to the University of Michigan survey showing strengthening consumer confidence. With this increasing confidence, 1972 can, indeed, be a strong year for our economy.

#### THE FOOD STAMP RACKET

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount daily indicating the gross misuse of Government programs designed to assist the needy and underprivileged.

A shocking example of this rape of Federal assistance programs occurs in the food stamp program and begs the question: Is the Government concerned with inflation or politics? A widely circulated example of the possible misuse of the food stamp program, as it appeared in "The Welding Distributor," is included in the RECORD at this point:

#### LET'S ALL GO ON WELFARE

How would you like to "retire" while going to school, get free food and some spending money to boot. I understand a lot of college kids are doing it with a new form of money—it's something called "Food Stamps."

I have been told that if you have 50 cents, or can borrow it, you can buy \$28 in Food Stamps. Then you go to the store and carefully buy about \$27.49 worth of groceries. (You see, if you spend over that amount, you lose the bait for the next batch of Food Stamps.) Then, with your 51 cents in change, you pocket the penny, and take the half buck to get another \$28 in Food Stamps.

You then repeat the process, pocketing the change except for 50 cents, which you again invest in more stamps. My informant said that this could be done up to three times a month. By now, you still have a goodly portion of your \$55 worth of groceries and \$28 in Food Stamps. Well, you can't buy booze or pot with food stamps, so you have a bargain sale—Food Stamps at half off. Not bad, free food and \$13.50 a month for spending money (you've put the extra 50 cents aside, to enable you to start the whole process over again next month), while going to college on a scholarship.

Soon, the only people going to college will be the poor, who go on scholarships and Food Stamps, and the extremely rich, who can afford to pay their way.

While you and I are footing the bills, our "representatives" are in Washington cooking up more bills for us to foot. One scheme they are toying with right now is a guaranteed, tax free, "annual wage" for those on welfare. That's only one of the brain storms; if all the crack-pot ideas were enacted, the national budget would be twice as great as it is, and the deficit probably 10 times what it is going to be. Just on one of the little schemes they cooked up last year you are now paying 20% more social security taxes this year—and the rest of your life. Your boss, in addition to coughing up an additional 20% on social security, also is paying 40% more in unemployment tax.

All this, of course, means that everything you buy is going to cost more, unless you are paying for it with Food Stamps. They haven't gone up, but food prices have. So let's all get on welfare, then we can all starve together instead of half of us working ourselves to

death so that the other half can waste away in idleness.

#### TRIBUTE TO BUFORD ELLINGTON, DISTINGUISHED GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened by the recent passing of my longtime close friend, former Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee.

Governor Ellington served two terms as Governor and also served as Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Tennessee. In addition, his good friend President Lyndon Johnson appointed Governor Ellington to serve as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning in Washington—a post from which he resigned to successfully campaign for his second term as Governor.

Governor Ellington had an outstanding record of public service—his life was dedicated to uplifting and improving the lives of his fellow Tennesseans. He took great pride in the tremendous progress achieved in economic development in the State during his administration.

Buford Ellington was personable, able, warm, and friendly—he had countless friends and he was highly respected and regarded for his executive and leadership abilities.

Buford Ellington and I were close personal friends for many years—he managed my first campaign for Congress in Marshall County, Tenn., and his efforts contributed to our success and splendid victory. We always cooperated and worked closely together for progress in the best interests of the people of Tennessee and the Nation.

The Ellington funeral service which I attended was beautiful and impressive, although unpretentious. There was an overflow crowd in the small town of Chapel Hill, Tenn., where services were held, and those attending included former President Johnson, Vice President AGNEW, both Tennessee Senators and most Members of the House delegation; former Governor Browning of Tennessee; several former Governors of Buford Ellington's native State of Mississippi; members of the Governor's cabinet, members of the legislature, and a host of friends. One of the most impressive events in connection with the service was the long motorcade which extended for several miles from Chapel Hill to the Lone Oak Cemetery where graveside services were held at nearby Lewisburg—and the streets and highways lined with schoolchildren, farmers, and friends along the way, many waving flags.

Governor Ellington will be greatly missed and I want to take this means of extending to Mrs. Ellington and other members of the family this expression of my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy. My wife Ann joins me in these sentiments.

In this connection I place in the



RECORD herewith an excellent editorial from the Nashville Banner eulogizing the life and distinguished service of this great Tennessean.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 4, 1972]

BUFORD ELLINGTON

Shock and sorrow mark Tennessee in the passing of former Gov. Buford Ellington—more than a name, a personality and character high on the honor roll of the state; esteemed in memory for the faith he kept in public service.

In that concept bespeaking conviction—first and foremost, a sense of duty—acquaintance with the man would discern his proper epitaph. It was coextensive with his public career; an able steward in every responsibility, possessed of rare administrative skill, and with that the eye to discern and the courage to pursue the course of conscience.

Buford Ellington had no illusions of personal grandeur; he aspired to no garlands of rank and adulation. He was a man of the people—basically of the soil that was his first calling; and he served the people by repeatedly taking time out from his personal business. Though comfortable in the presence of those associate dignitaries who sought and received his valued assistance in bearing problems of state—at both the Tennessee and the national level—he was at home on the farm; and he shared, as one of them, Lincoln's classic view that the Lord must have loved common people because He had made so many of them.

Tennessee knew him in that image, without frills and without subterfuge—speaking his mind frankly on any subject under discussion, and with a sense of honor paramount keeping every promise.

As distinguished citizen, as Commissioner of Agriculture, and as Chief Executive twice elected to the highest office within the power of the people to bestow, constituents of the state he loved knew and respected and honored him—feeling close to him with the regard of kinship and mutual interest he reciprocated.

The nation recognized his administrative stature—as underscored by President Lyndon B. Johnson's recruitment of him as old and trusted friend to serve as director of the Office of Emergency Planning. He ably filled that assignment, as the President's right arm in a period of crisis, and resigned that vital national post only to accept the urgent call of Tennessee to stand again for the gubernatorial position.

The former President put into words the feelings of a personal and public grief when he noted that with the passing of this long-time associate "all 50 states have lost an advocate. We shall miss him."

He was one who could fulfill with distinction the exacting standard started in Kipling's "If":

"If you can walk with crowds and keep your virtue,

Or talk with kings, nor lose the common touch;

If neither foe nor loving friend can hurt you—

"If all men count with you, but none too much . . ."

The breadth of Buford Ellington's interest in people was the span of society; young or old, rich or poor, irrespective of race, they were constituents—and he respected them as people; the components of a state to whose service he had taken oath.

In any showdown with a threat against peace and order within the domain of his authority, he was always on the side of law; and acted with courage when, in contrast to that, at some points across the nation, there was surrender.

For Buford Ellington believed in integrity, the conscience, the judgment and courage, of the people of Tennessee; He reciprocated in that the trust these had placed in him.

Public office in its numerous aspects of assigned responsibility was, to him, a public trust.

Heavy and time-consuming as was the load he carried, involving the business of his state, he always gave liberally of his time to assist in youth work . . . the ready colleague of Boy Scout and Girl Scout efforts, Boys Club activities, 4-H and Future Farmer work.

His dedication to the economic development of Tennessee was a feature of his Executive tenure; it was an interest antedating election in that capacity, and did not cease with expiration of his term. Much of the industrial expansion that has occurred, particularly in the matter of new industries attracted, was the direct result of recruitment campaigns led by the state.

In still another wondrous detail, Buford Ellington will be remembered. He was a distinguished family man, beloved by his wife, the treasured father and grandfather—his exemplary home life the ideal of responsible society; the churchman, worthy of that illustrious calling, too.

As he honored the trust reposed in him by his state and his generation, so will history honor his memory.

## MOSCOW: THE CARROT AND THE STICK GAME WITH WEST GERMANY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Democratic Union, currently the opposition party in West Germany, has scored another victory in the ongoing negotiations with Moscow.

There has been much attention given recently to the extension of visiting privileges to West Germans who still have relatives in the Eastern sector. A large group was permitted to cross the border for Easter and another group will be allowed to enter the East for Pentecost.

Those whose families are personally affected by this "thaw" naturally have strong, emotional feelings supportive of this easing of barriers. But emotions should not be permitted to impair clear thinking or an objective analysis of exactly what has prompted this "generosity" on the part of the Communists.

Any rational observer of recent international affairs in this area knows that these acts of Communist "generosity" are entirely a result of the hard bargaining position adopted by CBU Chairman Rainier Barzel and his party on the ratification of the Moscow and Warsaw treaties. If they had not taken the strong position of opposition to the treaties that they have there would have been no Easter holiday visits. The U.S.S.R. would have had no reason to grant such a concession to Willy Brandt, for there would have been nothing to gain. But because the CDU opposition seriously threatens the ratification of the treaties, everything possible is being done by Moscow to bolster the Brandt position.

I refer to this as another CDU victory, because I think the same rationale explains Moscow's recent acceptance of the

European Economic Community agreement. There is no other explanation for so important a concession by the Soviets.

Such concessions should also help to illuminate the nature of the treaties and just how much the Soviets obviously feel they stand to gain from their ratification.

On March 23, I called to the attention of the House an article in our local press, the substance of which stamped Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev as a political bully in his efforts to force West German ratification of the Moscow and Warsaw treaties through inflexibility and threats of confrontation and renewal of the cold war if he did not get his way.

The bullying continues, along with the coaxing, as evidenced by tiny items in Sunday's Washington Post which some of my colleagues may not have noted.

According to one of those items, the West Germans and the Soviet Union recently initiated a trade agreement, but the Soviets stipulated that it will not go into effect unless and until the West German parliament ratifies the so-called Moscow treaty.

The other item announced that the foreign ministers of East Germany and Czechoslovakia issued a joint communique last week urging West Germany to ratify the Moscow and Warsaw Treaties, saying that early approval of the treaties would further "peaceful cooperation in Europe" and "would also be in the long term interests of the States."

These Iron Curtain puppet states are obviously being prompted by their increasingly frantic Soviet masters as a means of applying more subtle and indirect pressure for ratification. Neither country has, itself, anything immediate at stake in the treaties.

While the United States and West Germany's other allies have remained aloof from an issue in which they have a very vital stake, the Communists are applying every conceivable pressure to bring about ratification. We have stayed out of what is described as "internal German politics." Obviously, the Communists do not consider it "internal German politics," or are not above interfering if they do.

I believe it is high time we in this country recognized the treaties and the Soviet effort to force their ratification for the attempted diplomatic coup they are. It is not "interference" to express a position on a matter which so vitally concerns the security of the free world when the treaties' promoters think nothing of threatening and bullying or making temporary concessions in order to achieve their purposes.

We can be assured, I think, in view of the bullying, that the recent concessions are politically motivated and, therefore, temporary and ephemeral. They have been wrested from the Soviets as a result of CDU's determined stand against ratification of the treaties and the fact that CDU is now within one vote of victory for its position.

The items referred to follow:

FOR THE RECORD

West Germany and the Soviet Union have initialed a trade agreement, but the Soviet Union has stipulated that it not go into ef-

fect until the West German parliament ratifies the nonaggression treaty with Moscow.

#### BONN URGED TO RATIFY PACTS

BONN, April 8.—The foreign ministers of East Germany and Czechoslovakia today urged West Germany to ratify its nonaggression treaties with Moscow and Warsaw, the East German news agency ADN said.

Otto Winzer of East Germany and his Czechoslovak counterpart Bohuslav Chnoupek in a joint communique issued by ADN at the close of their four-day meeting in East Berlin said early ratification of the treaties for peaceful cooperation in Europe.

It said ratification "would also be in the long term interest of the states."

#### WHY HANOI FIGHTS ON

### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, a hundred thousand South Vietnamese have been driven from their homes by the recent invasion from the north. They have all fled south—away from the invading Communist forces. They have fled only because they fear the invading forces.

It is as amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, as it was recently to Senator BUCKLEY that there are those among our colleagues who condemn not North Vietnam but President Nixon.

To those who say Vietnamization is a failure, let them explain why it is North Vietnam's regular army and not the South Vietnam which is carrying the battle. Let them explain how after more than a week of intensive fighting the South Vietnamese Army, without any U.S. ground support, is fighting vigorously to defend their people and their major cities.

To those who would say that the current invasion spells the doom of the Vietnamization program, let us await the outcome of the battle. The South Vietnamese Army is fighting the ground actions alone, whereas in 1968 the United States had 55,000 ground troops there. Today the United States has fewer than 90,000 and none of these ground forces are engaged in the combat, and further reductions are continuing on schedule.

To those who ask why President Nixon has not ended the war by now, let them consider how their statements have influenced Hanoi to continue the war and in their analyses of the recent massive invasion by the North Vietnam regulars, let them consider the following statement, "Why Hanoi Fights On."

The statement follows:

#### WHY HANOI FIGHTS ON

(By Edmund A. Gullion)

While Hanoi broadcasts its thanks to the Americans who march in protest against the war, there are other Americans who see the repetition of a grim and familiar pattern. Hanoi moves by the same calculations which paid off for it in the defeat of the French in 1954.

As the late Ho Chi Minh once told the French: "You will kill ten of our men and we will kill one of yours. And in the end, it will be you who will tire of it." French power

was shaken but not shattered by the defeat at Dienbienphu. What broke France was the collapse of will on the home front. The French were fighting to preserve a hold in Vietnam. The Americans fight to preserve the right of the South Vietnamese—the vast majority of whom fear and reject Hanoi—to choose and live by their own government. But North Vietnam, having seen one Western power worn down by sapping tactics on the home front, is sure the same strategy will pay off again. Indeed, this is what the declarations in the Hanoi press and radio are all about.

In Vietnam today, the enemy grows weaker as our side grows stronger. The situation is still precarious but President Nixon's Vietnamization plan shows real signs of working. The bitter paradox is that Hanoi grows more resolute as American will seems to waver here at home. (This would appear to be wishful thinking on the part of Hanoi, in view of the recent Gallup poll and the resolution by the House of Representatives strongly supporting the President's plan.) If the enemy believes that public opinion will force an immediate American pullout, he has no reason to negotiate at Paris or anywhere else. So long as he believes the "peace-marchers" are marching not for peace but for him, he will carry on the fight, and more American and Vietnamese men will lose their lives.

Another article which I wish to bring to the attention of those who are one-sided in their condemnation of American efforts in Vietnam is a study I have of how to serve to prolong the war.

This article traces from 1966 in a condensed form the abundant evidence from North Vietnam's own information sources. The record shows that the enemy not only is closely informed about the demonstrations in the United States, but is also counting on them to help him win the war.

Mr. Speaker, the article from Reader's Digest follows:

FROM HANOI—WITH THANKS—A STUDY OF HOW AMERICAN ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS SERVE TO PROLONG THE WAR

February 27, 1966: The North Vietnamese newspaper *Nhan Dan*.

"In America the debates on the Vietnamese problem will become increasingly fiercer. The U.S. imperialist rear will be the scene of great confusion, which in turn will exert great influence upon the morale of the U.S. servicemen on the front line. That is why the Johnson clique is very perplexed and afraid, faced with the ever stronger anti-war movement which, like a sharp knife, is stabbing them in the back."

November 6, 1966: Radio Hanoi.

"The Vietnamese people hail and support the struggle waged by the American people against the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, said Dr. De Dinh Tham, chairman of the Vietnam Peace Committee. "This struggle is a valuable encouragement and backing for the Vietnamese people, who sincerely thank the American peace fighters for their efforts to strengthen their solidarity with the Vietnamese people and coordinate their struggle with them."

November 8, 1966: Radio Hanoi.

"The Vietnamese people highly value the protest movement of the American people. We praise the American peace champions who courageously turned the courts which were trying them into forums to condemn the war. We praise the American journalists and writers who, in defiance of repression and threats, valiantly exposed the crimes of the Johnson clique in Vietnam."

February 15, 1967: Radio Hanoi.

"It is clear that the American people's protest movement has become a real second front against U.S. imperialists on the very soil of

America. It is the largest, most stirring, and best organized mass movement in U.S. history."

October 17, 1967 (four days before the "peace march" on the Pentagon): Radio Hanoi.

"The South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity With the American People has announced its program to establish relations with and contact all progressive organizations and individuals in the United States who want to acquaint themselves with the situation in Vietnam. The committee sent a message to the National Mobilization Committee and the Students Mobilization Committee in New York:

"We warmly hail your struggle from 16 to 21 October. Our struggle will certainly grow more powerful, and in coordination with your struggle it will certainly be capable of compelling the U.S. government to put an end to its aggressive war. May the October 21 struggle [the day of the march on the Pentagon] mark a new development in the American people's movement for an end of the U.S. war. We wish you brilliant success."

August 1968 (approximate): Speech by Truong Chinh, chairman of the National Assembly of North Vietnam and No. 2 man in the ruling party Politburo.

"We are currently taking advantage of the contradictions between the doves and the hawks in the American ruling class."

January 23, 1969: Radio Hanoi message to the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

"We were deeply impressed by the successful march on Washington during the Presidential inaugural day to welcome the victory of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and demand the withdrawal of all American troops. We extend to you sincere thanks. We hope that we would further coordinate our activities for peace and real independence in Vietnam."

October 6, 1969: Letter to American students from Tran Buu Kiem, former head of the Vietcong delegation to the Paris peace talks.

"We greatly admire the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall movement. You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success, thus further accelerating the common movement of the American people against the war."

October 14, 1969: Message to American people from North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong.

"This fall, the broad masses of the American people, encouraged and supported by many peace- and justice-loving American personalities, have again started a broad powerful drive to stop the war. The Vietnamese people fully approve and warmly hail your just struggle. We are firmly confident that with the solidarity and courage of our two peoples the struggle of the Vietnamese people will end in total victory. I wish your fall offensive a brilliant success."

October 14, 1969: Radio Hanoi.

"In response to Nixon's call for unity, the U.S. people have manifested a fierce opposition attitude. The U.S. people's autumn struggle is placing the Nixon Administration in an extremely difficult, embarrassed situation. We consider this struggle the most realistic support for the Vietnamese people's fight against the United States."

October 17, 1969: Message from Xuan Thuy, chief of Hanoi's negotiating team in Paris.

"I should like today to send warm greetings to all Americans and all persons who took part in the October 15 movement. We consider that these legitimate actions are of a nature both to make the Paris conference progress and to demand of the Nixon Administration the complete and rapid withdrawal of the GIs."



October 21, 1969: Broadcast from Hanoi to communist troops in the South.

"All deceitful tricks and threats of the Nixon clique cannot check the American people's will. In their valiant and persevering struggle, the American progressives will certainly win glorious victories. The Nixon clique will certainly be completely defeated in Vietnam."

November 6, 1969: Statement of the government of North Vietnam.

"The Vietnamese people hail the honest-minded Americans who, for the sake of peace, justice and the true interests of their people, have courageously denounced the plans for prolonging the war in Vietnam and strongly demanded a quick and total withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

November 11, 1969: Broadcast to the communist troops in South Vietnam.

"Deeply moved by the American progressives' struggle for the great cause, we can realize our great responsibility more clearly. The Americans are struggling for their own interests and Vietnam's interest right on American soil. As for us, what must we do to coordinate with the U.S. people's struggle? Let us further stoke the fire of victory on all battlefields. We must be determined to fight the U.S. aggressors until complete victory."

November 13, 1969: Broadcast to communist troops in the South.

"A struggle which took to violence on 15 October 1969 will break out even more fiercely on 15 November. It will be coordinated by the New Mobilization Committee to End the Vietnam War, one of the largest anti-war organizations in the United States. This struggle will have more violence and be on a much larger and more elaborate scale in all U.S. cities and state capitals. The seething struggle of U.S. youths, students and people is urging us to arise and win final victory for the fatherland."

November 14, 1969: Speech by Prof. Hoang Minh Giam, North Vietnamese minister of culture.

"We highly evaluate the great efforts of various U.S. anti-war organizations and well-known notables who had the initiative to organize the Moratorium Day, demanding the immediate return home of all U.S. troops with slogans suited to the American people's urgent needs and just aspirations. We enthusiastically welcome the peace-loving Americans who have stood up and struggled violently and bravely against the U.S. Administration's stubborn attitude in prolonging the war of aggression. Moreover, we regard the U.S. people as our comrades-in-arms, animated by the common goal of opposing the Nixon Administration's aggressive policy and war. The fall offensive drive of the American people has made more prominent our people's just cause and made our people more resolute."

November 15, 1969: Communist broadcast from South Vietnam.

"The 'fall offensive' is sweeping the United States of America. We express our militant solidarity with and gratitude to the true sons and daughters of the United States. With all of our hearts we wish to thank our American friends."

Gibson, vice president of American Airlines in charge of urban and environmental affairs.

I have known Paul Gibson for a long time and have seen what he has done to help the poor and the black. His leadership in changing the curriculum of a vocational high school in my district has made a world of difference in that school. Paul is a real inspiration to many black youngsters in New York.

I commend this article to my colleagues that they may know about the efforts of this black airline executive who is doing so much for our cities and our environment.

#### AN AIRLINE OFFICIAL HAS A DIFFERENT ROUTE

Paul Gibson's work can take him to Harlem one day and Acapulco the next.

His job is an unusual one in the airline industry—he's vice president of American Airlines in charge of urban and environmental affairs.

Mr. Gibson is responsible for the whole spectrum of his company's programs dealing with the quality of life—everything from fighting discrimination and urban decay to helping protect the natural environment of some of the pleasure points served by American.

Many corporations have specialists who focus on urban problems or on environmental problems. But Mr. Gibson wears both hats.

He has a hand in recruiting, placing and upgrading minority-group employees at American, and he is given credit for opening doors to minority suppliers who were convinced they could not meet AA's stiff purchasing standards.

Also, Mr. Gibson headed a task force of aviation and union executives, concerned parents and educators, which persuaded the City of New York to broaden the curriculum of a vocational high school near Kennedy Airport. It now offers courses leading to careers in transportation, travel and tourism.

"Attendance at the school was 58 per cent not long ago," says Mr. Gibson. "Today, it is 90 per cent, one of the highest in the city. Most of these youngsters [predominantly poor and black] had never been to an airport. But now they are well acquainted with Kennedy and many have been taken on flights over the city. I think we have convinced many of them they don't have to settle for entry-level jobs."

Currently, Mr. Gibson is leading a drive to keep litter off New York's Third Avenue, where his company and many others are headquartered. He has encouraged several companies to put up money for a giant vacuum cleaner which the city will operate along a 15-block stretch of the avenue, as well as to buy litter cans the city says it can't afford.

"We are the biggest carrier serving New York, so when the word is out that New York is not the place to visit, it behooves us to change that image," he points out.

Meanwhile, at the Mexican resort city of Acapulco, Mr. Gibson is overseeing a project to eliminate sewage pollution. In his spare time he works with Boy Scouts in New York ghetto areas.

could be seen on many of our farms. Many farms held a cluster of these windmills.

They were used to generate electricity with wind power and it was no trick to keep the farm operating electrically with the wind that blew.

Even today in some areas of our Sixth Congressional District, a few isolated farms depend on the wind for their power.

It appears now, from reading a news column by Margery Burns, which appears in many of our Sixth District newspapers, that perhaps we may turn to the wind for a nonpolluting source of our power.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to insert into the RECORD the very thought-provoking article on wind-power which appeared in Mrs. Burns' column so that it might be shared with my colleagues and the thousands of others who read the RECORD:

#### SHADES OF OUR GRANDFATHERS

The electric power companies have been turned into villains in the last few years because of the pollution coming from their plants. But just imagine what villains they'd be if they didn't turn out enough electricity for us! So, whatever they do these days, they have a tough time.

The problem these companies have is finding ways of giving us all the power we need while still keeping the air and water clean. It's a hard and expensive problem.

Now comes a professor at the University of Massachusetts, William E. Heronemus, with two solutions to the problem. In a paper presented Jan. 12, 1972 before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, he says, "This paper is a statement of advocacy and a gentle protest. I do not think that anyone of the hundreds who have raised their voices concerning the energy crisis in the past few years has been fair or even accurate regarding two sources of energy available within the United States, available for exploitation. I speak of power from the wind and power from ocean thermal gradients..."

He goes on to tell about the experiments which were made in the late 1930's and 1940's with wind-power in our country and in Germany during World War II. Because of the times, during the war and right afterwards, wind-power was given up as a source of power.

But later experiments are showing that power coming from the wind and ocean can be used very successfully in this country, and the advantages over coal or atomic power are terrific. There's no dust, or fumes, or cooling water. The assembly-line techniques need to build these systems can easily be used by existing aircraft, automobile or armament factories. And these same techniques are so well understood that the "perfected machines could start to flow from assembly lines in three years."

Prof. Heronemus says, "Recent literature concerning the Energy Crisis has failed to give appropriate emphasis to two major sources of pollution-free energy: large-scale Wind Power and large-scale Ocean Thermal Gradient Machines. Those sources, coupled with a hydrogen-plus-fuel-cell distribution and electricity-generation concept, offer a chance to place the entire electric utility and transportation industry in the country on a pollution-free invariant energy basis."

"An acceptable technology exists for all aspects of both processes: five years' development with existing underemployed technical talent could improve that technology. The components are those that could be manufactured in existing underemployed industrial plants using existing labor forces."

#### TRIBUTE TO PAUL GIBSON

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Nation's Business magazine this month calls attention to one of the outstanding airline executives in the country. He is Paul

#### SHADES OF OUR GRANDFATHERS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. My Speaker, in the days just before REA emancipated the countryside, new propeller-type windmills

"The electricity produced by the proposed systems is economic even by today's false yardsticks: by 1980 it would be a genuine bargain...."

"Is the United States willing to give proper attention to some very unsophisticated, low-key, gentle, alternative solutions to her energy crisis?"

Shades of our grandfathers with their windmills dotting the country side!

And the power companies will turn back into heroes, besides solving their problems, if they can use the wind and ocean as their source of power. It's an exciting idea.

**TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING  
STAN "CONSTANTINO" W. RAFFA  
FOR HIS 50 YEARS OF DEVOTED  
SERVICE AS A MEMBER AND OF-  
FICER OF ALPHA PHI DELTA  
FRATERNITY**

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Stan Raffa was born in Manhattan of Italian immigrant parents. He lived for 30 years of his life in New York and presently lives in Dumont, N.J.

He attended public school in New York City. Pursuing a natural technical ability, he attended Brooklyn Technical High School noted for its requirements of excellence in academic achievement.

Upon graduation, he entered the Army of the United States in 1943. He was sent to OTS at Fort Benning, Ga. However, the need for troops in Europe found him assigned to the 106th Infantry Division as a private first class. He saw action in Europe and on December 16, 1944, was captured during the Battle of the Bulge, spending the rest of the war as a prisoner. He was liberated on Easter Sunday, 1945, by the victorious Allied Armies then sweeping across Germany.

He attended Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, pursuing an engineering degree. While there, he joined Alpha Phi Delta Fraternity, Delta Chapter in January of 1949. He was extremely active as an undergraduate brother of Delta Chapter, holding the office of treasurer and then president. As treasurer, his policies assured the financial stability of the chapter and its membership grew to the largest number in its history, under his leadership as president. He found time to publish biweekly Delta Doings which kept both undergraduate and alumni pleasantly informed on chapter affairs. He was also instrumental in helping with employment opportunities—an effort which gained employment in industry for over 25 Alpha Phi Delta men in the early 1950's.

Broadening his scope in the activities of Alpha Phi Delta, he became editor of the Metrovox, a monthly newspaper of the third district of Alpha Phi Delta which was sent to 1,400 members of the fraternity in the metropolitan New York area. This led to his appointment as editor of the Kleos, the nationwide newspaper of Alpha Phi Delta Fraternity in 1956. He held this position for 12 years.

In 1968 he was elected vice president of Alpha Phi Delta and was unanimously voted to the presidency in 1970.

He was voted outstanding undergraduate in 1951 and received the certificate of merit as outstanding alumni in 1961. He presently is compiling a 50-year history of Alpha Phi Delta Fraternity.

He left Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn to take a position with Bosch Arma Corp. of Garden City, N.Y., in 1951. He continued his education at night and received a bachelor of science degree from Adelphi University. With Bosch Arma Corp., he advanced to the position of test operations supervisor at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

He presently is a vice president with Western Union and was director of their shared information systems programs at the technological laboratories in Nahwah, N.J.

**ANNIVERSARY OF TRANS-POLAR  
AIR SERVICE**

**HON. NICK BEGICH**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago regularly scheduled flights across the North Pole made front page headlines as part of man's conquest of space. Those headlines chronicled the start of scheduled Trans-Polar air service from Europe via Anchorage, Alaska to the Orient, by SAS in 1957. Through this feat Alaska and Anchorage have enjoyed an ever increasing growth in the airline industry and the tourist industry.

That anniversary was celebrated last month at a luncheon given by the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce and the Anchorage Rotary Club in Anchorage. B. John Heistein, vice president and general manager, North American Division of Scandinavian Airlines, was the keynote speaker, and in his remarks Mr. Heistein touches on the great potential of the State of Alaska as a growing domestic market, sound financial investment and tourist attraction—all founded on trade.

I call Mr. Heistein's remarks to the attention of my fellow Members and all others who share with me the "vision of Alaska."

The remarks follow:

**REMARKS BY B. JOHN HEISTEIN**

It is always a pleasure for any of us from SAS in New York to come here to Anchorage. Your welcome is so warm, and your regard for SAS so flattering, that I wish we could make the trip a lot more often.

It's an especially good feeling today. We take great satisfaction from the fact that Alaska became a full-fledged part of the SAS system even before it got the same status in the American Union. In these days of short memories, when the popular motto is "What have you done for us lately?" we are all the more touched by your initiative in celebrating this 15th anniversary of what we will always consider one of our really monumental achievements as an airline.

Flying across the Pole on a regular schedule with a regular payload is pretty routine today. But only 15 years ago, it was a great adventure which was reported on front

pages throughout the world as part of man's conquest of space. I am happy that the man who helped so greatly to transform that Adventure into the science of Polar navigation can be with us today. Colonel Balchen needs no introduction in Alaska; but I do want to record our regard for him as a great American and a great Norwegian; as a conqueror of both Poles; as a great airman; as a living bridge between the SAS of today and its original format—and, incidentally, as an artist whose work we are proud to display in our SAS collection.

Our President, Knut Hagnrup, who was one of the prime movers in the Trans-Polar project when he was our Vice President of Operation, has asked me to express his appreciation for your kindness here today and also to convey his warmest good wishes to Colonel Balchen.

Last night, we had a small family party here for the SAS people in Anchorage, our sales and station staff, and the flight deck and cabin crew for the Trans-Polar route who make their temporary homes here. It was good to see what a happy and healthy lot they are in this brisk and stimulating atmosphere; and I should like to thank you for having made them feel so much at home in Alaska.

I don't know what it's like up here, but back in the East we are going through a fit of what one might call anti-establishmentarianism. Businessmen and community leaders are pretty heavily discounted, except perhaps among their fellows, but the fact remains that they still are the men and women who have taken on the responsibility for keeping the economy ticking and keeping society viable, whether it is popular or not. Someone, someday will write a history of America in which Chambers of Commerce and Rotary Clubs are given the credit they deserve. Meanwhile, although my voice may not be a big one, I'd like to raise it in appreciation for the vital role you have played in the building of Alaska as a good place for men and women to live and work and raise their families.

Modest as our presence here may be, we feel very much a part of this process. SAS, too, has been touched by the vision of Alaska, and SAS, too, has a stake in it. As a foreign carrier, flying the flags of three other countries, we cannot have opinions about many matters here, but the economic development of the State, the building of its prosperity and the expansion of its trade and influence, are very much our business.

So today, I hope to concentrate on talking business—and in a pretty business-like fashion. I'm sure you all know that Anchorage came into our system 15 years ago as a way station on the route between Europe and Asia. It was perhaps analogous to the establishment at a hitherto obscure harbor of a coaling station for the first steamships in Asian waters. Today, that harbor is the great and bustling city of Singapore. I'm not going to press the analogy too far, except to say that it is a good case history of how a port of call can become a great workshop, a great market and a great metropolis, founded on trade.

In a sense, this is our vision of Alaska. We have come part way to its realization. Fifteen years ago, Anchorage represented a 100 per cent expense item on our system account books. Today, thanks to the development of Alaskan trade and the Alaskan economy, the picture is different: we still spend twice as much here as we earn, but trade and travel have developed to the point where Anchorage is a respectable sales district in our scheme of things.

Obviously, we look forward to the day when Anchorage will be a self-supporting unit in the SAS system and perhaps return a bit of profit. I'm sure the day will come, of Alaska, but as a businessman, I'd like to see it sooner. And as businessmen yourselves, I'm sure you would agree.



How is it to be done? Of course, we'd like to see a lot more Alaskans going to Europe, for both trade and tourism. After all, on the Polar projection, Copenhagen and Oslo and Stockholm are not much further away from Anchorage than New York or Washington, and the beaches of the Mediterranean are no further away from Florida. I'm not suggesting that you give up your ties to the rest of the United States, but I do suggest that you know your options and make the most of them.

On the tourist side, we're doing our best with new and lower fares and more attractive tour packages of all kinds. I won't go into them here, but John Kucala or any of the travel agents in Alaska—whom we regard as our full partners in this enterprise—will be glad to tell you all about them.

I realize that you cannot spend what you do not earn, so I would also suggest that you take a closer look at the earnings opportunities offered you by this quick, convenient non-stop facility to Scandinavia and the rest of Europe.

I am sure that there are many enterprising men among you who can find in the market place of Scandinavia—where trades and conditions are often much like your own—products and processes which can profitably be applied to Alaska.

And I feel equally confident that there are Alaskan products for which you can find a demand in these well-off countries at the other end of the Polar flight. Today it may be fur articles and native handicrafts, fish and other edibles; tomorrow, I am sure, it will be a range of other and more sophisticated items. Again, this is no place for a market survey, but if you are interested, our people here and in Europe will be happy to help any of you explore possibilities and contact interested parties on the other side.

There is one area in which Alaska has inexhaustible resources and immediate opportunities—your wide open spaces and your facilities for recreation. We would like to see Alaska make more of its own attractions for the city-bound tourist from cramped and crowded Europe. You have some of the world's best fishing, and your moose, caribou, bear and mountain sheep should be a great attraction for hunters—and perhaps more for people who prefer to see and photograph wild life, as do the thousands who take our safari tours to Africa these days. Alaska has a very great deal to attract the tourist; the problem is to make it known. We hope that you will do more to spread the awareness of Alaska in the tourist markets of Europe and we are ready to cooperate with you in any effort you may undertake.

To carry out my theme, and because some of what I say may be picked up by Scandinavian news media, I'd like to use this occasion to say a few words directly to them. To them, I would say this: Alaska is still a frontier—it is a great book in which men may still write chapters of their own, and not just footnotes to what preceding generations have already packed on the page. The days of the land rush, when settlers could find on a free homestead in Alaska the opportunities they could not get at home, are probably over now; but then the conditions which forced so many Scandinavians to seek free land in America are also things of the past. What Alaska offers today is what a great many ambitious and enterprising Scandinavians are looking for—opportunities for professionals, for enterprisers and for investors. Alaska may have enough hands for the time being, but it offers virtually unlimited scope for heads and money.

There are sizeable opportunities in Alaska for light manufacturing of consumer goods for a growing domestic market, from tableware to furniture. Alaska offers opportunities in food processing and meat pack-

ing. Its forest products potential is a great one. It offers a very interesting field for some of the housing and construction techniques which have become so highly developed in Scandinavia. With its tourism potential, it cannot help but open attractive prospects for investment in hotels and inns—and in the service trades needed to operate them.

It is a fact of life at the moment that Scandinavian crowns will get you more dollars today than ever before; and those crowns invested in Alaska can produce a better return. The same, I think, applies to the investment of talent and expertise: the Scandinavian with a skill, a profession or an idea may well expect a greater personal reward from investing it in this wide open land of Alaska.

In addressing these remarks to our own people back home, I should add that they will be considering a country in which Scandinavians have deep roots and a pretty good reputation. After all, it was a Dane, Vitus Bering, who discovered Alaska; and Alaskans pay as much honor to Amundsen for his discovery of the Northwest Passage as Norwegians do for any of his other great accomplishments. Thousands of individual Scandinavians—the fishermen of "Little Norway" at Petersburg, the Lapp herders in the Westward region and a lot of others here in Anchorage or the other cities of the State—have already made their personal discoveries of Alaska. I think most of them are happy they did so.

As people who are responsible for turning out a lot of promotional literature, we generally allow for a little poetic license in what we read. But to our friends back in Europe, there are a couple of paragraphs in a magnificent publication by the State of Alaska which I'd like to quote with 100 percent endorsement. The first paragraph is this:

"The opportunities in Alaska challenge men's spirits. Those who have taken up the challenge have led Alaska to the threshold of the greatest economic development in the United States today. The opportunity to implement this development is yours."

And the second is this:

"Is there still room in Alaska? Still time? For the newcomer with vision, yes. No reservations, no waiting in line. Just step up with the Alaskan dream in your pocket and the will to work in your heart."

Mr. President, if you can get us some extra copies of that publication, we'd like to get them into the hands of Scandinavians who have dreams and will.

For one final moment, let me bring my remarks back home. In anticipating this very pleasant occasion, we gave considerable thought to what we might bring here today as a memento of our appreciation for what Anchorage and Alaska have meant to us. We decided finally that it should be something which illustrates the role of an international airline, not merely as a public utility, but as a bridge between peoples and cultures. So we have taken the liberty of bringing here today a collection of books about Scandinavia, which I would like to present now to the people of Alaska through the Anchorage Public Library. I hope that as many people as possible will enjoy them.

#### NATIONAL ARTHRITIS MONTH

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to the need for increased awareness by the

public of the causes, treatments, and effects of the Nation's No. 1 crippling diseases, arthritis, and the rheumatic diseases, I am today introducing a resolution to designate the month of May as "National Arthritis Month."

Arthritis and the rheumatic diseases affect over 17 million Americans and are second only to heart disease as the most widespread chronic illnesses in the United States today. Approximately 15 percent of those afflicted are unable to carry on their major activity, resulting in an economic loss to the Federal Government in 1 year of over \$200 million in reduced income and excise tax collections alone.

While the search for effective treatments of various forms of these diseases continues, the primary cause of rheumatoid arthritis, the most crippling form of arthritis, is still unknown. National attention and, consequently, Federal funds are largely directed toward research in the treatment of acute diseases, which actually affect fewer Americans than the chronic illnesses. The Federal Government, through the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, spent little more than 8.6 percent of the \$13 million in Federal funds in fiscal year 1969 for arthritis research and treatment.

During the past 7 years, arthritis training research grants have actually declined from \$1,766,000 to \$1,410,000, which, taking into account increased price levels, indicates a decrease of almost one-third in this program.

Treatment facilities and clinics prepared to handle the many arthritis victims are inadequate; there are only 50 first-rate arthritis research-treatment-care centers in the United States and about 300 clinics.

Furthermore, one of the major problems that creates the "delivery gap" in medical care is the need for more physicians trained in the diagnosis and treatment of arthritis and the rheumatic diseases. There are approximately 2,200 physicians who are members of the American Rheumatism Association, only some of whom can be actually designated as rheumatologists. Most of these doctors are located in or near large cities, thereby depriving many arthritis victims of medical care easily accessible in the rural areas. Even though the need for more trained personnel is great and continues to grow, qualified physicians wishing to specialize in rheumatology cannot find fellowships or traineeships, and only 57 of the Nation's 100 medical schools offer a full program of courses in this field.

Clearly, the disabling effects of arthritis and the rheumatic diseases upon many once active Americans and the compelling need for adequate treatment facilities and more research to determine the causes and possible cures should be brought to the attention of the American people and become a focus of national concern.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join with me in recommending to the President that the month of May in each year be designated as "National Arthritis Month." Since this is also the period when the National Arthritis Foundation

conducts its annual fundraising drive, I urge the Members of both the House and the Senate to support this organization's efforts by bringing research and better treatment facilities to the attention of the people of the United States.

#### FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Patrick Henry, on March 23, 1775, stated:

Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

He knew that freedom was earned and that it must be nourished and protected.

Patrick Henry, and the other patriots that formed this Nation, insisted upon the inclusion of certain freedoms in the U.S. Constitution. Due to their foresight, we are guaranteed the free exercise of religion, the freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

To protect those freedoms, Americans have died on foreign and domestic soil.

No less than the fathers of our country, we have a responsibility to encourage freedom to flourish and grow.

In keeping with this custom, for 21 years the Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary No. 86 in Lynwood, Calif., has sponsored an essay program in the fifth and sixth grades of the schools located in Lynwood.

This year the theme for the essay was "Freedom—My Responsibility." Hundreds of essays are received each year, and from these, 7 to 10 of the most outstanding are selected for awards and special recognition.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to commend all of those students who participated in this program.

A special word of thanks should go to Mrs. Lucille Kanka who has chaired this event for the past 21 years.

In addition, I would like to commend those students who received special recognition for their essays. Debbie Pierce, from the Janie P. Abbott School, won first place. Debbie Gramlich, from the Janie P. Abbott School, won second place. Diana Jobst, from the Woodrow Wilson School, won third place.

The students whose essays were accorded honorable mention are the following: Paulmena Tinsley, St. Emydius School; Pam Leon, Will Rogers School; Edith Parrott, Woodrow Wilson School; Greg Goodan, Roosevelt School; Denise Anderson, Roosevelt School; Tamara Renee Inma, Roosevelt School; and Michelle Marquis, Janie P. Abbott School.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to include the winning essays. The essays follow:

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Debbie Pierce, Janie P. Abbott School)

Webster says, freedom is the state of being free; independence and liberty. Free is being

able to decide for yourself. *Independence* is freedom from rule by others. *Liberty* is privileges given to us. As a sixth grader by Webster's definition, I have not experienced much freedom although the older I get the more freedom I'm given. To say how freedom is my responsibility is a hard thing to do.

I do know that freedom is not free. We have to work at it and sometimes even fight for it. It would take everyone to make freedom work completely.

I feel my responsibility is to learn all I can about my country and its government. To find out how our laws are made and our representatives are elected. By doing this, when I become an adult I will know the right way to go about making my country better to live in. As an adult I would try to keep my country as free as possible. No country can have complete freedom, but the United States has the best system.

One of the most important things our country must do is learn to get along with one another. The whites, the blacks, the orientals and all the other races must learn to accept one another. We must be able to live in peace with each other, to respect others, their customs and their ways of life.

Each generation has the responsibility to keep our country free and to do all they can to give Americans their freedom. My generation will decide what type of government it wants and I will do my part to make America proud of my generation.

When more people care about people then more people will know what freedom is all about.

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Debbie Gramlich, Janie P. Abbott School)

Freedom is my responsibility. God gave us the land, our forefathers fought to keep it free. It is my duty to keep this land free so it never returns to the system of slavery. Many people lost their lives fighting for freedom.

The men in the Army, Navy, Air Force and the Marines must be responsible to do their best for their country. Their lives will be risked many times while serving their country.

I must be confident of myself to be a civilized American. When I am old enough to vote I must be able to know who the best person is. I should be well informed about each of the candidates who are running for city, state, and national offices. I also have the freedom to voice my opinion in my community.

I am active in school and community projects and I am also aware of what is going on in my community.

When I am an adult I will still have the opportunity to voice my opinion and I will continue to be active in city and community projects. I will be as helpful as possible to keep America a free country. That is why Freedom is My Responsibility.

#### THIRD PLACE: "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Diana Jobst, Woodrow Wilson School)

The freedom of America is depending on the young people of today because we are the ones who will govern our country some day. It is up to me and my generation to keep America's freedom. We are the ones who will protect America from losing its Americanism through loss of freedom for each individual.

Shields were used long ago in fighting, to help protect men from harm. That is just what we the young people of America are—Shields! We will protect America's freedom from its enemies like shields protected men from their enemies many years ago. With every shield there is a sword. Our Bill of Rights and our Constitution are the swords that go with the shields of Americanism.

I think that we all can make America a

free place to live. When I said a free place to live, I am not saying, get rid of the jails and get rid of the government, but I am saying to be free by the way of the laws that were made to obey. We all must learn what freedom is before we can truly understand it. I have learned what freedom is, I do understand it and I accept the challenge of protecting it.

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

HONORABLE MENTION

(By Paulmena Tinsley, St. Emydius School)

Freedom—My Responsibility... First of all what is freedom? Well, is it something you can hold on to? Is it something you can have wherever you go? Is it something that exists all over the world? If you look "freedom" up in a dictionary you would probably find a meaning something like the following: 1. being free, 2. liberty; power of choosing what you will do, 3. free use, 4. too great liberty, 5. ease of movement or action. Do you agree with these meanings?

Is it my responsibility? Is it yours? It might be neither. It might be both. But if it is mine and yours what can we do to make this freedom our responsibility? We could maybe try to spread freedom to people and places. We could try to tell people what this thing "means." Do you think it would be a good thing for everyone? It probably would be. But think about it. What about the people that aren't all sugar and spice. Everyone is not perfect. Sometimes these people try to stretch their freedom and interfere with someone else's life and freedom. It's our responsibility to stop this or who will.

Some people say, "I don't want to get involved." What if nobody wanted to get involved. Then what would they say? So, remember, freedom is my responsibility, freedom is your responsibility. If you want freedom, you've got to work for it.

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Pam Leon, Will Rogers School)

Freedom is my responsibility, because, I thank God, I am an American, and I was born free. My freedom and your freedom is guaranteed by the "Bill of Rights." The "top ten" of our Nation's rules of law as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

In Vietnam today there are many people who are fighting for their freedom. Thousands of our boys have fought beside them; many will not come back to enjoy this wonderful homeland that is free.

Freedom as we know it in America will keep its wonderful meaning so long as it is prized and not abused among the young people, and I will meet, in deed and in word, every challenge to keep my country free.

It is my responsibility to feel the way Francis Scott Key must have felt when he wrote the Star Spangled Banner, when he saw that our flag was still waving in the air. It is my responsibility to feel great pride when I see the Statue of Liberty, standing straight and tall, holding her torch of freedom, to all foreigners who come into her harbor. It is my responsibility to like the chill that raced up and down my spine, when I saw the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia a few years ago.

It is my responsibility to love and understand my fellow Americans, no matter what their race, color or beliefs; maybe because, even though I am young, I love my freedom, too. I will not just live and let live, but I will live and help others live. In this way I shall pass on the most precious heritage of freedom so that future Americans can sing with me—I was "Born Free."

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Editha Parrott, Woodrow Wilson School)

As a citizen of the United States of America, I am proud of being able to live in a country where the people have the right of freedom. Freedom is to be able to live our lives without fear, to speak freely, to take



part in our government and look into any man's eyes as an equal. I know that there are many people in the world today who do not have the liberty we enjoy, and who live more like slaves than freemen.

My responsibility is to see that others progress themselves and see that others get the same freedom as we have today. America was founded on the idea that human beings are entitled to live in freedom. I believe that government and our way of life promises more freedom and liberty to more people. Throughout history men have struggled and risked their lives for freedom and justice and the right to govern themselves. In many countries these things have never been achieved but in the United States they are the very foundation of our government and our way of living. Today in the United States the individual is important, his family, his job. I believe that every one should have an opportunity to get an education and make a decent life for himself and his family.

Because I love my country and believe in freedom for all, I will carry out this pledge for an American citizen—I will be loyal to my flag and respect it. I will do my duty when I become an adult citizen by voting in all elections. I will remember that the government is no better than the men who run it and do my best to vote for able and honest men who believe in the ideals of our country's freedom. I will judge a person by what he is not by his race or religion. I will not let prejudice affect my ideal of justice and fair play. I will do my share in school, church, and in the community activities so that my country will be a better place to live in.

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Greg Goodan, Roosevelt School)

Freedom was brought forth to us on July 4, 1776 in the Declaration of Independence. Freedom is your responsibility, it is my responsibility, it is our responsibility in the things we do every day, things such as, saluting the American Flag and respecting it, knowing the Bill of Rights and knowing what they stand for.

Have you heard the closing lines of the Star Spangled Banner? They say the home of the free and the brave. This means America is a home for free people, free from communism and torture. It also is a home for the brave men who fought for their lives too. We should all know what our national anthem is saying to us.

Freedom! We should all love it, cherish it, live for it, die for it, and fight for it. My Freedom is your freedom, so let's take care of it. It's a priceless gift!

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Denise Anderson, Roosevelt School)

Freedom is my responsibility, but what is freedom? To me, freedom means the rights that I have. Freedom is being myself. Freedom is doing what I like, so long as it is right.

In order to have privileges, one must accept responsibilities. Freedom is like this. My responsibility is to use my freedom as it is meant to be used. Many people take advantage of freedom. We have the right to assemble peacefully. That is what is meant to be done. It isn't right to assemble to talk about starting a riot, or anything like that.

Another way that freedom is my responsibility is this—I should respect my rights and the way they were won. To the best of my ability, I should defend my freedom.

It is also my duty to respect the rights and property of others, and to help them use their freedom properly. It is my job to protect American rights from people who misuse them. There are people who don't care about rights—theirs or anyone else's. I should help them to know and love freedom as I do.

Freedom is a privilege for which everyone

must do their part. Freedom is my responsibility in many ways.

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Tamara Renee Inman, Roosevelt School)

Have you ever thought what it would be like if we didn't have freedom? Freedom is my responsibility because if we don't obey the laws we won't have Freedom. If we didn't have the Constitution we wouldn't have Rights. If we didn't have Rights we wouldn't have Freedom.

When I began to write my essay, I wondered just how, I as a student, have any responsibility toward Freedom. I have studied Freedom for a few years now and know that we live in the best country with Freedom for all and these Freedoms are guaranteed by our Constitution. My biggest responsibility toward Freedom as a student is to learn all I can about Freedom until I reach the age where I can give my opinion through my right to vote. Freedom is everyone's responsibility and unless people realize that this is true, they might find their Freedom slipping away.

#### "FREEDOM—MY RESPONSIBILITY"

(By Michelle Marquis, Janie P. Abbott School)

Freedom—my responsibility.

Most people think it stupidity.

"Freedom from what?" They demand.

"Well," I say, "Just look at this land."

You complain about pollution,

But you'll never find a solution.

You just sit there like a log,

Just look at all the smog.

Your factories are always going,

Never stopping or never slowing.

And when we kids clean it up,

We think that surely you will stop.

But no, not you, that's for sure,

You just do it all the more.

And so don't you see,

How freedom's my responsibility?

And really it's yours too.

So please really do,

Try to understand,

About getting freedom for our land.

### THE RED CHINESE THREAT TO THE TUNG OIL INDUSTRY

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while hearings are underway to salvage our U.S. tung oil production—if for no other reason than to aid the U.S. tung nut farmers who were encouraged into the business during World War II as a matter of national defense—a new price predator has appeared on the scene—Red China.

The heretofore embargo on imports of tung oil from Communist China was lifted on June 10, 1971. Tung oil imports may now enter the United States from Red China duty free and without quotas as from other tung oil importing countries.

The Sino-American Trading and Engineering Corp. is reportedly serving as an intermediary for an unidentified Washington firm in consulting with the Red Chinese on financial arrangements for importing 5,000 metric tons of tung oil from mainland China.

More Americans go without jobs and income and the welfare list and the food stamp lines lengthen but no one dares suggest that it is not progress to export

America's jobs while we import foreigners' goods. All of this is being sold to the American people as necessary so our newly found Communist Chinese ally will be able to have U.S. dollars on hand to buy what their industry and technology cannot make; that is, airplanes, trains, and sophisticated machinery.

### THE UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT OF 1970

#### HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, 1971, the President signed into law the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. Prior to passage of this act, relocation payments for those displaced, because of federally funded or assisted projects differed greatly between States. Furthermore, although those involved were compensated for the physical loss of real property, no dollar amount was assigned to the economic value of a business or property. The Congress enacted this legislation to correct the situation.

The act gives the states until July 1, 1972, to amend their own statutes to have them conform with the terms of the Relocation Act. As a sponsor of this legislation, I supported this needed reform. Most States, including my own State of Georgia, have made a good faith effort to comply with the terms of the act. Unfortunately, Georgia has a unique situation which will prevent the State from fully complying with the terms of the legislation by the July 1, 1972, deadline.

As you are aware, under the terms of the act, the Federal Government is now paying the first \$25,000 of all relocation payments with the remainder being divided proportionally between the State and the Federal Government according to the particular program involved. On July 1, 1972, the State and the Federal Government will begin to divide the entire amount of the relocation payment according to the proportions established by the law governing the particular project. For instance, with regard to the interstate highway program, the States are required to pay 10 percent of the highway construction costs and the Federal Government pays 90 percent.

Unfortunately, the Georgia constitution states that Georgia can only compensate a person or business for the loss at a price determined by the fair market value of his property and thus, no payment can be made for economic losses due to the Government's acquisition of real property. Unlike most States, Georgia is forced to change the State constitution in order to comply with the terms of the law. However, Georgia's constitution can only be amended at a general election. One will not be held until November 1972.

On June 4, 1971, Gov. Jimmy Carter,

recognizing the problem, established a special committee to study what action the State should take. The committee recommended that the Governor propose an amendment to the State constitution which he did at the last session of the State legislature. The Georgia State Assembly has placed the proposed amendment on the general election ballot which will be held in November of this year.

Since the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 became law, the State of Georgia has not held a general election. Obviously it is impossible for the State to conform with the law by the deadline, July 1, 1972. Definitely, Governor Carter and the State legislature have made a good faith effort to comply with the law, and I believe that they deserve relief until the constitutional amendment is passed by the people of Georgia. Without this relief the State will be denied participation in the Federal programs for highways, airport and airways development, water and sewer grants, mass transit aid, and any other Federal programs which require property acquisition.

To prevent this unfair situation, I am today introducing legislation. My bill would postpone the effective date of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act to allow States extra time to pass enabling legislation authorizing State and local agencies to comply with all the act's requirements. The act would be extended to July 1, 1973, or 30 days after the end of the next regular session of the State legislature, whichever is earlier, giving a State up to an additional year to obtain the necessary legislation.

The bill I am introducing would continue after the July 1, 1972, date full funding for the first \$25,000 in relocation payments now assumed by the Federal Government. In other words, this would become a permanent feature of the law, as it was intended to be in the original legislation before the Congress in 1965.

Moreover, in order to assure that relocation payments are not denied to eligible individuals after the present July 1, 1972, effective date, the bill further authorizes Federal agencies to make payments that would otherwise be made, and partially shared by State or local agencies where legal obstacles prevent States from making those payments. In such cases, the State would be required to reimburse the Federal Government for its share either by a lump-sum payment or by a reduction in future grant-in-aid payments.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must act very quickly if this needed relief is to be granted to my State, and those others not able to comply by July 1, 1972. The Senate will take up the matter on the Senate floor in the near future. I hope that the chairman of the Public Works Committee will try to hold hearings as soon as possible. For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting a copy of the Governor's report regarding the need for relief:

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON STATE RELOCATION AND ASSISTANCE

The Governor's Committee on State Relocation and Assistance was established by Executive Order signed by Governor Jimmy

Carter on June 4, 1971. The committee was instructed to concern itself with the formulation and recommendation of any legislative changes that might be needed for the State and local communities to comply with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 which was signed into law on January 2, 1971.

Pursuant to such Executive Order, the committee reports its findings and recommendations as follows:

#### I. UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT OF 1970

For the purpose of this report, Title I of the Relocation Act is pertinent to the extent that it defines "State" and "State Agencies" in such a broad way as to cover the State of Georgia, each county, each city, and each department, agency and instrumentality thereof. The Act also defines the term "displaced person" to mean—

"Any person who on or after the effective date of this Act, moves from real property, or moves his personal property from real property, as a result of the acquisition of such real property, in whole or in part, or as a result of the written order or as the result of a written order of the acquiring agency to vacate real property, for a program or project undertaken by a Federal agency, or with Federal financial assistance . . .".

Accordingly, any acquisition, either voluntary or by condemnation, of real property by any State, political subdivision, or public agency will cause any person living or conducting a business thereon to become a "displaced person" provided any Federal financial assistance is availed of for the proposed project.

Title II of the Relocation Act provides in Section 210 that the head of a Federal Agency shall not approve any grant to, or contract or agreement with the State, any State agency, or other public body unless he receives satisfactory assurance as to the following matters:

I. Relocation payments and assistance will be provided to displaced persons under Section 202, 203, and 204 of the Act;

II. Relocation assistance programs offering the services described in Section 205 will be provided to such displaced persons; and

III. Within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, decent, safe and sanitary replacement dwellings will be available to displaced persons in accordance with Section 205(c) (3).

Section 305 of Title 3 of the Relocation Act provides and under circumstances similar to those mentioned with respect to Title II above, the head of a Federal Agency must receive satisfactory assurances that

(1) In acquiring real property the State, State agencies, or other public bodies will be guided to the greatest extent practicable under State law, by the land acquisition policies set forth in Section 301 and the provisions of Section 302,

(2) Property owners will be paid or reimbursed for the necessary expenses specified in Sections 303 and 304.

In summary, the State, State agencies, and other public bodies must provide for a wide variety of payments to displaced persons as defined hereinbefore pursuant to the Relocation Act. Bearing in mind that "just and adequate compensation" required by the Constitution as payment for property taken or damaged for public purposes has been, and is now, interpreted by the courts as compensation for the destruction or interference with property interests, it appears that in many instances the payments required by the Relocation Act go considerably beyond those payments which are currently classified as elements of constitutional "just and adequate compensation".

#### II. COST TO GEORGIA PUBLIC AGENCIES TO COMPLY WITH RELOCATION ACT

The committee has made a number of attempts to determine factually the prospective

out-of-pocket costs to the State of Georgia and its political subdivisions as a result of the payments and obligations required by the Relocation Act. We were unable to obtain any adequate information on this point because a number of the payments vary according to the decisions and acts of the displaced persons, and because certain obligations are not related to the actual costs of the land acquired. We also undertook to determine the amount of Federal monies which would be lost as the result of failure to comply with the Act and were unable to obtain any adequate facts on this score. We have concluded that the additional costs to the State and its agencies and political subdivisions of the State will be substantial but that the amount of Federal funds which will be lost as a result of the failure to comply with the Relocation Act would be many, many times as large as the additional cost required for compliance with the Federal legislation.

#### III. LEGALITY OF PAYMENTS AND UNDERTAKINGS REQUIRED BY THE RELOCATION ACT

The committee has done much legal research on the question of the constitutional authority for making payments and providing services required by the Act. The demand for compliance with the Act is predicated upon Federal financial assistance to a project which will displace an individual or a business. Displacement may, of course, result from either condemnation or voluntary sale of real property.

While there are numerous Federal or Federally assisted projects and many public bodies which are concerned with the acquisition of land, one factor appears to be common to all of the diverse agencies. The common ground is that public acquisition of land is predicated upon payment of that amount of money which represents the just and adequate compensation required by the Constitution.

Constitutional just and adequate compensation derives its meaning from the case law. Succinctly stated, it is compensation for the extinguishment or interference with property rights. While the requirement for making payments demanded by the Relocation Act is predicated upon public acquisition of private property, many of those payments do not appear to be compensation for property interests as those interests are presently treated by the courts. The committee is of the view that many of the payments cannot properly be classified as elements of just and adequate compensation.

The committee has sought to discover other sources of constitutional authority for making such payments common to all public agencies. For example, the committee has considered the proposition of basing such payments upon the welfare provisions of the State Constitution. That provision does not, however, provide a solution applicable to all agencies in all instances, as a displaced person need not be an indigent within the meaning of the Constitution. The committee cannot find constitutional authority common to all public bodies which would authorize implementation of the Relocation Act by all public bodies in the State.

#### IV. CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE RELOCATION ACT UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The committee has considered the constitutionality of the Relocation Act under the United States Constitution in order to determine whether it would be feasible for Georgia public bodies to launch a constitutional attack upon the Relocation Act.

The committee is of the view that the Relocation Act is a constitutional exercise of congressional power. Congress has the authority to make grants or loans for public uses and the determination of public uses is left to Congress. In this instance the legislation does not coerce any State to pass any legislation or do any other act without its prior consent. The granting or withholding of Federal funds to states on the basis of



conditions first established, under these facts, does not constitute coercion even though the dollar amounts are substantial.

#### V. PROPOSED SOLUTION

Having concluded that the Relocation Act is a constitutional exercise of Federal authority, that no constitutional authority common to all agencies which receive Federal financial assistance presently exists, the committee proposes that the State Constitution be amended as quickly as possible so that all public agencies in this State will unquestionably have the power to make the payments and undertake the obligations specified in the Relocation Act.

Attached to this report as an exhibit is a proposed resolution calling for a constitutional amendment which the committee believes would, if adopted as required by law, alleviate problem areas which currently exist under Georgia law.

The constitutional amendment proposed for consideration by the committee is not self executing and will require subsequent legislative action for its implementation. This method will allow sufficient time for detailed examination of a vast number of separate statutes pertaining to individual State and local agencies. That examination will allow for appropriate legislative action tailored to the individual statutory requirements of a particular agency. It will also allow time for study and preparation of legislation to create the most feasible method for implementing the relocation program.

The committee recommends that immediate steps be taken to procure an amendment to P. L. 91-646 which will extend the deadline for compliance beyond July 1, 1972. The committee recommends that P. L. 91-646 be amended so that the application of the Act would be suspended as to those agencies in Georgia which cannot comply with the terms thereof until July 1, 1973. The committee feels that immediate congressional attention to the problem is required because some Federal financing agencies either are now or probably will shortly commence curtailment of new federally assisted projects because of the impending July 1, 1972, compliance deadline.

The committee is of the view of that seek-

ing an amendment to P. L. 91-646 so as to extend the compliance deadline to July 1, 1973, is reasonable. The Federal statute came into existence on January 2, 1971, with an effective date clause which requires compliance as soon as possible and which demands compliance not later than July 1, 1972. The penalty for non-compliance after July 1, 1972, is total cessation for the flow of Federal funds into Georgia programs which displace individuals or businesses from their premise.

Under these circumstances, the existence of potential constitutional impediments does not appear to have been provided for, as Georgia was simply never given an opportunity by the Congress of the United States to alleviate any local constitutional problem.

P. L. 91-646 passed the Senate in October of 1969. It was passed with amendments in the House in December of 1970. House amendments were agreed to, with amendments, in the Senate in mid December of 1970. The House concurred in the Senate amendments in mid December of 1970 and the Act became law on January 2, 1971. A brief look at the significant dates in the legislative history of the statute shows that the earliest possible moment that the Georgia General Assembly could have given meaningful consideration to the Act was the 1971 Session. However, had a Resolution been adopted in the General Assembly Session of 1971, offering an amendment to the Constitution for ratification, the action would have been meaningless because we did not have a General Election in November, 1971. The next election at which a State constitutional amendment could be considered is the November, 1972 election. Of course, any constitutional difficulty to be cured by amendments offered for ratification in the November, 1972, election would be too late as the State and local public agencies would have already suffered cessation of Federal financial assistance for at least four months. In short, the Congress has simply not given Georgia any opportunity to present this question to the voters of this State and to cure any existing constitutional problem. The committee feels that Congress should in fairness to this State, permit the continued flow of Federal financial assistance to Georgia during that time required for the State to cure local legal problems.

#### SURVEYING THE YOUNG VOTER

#### HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, a highly valuable peek into the thinking of young Americans today is provided in the results of my recent Young Voter Opinion Survey.

In mid-March, I posed 10 questions to nearly 2,500 young men and women in my congressional district between the ages of 18 and 20. They are the newly enfranchised citizens.

So far, though returns are still coming in daily, 667 questionnaires have been returned to me. I am told that this is one of the largest poll of this age group on national issues since the 25th amendment was ratified.

To me at least, the results are most reassuring. For example, the tabulations show that 88 percent oppose forced busing; 86 percent say 18-21-year-olds should be legally treated as adults; 76 percent favor voluntary prayer in public schools; 72 percent would be willing to pay more for products and utilities that are virtually pollution-free; 66 percent oppose Federal deficit spending; 61 percent think foreign aid should be drastically reduced; 60 percent feel the President's recent China trip was worth while; and 50 percent say the United States is not "an effective peacekeeping organization."

I thought it was interesting that the highest degree of uncertainty was on the issue of the President's trip to China: 22 percent said they are not certain the trip was worthwhile.

The complete tabulation of results follows:

#### 1972 YOUNG VOTER OPINION SURVEY—TABULATION OF RESULTS

[Conducted by U.S. Representative Charles W. Sandman, Jr., 2d District: Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, and Salem Counties, N.J.]

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Not sure		Yes	No	Not sure
1. Do you favor forced busing of children away from their neighborhood schools to achieve a racial balance?	6	88	6	9. To express your views, have you ever written to:			
2. Now that they have the right to vote, should 18- to 20-year-olds be legally treated as adults for the purposes of contracts, law enforcement, etc.?	86	5	9	(a) Your mayor or other local official?	12	88	
3. Would you favor a constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer in public schools?	76	17	7	(b) Your county freeholders?	8	92	
4. Should the Federal Government be allowed to spend more than it takes in from taxation?	17	66	17	(c) Your State senator or assemblyman?	20	80	
5. Do you feel the United Nations is an effective peace-keeping organization?	30	50	20	(d) Your Congressman or Senator?	24	76	
6. Would you be willing to pay more for products and utilities if they were virtually pollution-free?	72	16	12	10. If you have formed an opinion already, how would you rate the performance of:			
7. Do you feel President Nixon's recent China trip was worthwhile?	60	18	22		Great	Good	Poor NA <sup>1</sup>
8. Do you think foreign aid should be drastically reduced?	61	23	16	(a) President Nixon?	12	56	6 6
				(b) Vice President Agnew?	8	32	47 13
				(c) U.S. Senator Williams?	6	46	12 36
				(d) U.S. Senator Case?	8	46	14 32
				(e) Congressman Sandman?	17	53	11 19

<sup>1</sup> NA—No opinion given.

#### JAMES E. JOHNSON IN PROFILE

#### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of the Navy League's Sea Power magazine carried a fine article on a most CXVIII—790—Part 10

remarkable man, James E. "Johnny" Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

I know many of my colleagues share my respect and admiration for Mr. Johnson and will enjoy this excellent profile.

The article follows:

JAMES E. JOHNSON IN PROFILE: A FRIEND A DAY

Once each day somewhere around the seventh corridor, E ring, in the Pentagon,

a tall, slim man accosts a stranger, smiles, and offers his hand.

"My name is James Johnson," he says, "I try to make a friend each day, and I'd like to get to know you."

The reactions of the chosen are often startling. Some are suspicious: "What do you want from me?" But many respond after a moment's hesitation with a delighted smile, an unexpected friendly gesture in the monotony of a humdrum day.

Later they will get a note from James E.

Johnson, and find that the man who sought to be their friend is the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, a man dedicated to making friends, to people, and to a positive approach to life.

His approach is typically simple and direct, and his attitudes and competence have catapulted him from Chief Warrant Officer, USMC, to one of the top civilians in the Navy hierarchy, by way of a million-dollar-a-year life insurance executive, in only a few years.

"Johnny" Johnson is also the highest ranking black civilian in the Navy, but this is a fact with only marginal relevance to what he is trying to accomplish.

That job is trying to fashion the policies which will build a naval manpower force responsive to new concepts in national policy such as the Nixon Doctrine, in the face of changing pressures in the civilian community.

His goal is quality instead of quantity—to meet the challenge of a Navy diminished in size by one-third, but which must meet the same or even greater commitments.

Recruiting is perhaps the most pressing problem, and the goal of an all-volunteer force by June 1973 looms large. "It's not easy," Johnson admits. "We don't have the draft threat to motivate enlistment in the Navy, and the economy is getting better, so the man who wants a job can get one outside."

"But on the positive side, we have a pay raise, we don't know the true effect of that yet, and we are doing a number of things to assist recruiters." The hope is that better recruiters will attract better men. And the new Seafarer program means men can go to sea immediately after boot camp instead of having to go through another training program.

And quality is being instilled in the force itself, Johnson notes, as the Reserves are upgraded to take on operational tasks in increasing frequency, and are given first-grade equipment.

There are problems, however, and the retention rate is rising only slowly, now up to a little over 20 per cent, the goal being 30 per cent. But this compares favorably with last year's 17 per cent, and the previous year's 10 per cent.

#### CHALLENGES GREETED WITH EQUANIMITY

But challenges are greeted with equanimity by Johnson, whose boyhood was spent in the Chicago area, the youngest son in a big family whose father was 66 when he was born.

"The good part about it was that we didn't know we were poor, there were no psychologists or social workers to come and tell us. So we were very happy."

Johnson's father, he recalls, was a strong man, a strapping big 6 foot 9, 275-pound giant who had been at various times a logger, a boxmaker for the Chicago Box Co., and later owner of a cleaning shop. Even during the depression he was never out of work. His philosophy was, "If the boss pays you a dollar a day, give him a dollar and a half worth of work, and you'll never be without a job."

His father instilled in all his children a positive approach to life, by which philosophy Johnson still lives. "When I would get discouraged, he'd say, 'Son, if you really want to do it, you can. You can do anything, and there's no telling how far you can go if you don't care who gets the credit.'"

About the time Johnson was 18, the Marine Corps opened up its ranks for the first time to admit Negroes. "This was a real challenge to those who could pass the entrance exam. It was the 'in' thing to do. If you could make it, you were looked on as being very bright."

But he adds, "When I got into boot camp and was rapped around a few times I thought maybe I wasn't so bright after all."

The services have come a long way from those first years which Johnson and others

spent in segregated training and service until integration finally was achieved in 1949. The Navy's image has changed, Johnson feels, and it can now be regarded as a service which looks at all people in the same light. The number of minority students at Annapolis has been doubled in the past few years, and all service rates have been opened up to all races. Not for some time have Filipinos been confined to stewards' jobs, nor the officer ranks virtually closed to blacks.

The Navy soon will have five NROTC units at Negro colleges, and the number of junior ROTC units has expanded greatly, including a unit at Watts High School in Watts, Calif., scene of much racial rioting a few years ago. The Navy has been able to sell these units, Johnson feels, by showing the faculties the virtues of the discipline the students are taught, and by pointing out to the students that they will always have a career waiting for them or to fall back on if they take this training.

#### NAVY RACIAL PROGRAMS BEST

Racial unrest in the service is still a problem, but Johnson feels that the Navy's education program is the best of the services. Each Naval command will soon have a minority officer to assist in this area, and they will be increasingly used in recruiting, he says.

Education has played a tremendous role in Johnson's life, and he gives it great importance as part of the job he is doing to make the Navy an attractive place to work for others. He himself is a veteran of more than 200 correspondence courses, ranging from weaponry to nutrition, and he is now studying for his Ph. D. at George Washington University in management and public administration.

Johnson was about 40 when he decided to leave the Marine Corps. "I felt a great challenge outside to do something I always wanted to do—earn a lot of money."

Prudential Life Insurance Co. took him on. "I approached the job with a positive attitude, and changed the negatives of the situation into positives. Someone had said that a Negro could never sell insurance in an almost white community. I said that being a Negro was a positive thing, I stood out. It also was a positive fact that people want to help those they feel are at a disadvantage. So it became a plus factor."

Prudential, as Johnson says, soon "became a believer." He sold \$1.5 million worth of insurance in two and a half months, making him a leading salesman and leaving a record for that area that no one has topped since.

A brush with the then existent government in California over insurance matters led him to believe that a change was necessary in the statehouse, and he set to work campaigning for Ronald Reagan. After the election, Reagan called upon him to come to Sacramento "for just one year" as Director of the California State Department of Veterans Affairs.

One of the most exciting aspects of his work, he recalls, was the creation of an "amputee ski" program. "These men injured in Viet Nam, were terribly withdrawn. We taught them how to ski—it was a most amazing thing. They gained confidence in themselves and began to converse with others again."

A deer hunting group also was organized, and Johnson remembers a double amputee who had not talked since he had lost his legs in Viet Nam. "He wouldn't respond except to do what people asked, so we let him ride on the back of a truck and gave him a gun and told him to hunt. Then we saw a big buck, which he shot."

"He yelled 'I got him!' When we all stared at him, since this was the first thing we had heard him say, he yelled, 'What are you guys looking at me for? Go and get my buck!' After that, he no longer was withdrawn."

"I got more out of this work than the men did," Johnson says. "It made me feel very humble to work with them."

After two years as Veterans Affairs Director, Johnson was appointed Vice Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

#### ENJOYS PERSONAL CONTACTS

In his current job, Johnson is able to maintain the personal contacts he enjoys, visiting Bethesda Naval Hospital and going aboard different ships to talk to the men, often shaking thousands of hands during such a visit.

"I put myself in their place. I always thought that if someone would just give me a glance, just stop and smile and touch me, I would be so thrilled. I believe we must show we are humble and appreciate what these men do."

The Johnson family, his wife, three boys, and one girl, is very close. Wednesday night is family night, when all the week's activities are shared after the homework—all including a budding five-year-old male mathematical genius, are students—is done.

Weekends are spent together with Sunday devoted to the Wheaton Baptist Church, where father teaches a college-age Sunday school class which has grown from a handful of students to several dozen under his tutelage.

He feels strongly about the Navy's need to decrease its own members' time away from home, the one reason which, more than any other, causes men to leave the service. In part to meet this problem, agreement was reached to permit home basing in Greece. But the Nixon Doctrine will be followed, he notes, and the settlement there will be essentially just a dependents' colony, not another big base.

By the time of this printing, Johnny Johnson will have a partially home-grown constituency. His own 22-year-old son, Kenneth E. Johnson, will have been sworn in by the Commandant of Marines as a second lieutenant, and the Assistant Secretary, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, will undoubtedly get some first-hand reports on how well he is doing.

#### CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE

#### HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, at a later date, I am sure that all of us will join in extending our accolades and our best wishes for success to the new Under Secretary General of the United Nations, our colleague, BRAD MORSE. I would like to preview those commendations briefly today.

The boundlessness of BRAD MORSE's interests is comparable only to the ever-present good nature that he brings to each endeavor. It is always a great pleasure to work on projects with BRAD. Our mutual activities have included programs sponsored by the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, by the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, by the Wednesday Club, and by many others. Since my recent appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee and my assignment to the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, on which BRAD is the ranking minority member, I have had further opportunities to observe and benefit from



the expertise in foreign relations which he possesses.

Undoubtedly, the President has chosen wisely in appointing BRAD MORSE to the position which Ralph Bunche filled with singular distinction. I am confident that BRAD's record also will be classified as a unique and meaningful contribution to the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that BRAD is leaving us, but I am pleased that the President has seen fit to select a Member of this great body for such an important post. BRAD, I wish you only the best.

# ANNUAL KANSAS FOURTH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

## HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress in 1961 to invite my constituents to participate in an annual opinion poll. I have found this questionnaire to be a valuable method of encouraging broad citizen participation in representative government, and of determining the views of my constituents on important domestic and foreign issues.

The 1972 Kansas Fourth District opinion poll is now being mailed to each household in the district, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the questionnaire:

### CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER'S ANNUAL FOURTH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

(NOTE.—Each question provided for answers of "yes," "no," or undecided.)

#### FOREIGN POLICY

1. Do you support President Nixon's efforts to open communications with Mainland China?

2. Are you satisfied that President Nixon is moving in the direction to end the war in Vietnam?

#### FISCAL

3. Do you feel that present wage and price controls are working?

4. Would you support increased Federal spending for public works projects to ease unemployment?

5. Should the present minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour be raised to \$2.00 an hour?

6. Should the Federal Government share income tax revenues with State and local governments, for unrestricted use without Federal control?

#### SOCIAL

7. Do you support the Administration's proposals for a moratorium on court-ordered busing of school children for purposes of achieving racial balance?

8. Would you favor directing over \$2½ billion in Federal funds in the next year to help achieve equal educational opportunity for all children?

9. Do you favor Federal legislation to promote the establishment of daycare centers and nursery schools?

10. Do you feel that a National Health Insurance Program is needed?

11. Which of the following actions on Social Security benefits would you support? (Circle 1)

- Increase benefits by 20%.
- Increase benefits by 10%.
- Increase benefits by 5%.
- No change.

#### AGRICULTURE

12. Federal farm controls and supports should be: (Circle one.)

- Phased out within 5 years.
- Continued substantially as is.
- Increased.

#### GENERAL

13. Do you favor legislation giving amnesty to those men who left the U.S. to avoid military service during the Vietnam War?

14. Would you be willing to pay higher taxes, if necessary, to finance an all-out Federal attack on pollution of our environment?

15. Do you believe a law should be enacted to deal more effectively with strikes that cause national transportation emergencies, such as the East and West Coast dock strikes, railroad strikes, etc.?

16. Would you favor allowing \$1.00 of your Federal income tax payment to be used as a contribution to the political party of your choice?

## THREE WINNERS OF THE FREEDOM ESSAY CONTEST

## HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Smoky Mountain Sertoma Club, Newport, Tenn., recently sponsored a Freedom Essay Contest. I had the distinct pleasure of attending the Sertoma Club Meeting and presenting awards to the three winners.

It was certainly gratifying to read the essays written by young people from 8 to 18 on "Freedom—What It Means To Me."

The three winners were Christian Williams, Debbie Jones, and Susan Denton.

Christian, a student at Newport Grammar School, is 8 years old and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Williams.

The daughter of Mr. Bill Jones, Debbie is an eighth grade student at Edgemont School.

A tenth grade student at Cocke County High School, Susan is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Denton.

Residents of Cocke County take great pride in these young people and all those who entered the Freedom Essay Contest. In addition, congratulations are in order to Mr. Troy Ingle, president of the Smoky Mountain Sertoma Club, Mr. Jack Brockwell, who headed the committee for the program, and the other members of this fine organization.

I would like to make these three outstanding essays available to readers of the RECORD:

#### FREEDOM

(By Christian Williams)

Freedom.

What it really means to me. Freedom means many good things to me. It means I can be what I want to be when I grow up. It means I can go to the School I like. It means I can go to my church and carry my own Bible. It means I am free to write what I believe in this essay. Freedom is worth fighting for. Freedom makes America the best place to live in the world.

#### FREEDOM

(By Debbie Jones)

What freedom means to me. We have many different kinds of freedom. Although some

of the most important are stated in the 1st Amendment. Which are freedom of Speech, freedom of Religions and freedom of the press.

We are very lucky to have these rights and had it not been for our government we wouldn't have.

Freedom to me means being able to use your rights to help yourself but not to harm others.

Freedom to me means for you to be able to go anywhere in the world you wish. To be able to meet all the different people in the world but there is something that forbids us from doing this and that is war and hate. This is what has kept the world apart today. This hate has stopped us from having our freedom.

Freedom doesn't just mean being able to do what you want.

Freedom means many different things to me but most important it means having peace throughout the world, because with war you would not feel free and without the Freedom that we do have where would we be today.

And that is what freedom means to me.

#### FREEDOM

(By Susan Denton)

Freedom! What it really means to me.

In Philadelphia, in the year 1776 many great men sat down and wrote one of the most important documents in our history. It stated: "We hold these truths to be Self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

This stood for what freedom meant to them and it says what freedom means to me.

When anyone mentions freedom, my best thought is naturally of the United States of America, our country was born out of the will of people to have a greater freedom than any other country. They succeeded in creating America, a country that is freedom.

Another type of freedom, is the one parents can give their children. It can be given by Trust, trusting them to follow the principles they have learned and giving them, the chance to try their own ideals. This is a freedom all people deserve.

The final and greatest freedom was given long ago to all people on the earth, it is the choice between right and wrong given through the love of God. This freedom can never be taken away from man, regardless of race, religion or color.

Freedom is not living without any rules to govern man, but freedom is the right to choose what you want to do without harming other people or their rights.

## POSTAL REFORM IS WORKING

## HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a major factor for the support given to postal reform was the belief that through the development of a more rational system, service could be improved and costs could be controlled. Recently, Postmaster General Klassen announced that the proposed rate increase had been canceled and that cost-cutting measures had been initiated. I would like to call the members attention to a recent editorial in the Sheboygan Press applauding this decision.

The editorial follows:

#### NO POSTAL INCREASE

It's a rare occasion when the word comes through that a proposed rate increase for services has been cancelled. Usually the word is that there will be an increase.

That is why the announcement Wednesday by Postmaster General E. T. Klassen deserved to be received with a tremendous cheer from the long-suffering public. Mr. Klassen said plans are being made to cancel the \$450 million postal rate increase scheduled for next January.

What's more, Mr. Klassen very boldly stated that, "We must learn to live within our income." He said this means that without impairing service, "cost must be substantially reduced."

As with most such announcements, there was a catch in it, although in this instance the catch could not be regarded as too stringent. Mr. Klassen directed that there be no hiring in the Postal Service for 90 days. The intention is to fill clerical vacancies by the promotion, transfer or reassignment of career postal employees. The use of temporary employees to augment day-to-day work forces will end by July 1.

The postmaster general may be somewhat optimistic in regard to the plans to cancel a rate increase, but it is worth trying. The public will note, too, his pledge to improve mail service while reducing postal costs.

#### WINN-DIXIE FREEZES MEAT, GROCERY PRICES FOR 30 DAYS

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Florida Times-Union on Friday, March 31, 1972, concerning the decision of the Winn-Dixie grocery to freeze meat and grocery prices for 30 days and pass on any savings if the wholesale prices go down. This is certainly an action in the public interest by the outstanding leadership of this civic-minded business giant. I feel it deserves nationwide recognition. The article follows:

#### WINN-DIXIE FREEZES MEAT, GROCERY PRICES FOR 30 DAYS

Winn-Dixie Stores, a chain of 871 supermarkets here and throughout the Southeast, says its stores will hold the line on meat and grocery prices through the month of April.

Winn-Dixie's action Thursday follows an announcement by Safeway Stores Inc., one of the nation's largest supermarket chains, that it intends to impose "major reductions" in retail beef prices in its 246 outlets in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware and Pennsylvania.

In Jacksonville, Winn-Dixie President Bert L. Thomas said, "We've said we'll hold the line on prices for now. And if our cost prices go down, we'll pass the savings along to the consumer."

Safeway's announcement, made in Washington, came after an earlier action by the Grand Union Co., another food store chain on the eastern seaboard, clamping a freeze on fresh meat and poultry prices.

A Safeway vice president said the reductions—which would be effective Friday—reflect recent declines in the wholesale cost of meat.

He said the chain had planned to make the price reduction announcement in Easter newspaper ads, but decided to move now "as part of its pledge to the administration to

do everything in Safeway's power to help keep food prices low."

Officials of a dozen supermarket chains conferred with Treasury Secretary John B. Connally Wednesday, when the store executives agreed to "go back and take a real close look at what we're doing."

The price reductions coincide with an Agriculture Department report that said live beef cattle prices in the month ending March 15 declined moderately, the first decline since last summer, but remained well above those of a year earlier.

#### COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROJECT UNDERWAY IN JUNEAU

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Terry Kelly and Joe Miguel are directors of the community schools project for the Greater Juneau borough schools in my State of Alaska. It is their thought and that of the many others working in this pilot project that the resources, facilities, and equipment of local schools can and should be made available to the entire community for extracurricular courses of educational and recreational value. This is not an entirely unique concept for the people of my State who are generally community-conscious and where organizations and agencies open their doors to the needs of local citizens. However, so that all may see another example of the imagination and hard work of the many Alaskans striving for better and more relevant educational opportunities for your youth and adults alike, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following article on the Juneau community schools concept:

#### SCHOOLS—OUR STANDARD MONUMENTS

(By Terrence W. Kelly, Jr.)

Living in our technological age is a day-to-day education in itself. Likewise, education should be a continuing process of preparing the individual to cope with, comprehend and enjoy the wide horizons of life's opportunities.

What does this have to do with the Community Schools concept? The Community School idea is based on a simple fact: Every community has school facilities which contain space and a wealth of special equipment that is not available to the ordinary citizen in his home. These resources currently lie unused roughly 70% of the time for any community purpose. Why not then open the schools for public use when they are not being utilized for the formal school program?

Along with these buildings and equipment are the skilled instructors who staff it. Many of these staff members are receptive to the idea of teaching one or many of their specialties for a small fee paid for by the participants. Also in every community are skilled artisans, craftsmen and hobbyists including local businessmen who can provide a service while increasing interest in their specialty.

Why not bring the buildings, equipment, tools, space, instructors and people together in a common place to learn some of the things that are of interest to people and that they find enjoyable? In other words set up activities that the surrounding neighborhood residents feel they would benefit from learning. This includes pre-schoolers, elementary, and secondary students as well

as adults. The program need not be limited to any particular age or income group. Program fees should be as low as possible and scholarships should be available to those who cannot pay and yet could use the skills to help themselves.

The types of programs offered should depend on the needs of local people, as they see them. However, these activities should not be looked on as "frills". In most cases they consist of activities which carry no grades, term papers or credits, however they do convey useful skills in areas such as: speed reading, preparing budgets, home decorating, and design, basic carpentry, sewing, knitting, rug making, house construction, basic cooking, auto-mechanics, and small appliance repair. This is not meant to be a definitive listing but merely examples of things that can be offered to pupils of all ages. Hobbies and recreational activities as well as profitable avocations should also be included as important. Stamp collecting, coin collecting, mineralogy, taxidermy, skiing, hunter safety, gunsmithing and other activities could be taught which provide amusement and enjoyment to thousands in their off time. The handicapped and elderly could benefit from these things as it can provide a means of supplementing their incomes and the opportunity to interact with others who have common interests. The elderly and retired could be used to lead activities, teach skills or provide information to students in areas of craftsmanship and history as they have witnessed history in the making and seen a myriad of changes take place. Many of their personal collections and artifacts surprise the average person when they become aware of them. What about the thousands of married couples with no children and the elderly couples whose children have grown? They continue to pay school taxes and receive no tangible personal benefits from this investment. Is there a connection between these groups and the many local bond issues that are rejected at the polls with the recurring claims that "we pay too many school taxes already?" It would be a simple matter to arrange for these groups to organize social clubs and activities like Bridge groups, Bingo, chess, checkers, dancing, etc., and have them take advantage of empty classrooms in the evening or at other times when the school is not in session.

The idea that education stops when an individual leaves the schools nevermore to return to the "hallowed halls of learning", has been long recognized as totally unrealistic. Everyday an individual lives, he learns. He is exposed to things he never knew. He is constantly being amazed by the changes and advances that modern technology continues to make in seemingly never-ending leaps and bounds. With the rising cost of living and higher education the Community School concept becomes more important daily because it could make the value received per dollar spent the best buy to be had anywhere. It could also help solve a decade long problem in which the teenagers have pronounced that the education they are receiving is "irrelevant". The administrator's problem has been: how do you incorporate the new experiences that are relevant into the regular school day without making it longer or closing down for a year and completely revamping the curriculum? The answer appears to be obvious, you incorporate other types of learning experiences which support and enrich the regular curriculum in a manner so as to make them "relevant".

Children do learn from adults and what better example than the Community School can be incorporated to show children that education is more than book learning, that it comes in many forms, and that it offers many opportunities for a more useful and enjoyable life at all ages.



Juneau has begun a pilot project in the attempt to help local residents realize what can be done by themselves, in co-operation with their schools, to achieve a closer knit community which will provide residents with the opportunity to do what they feel needs to be done.

The next part of this article will go into the specifics of the Juneau program.

#### SCHOOLS—OUR STANDING MONUMENTS

(By Joseph Miguel, Jr., and Sandra Samaniego)

In every city, town or village throughout the country there is at least one standing monument. These monuments were erected by the many generations of inhabitants as the citadels of learning for their children so they might receive the education necessary to lead a productive life. In many communities these schools sit idle during the evening hours when school is in session and for three months during the summer. These schools, which usually abound with the diversified sounds of learning, were nothing but costly standing monuments.

Under the guidance of William D. Overstreet, the former Superintendent, and John E. Coffee, the now acting Superintendent, the Community Schools Program in Juneau, Alaska, is blossoming and the fruits from those buds are being harvested. The standing monuments which nightly held the custodial staff preparing for the return of the students the next morning now are becoming focal points of gathering for the people of the community.

A majority of the evening classes are scheduled into the Juneau-Douglas Senior High School and Marie Drake Junior High School. This is due to the fact that the two directors cannot keep all the buildings supervised so the two centrally located ones with shop facilities were chosen to begin the program.

The classes which are now meeting were set up on the basis of local interests. If enough people were interested in a subject, an instructor was located by the directors and a facility was given to the class for their meetings. A total of twenty-six different interest areas ranging from Speed Reading to Dog Obedience are presently being offered evenings and on the weekends.

This is not to say that the evening classes are the total concept of the Community Schools, for it goes far deeper than that. The concept revolves around the idea that a facility is present and that there are many needs of the individuals of a community which go unmet. For each of those needs which goes unmet there are people living in the community who can help meet those needs. What the Community Schools try to do is bring the needs of the people and the people who can meet those needs together in an existing facility. This includes cooperating and assisting all existing agencies in every possible manner. In many instances a group will ask for something with which an agency in the community can supply them. It is then up to the Director to bring those people and the agency together in a facility.

Basically this is what the two Community Schools Directors, Joe Miguel and Terry Kelly have been attempting to do in the Juneau area. With the inception of this new program there have been many ups and downs, but the number of people becoming involved is increasing.

It was believed by the Directors that in order to get the people aroused the adult population must become involved. With this in mind the program began in July 1971 and expanded from 14 classes the first semester to 26 classes the second.

For this attendance area he will be responsible for activities for elementary students, Junior and Senior High students and adults

in the after school and evening hours. He will maintain direct and frequent contact with A Neighborhood Council which will consist of representatives of the attendance area of the Neighborhood school. This group will serve to feel the pulse of the area and advise the Director as to the kinds of activities best seen to meet the needs of young and old alike.

Additional assistance is gained through the Home School Counselors, who are indeed an integral part of the Community Schools Program. Presently, our counseling staff consists of Mary McClinton who works with the Juneau Children's Home, Sandy Samaniego who is the Elementary Home Counselor for Capital and Harborview Schools and John Martin the Home School Coordinator for Marie Drake Junior High School. These people act as a liaison between the school and the home and are in an ideal position to observe the needs of the community which might be alleviated through the Community Schools Program.

Although the activities of the Community Schools do take place after the traditional hours of the school day, who can possibly say that at 3:30 the learning process for a student ends? With each new experience a child or adult learns something new, something they can use when the occasion arises. The 6th grade child who takes an Elementary Spanish class in the after school hours will return to his classroom with a working knowledge of the language and customs of the people he is studying about in South American History. The young girl who takes a cooking for fun class will return to her classroom full of ideas when her class in Health discusses nutrition and table manners. The Junior and Senior High Student who takes a class in 2-cycle engine repair might return to an English class with a factual first hand term paper on internal combustion. The father who brings his son to a house construction class is sharing with him his dream of refurbishing his home. The list is endless, but the point is clear. The things a child learns outside of his classroom can and will enrich his school day curriculum.

With budgetary matters still in the finalizing process, it appears there will be an addition of one Director and a Secretary to the Community Schools Program in Juneau. If this addition does occur the Directors will then be able to cover three main population areas and involve those people in the areas around their Neighborhood Schools. Hopefully the Community Schools can act as the catalyst to turn the once standing monuments into bustling centers of community involvement and cooperation.

#### PLEASANT HILLS, PA., MARINE KILLED

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fightingmen, 1st Lt. David C. Bruggeman, of Pleasant Hills, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Lieutenant Bruggeman for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by inserting in the RECORD the following article:

#### PLEASANT HILLS MARINE KILLED

A Pleasant Hills Marine officer who had been in Vietnam just four months was the only American ground soldier to die in the first week of the new North Vietnamese offensive.

The victim, First Lt. David C. Bruggeman, 25, son of Mr. and Mrs. Rudolph Bruggeman of 142 Broadway, was killed last Saturday as he attempted to board an evacuation aircraft near the demilitarized zone, a Pentagon spokesman said.

Lt. Bruggeman was a graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School and Thiel College and was the only child of the Bruggemans, both of whom teach in the West Jefferson Hills School District.

The officer had been directing artillery fire from an advance base near the DMZ when he met his death, the Pentagon spokesman said. The base, he added, was assaulted by the enemy and an evacuation begun. All, he reported, made it safely inside the rescue craft except Lt. Bruggeman.

The officer was one of 10 Americans killed in combat in the war zone last week, the U.S. Command reported in Saigon, the other nine victims presumably casualties of the air offensive. Another 15 Americans were listed as missing or captured as a result of air crashes.

The total of combat deaths was the highest reported since last Oct. 21 when 21 Americans were reported killed.

#### POLK BROTHERS OF CHICAGO NAMED "RETAILER OF THE YEAR"

#### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues that one of the world's largest retailers, Polk Brothers of Chicago, located in the 11th Congressional District, has been selected as Brand Names Foundation "Retailer of the Year" in the Appliance-TV Stores—Class I category.

The 1971 award is the third one for Polk Brothers—previously this outstanding retail appliance dealership had merited the award in 1962 and in 1967. Sol Polk, distinguished president of Polk Brothers, will receive the coveted award on April 20 in New York City at the annual awards banquet of the Brand Names Foundation.

Only a week ago I had the opportunity to tour one of the facilities of Polk Brothers and spoke with Sol Polk and his brother Sam Polk. Their family-run business is a tribute to their enthusiasm, hard work, and dedicated efforts to bring the consumer low prices on high quality merchandise along with efficient and courteous service.

Starting from scratch more than 37 years ago, Polk Brothers has grown into a business that annually grosses better than an estimated \$100 million annually. The esprit de corps of the employees—and I personally talked with hundreds of them last week—as well as one of the best-run and best-managed retail establishments I have ever seen—are both important factors contributing to the great success of Polk Brothers.

The Horatio Alger success story of Polk

Brothers is one of which all Americans can be proud for it symbolizes the innumerable opportunities for achievement available to all of us and it proves once again that individuals with initiative, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and a willingness to work hard can and do achieve tremendous successes.

I congratulate the Polk family on once again meriting the "Retailer of the Year" award and extend my best wishes for their continuing success in serving the retail merchandise needs of our community and our country.

An article about the Polk Brothers which appeared in the March 29 edition of the Belmont Central Leader, one of the excellent community newspapers serving the Northwest Side of Chicago, follows:

#### POLK BROS. WINS THIRD BRAND NAMES AWARD

Polk Brothers has been judged Brand Names Foundation Retailer-of-the-Year in the Appliance-TV Stores, in Class I category.

Sponsored by the General Electric company, the Polk Brothers' entry won the coveted award for "good retail citizenship, consumer protection, and outstanding merchandising in 1971," according to H. Ford Perine, Brand Names foundation president. Perine noted that 1971 was the 36th year Polk Brothers had exclusively merchandised brand name products.

The giant retail appliance dealership was started in 1935 when the 18-year-old Sol Polk rented a store on Chicago's northwest side. The fledgling store's growth was spurred by his practice of loading his car with merchandise at closing time and spending the evenings selling house-to-house.

The award will be presented to Sol Polk, President, at the foundation's annual awards banquet April 20, climaxing a two-day gathering of manufacturers, retailers, and advertising agency and media executives at New York's Americana Hotel. The April 19-20 meeting will feature a "Great Ideas" theme, and promises "an unprecedented exchange of ideas among our membership," according to Perine.

The Brand Names foundation was formed in 1943 to maintain and strengthen brand competition. It is presently concentrating its efforts in two priority areas: "Professionalism in Retailing," which includes the "redefined and redeveloped" ROY competition; and its related "Constructive Consumerism" activities which include the current leadership advertising campaigns to "Shop in a Circle of Confidence" and "Advertise Advertising."

Polk Bros. have won the award three times now, in 1962, 1967 and 1971.

#### LOUISVILLE GI DIES IN VIETNAM; RITES THURSDAY

#### HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, recently, David Shelton of our Fourth District died in Vietnam. He was only 19 years old and had been in Vietnam only about 2 weeks. The tragic circumstances of his death points out once again to all of us the hazards and sacrifices that our military boys must face when entering our Nation's service.

I wish to extend my sincere condolences, and the prayers of all of us, to

David's parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Shelton, Jr., and to the entire family for the loss of this fine young man.

Below is the article from the April 7 Louisville Times reporting Private Shelton's death.

The article follows:

#### LOUISVILLE GI DIES IN VIETNAM; RITES THURSDAY

A 19-year-old Louisville soldier died Wednesday in South Vietnam, less than two weeks after arriving, the Defense Department has announced.

Army Pfc. David P. Shelton, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Shelton Jr., of 6311 Oak Valley Drive, died as a result of nonhostile action, but details were not available.

Shelton, a 1971 graduate of Jeffersonstown (Ky.) Vocational School, had been in the Army since last September.

Shelton is survived by his parents; a sister, Miss Susan Shelton; a brother, A. C. Shelton III, and his grandmothers, Mrs. Jessie Mudd and Mrs. Mary Shelton.

The funeral will be at 11 a.m. Thursday at Owen Funeral Home, 5317 Dixie Highway, with burial in Resthaven Memorial Park. The body will be at the funeral home after 7 p.m. today.

#### NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

#### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD the April 10 edition of the Bicentennial Bulletin. I take this action in an effort to help keep my colleagues informed of bicentennial activities. The bulletin is compiled and written by the communications staff of the Commission. The bulletin follows:

#### BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN OF APRIL 10, 1972

Forty-six prominent Americans from the fields of travel and hospitality, creative and visual arts, and the performing arts have been named to important ARBC advisory panels. The three panels will develop programs and recommend policy procedures to the ARBC Open House USA Committee chaired by George E. Lang. Among the first projects the Performing Artists and Allied Experts Panel and the Creative and Visual Arts Panel will be that of undertaking a review of the cultural resources which could be made available for the Bicentennial. They will meet initially on April 10 and April 11, respectively. Members of the Invitation to the World Panel will assist the Commission in its efforts to encourage and facilitate travel and hospitality and will hold their first meeting on April 17.

On March 30, Florida Governor Reubin Askew signed important legislation for financing Interama—a step toward a Bicentennial opening. The new law allows the Interama Authority to issue \$12 million in revenue bonds which could be used for payment of ad valorem property taxes in Dade County in the event of default on the bonds. It also permits any agency of the State to enter into finalizing agreements with the Authority and clarifies certain terms and status of the City of North Miami bonds.

The Memphis (Tenn.) Jaycees are buying and donating to schools portfolios entitled "The Forty Documents of Our American Heritage" in conjunction with the Bicen-

tennial. The portfolios were compiled and photographed from the 250 original documents included on the Freedom Train of the American Heritage Foundation. As a public service forty negatives of these original documents were preserved and are now being distributed as a public service to schools who no longer have the finances for supplemental publications.

Ralph J. Menconi, the designer of the Bicentennial Medal that will be produced by the U.S. Mint, was recently selected by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., to receive its George Washington Honor Medal Award for 1971. The annual prize is granted for an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of America and Americans. He was honored for his "historic medal creations."

Preliminary plans to establish a Lenape Village for the Bicentennial celebration at Washington Crossing, Pa., are being formulated by Lenape Land, an American Indian organization. Mrs. William Bradley, chairman of the group told the Bucks County Bicentennial Committee that a village and interpretation center would be established. The organization has been studying Indian life in Delaware Valley in colonial days.

Rep. Richard C. White (Tex.) has introduced legislation calling for the minting of a special U.S. coin to commemorate the nation's Bicentennial year. The bill calls for the coinage of 50-cent or one-dollar pieces for general circulation. The metal coins would bear a design chosen by the Treasury Secretary to commemorate the nation's 200th birthday. The White bill does not prohibit a standard blend of metals. A Hearing on the bill has not yet been scheduled by the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee which must debate the bill.

An "America's 200th Anniversary Clock," designed and built by Harold W. Lanzer, Holgate, Ohio, cabinetmaker, has been placed on exhibit at the Ohio Historical Center in Columbus. The clock was built to symbolize the Bicentennial for Ohioans and visitors.

As part of youth involvement for the Bicentennial, the Williamsburg (Va.) Gazette ran a recent article detailing state involvement. It reported that members of the Junior Bicentennial Commission in Charlottesville are spending part of each Sunday tidying up Revolutionary War graveyards, and have a painting program set for Spring.

The Marine Digest Weekly has endorsed a proposal offered by Peter Stanford, president of the National Maritime Historical Society of New York, to make the last existing American built square rigger, the *Kaialani*, a U.S. Bicentennial Project. The ship, currently in poor shape, has been languishing in the waters of Subic Bay, Philippine Islands, troubled by lack of funds to get her back to the states for restoration. Mr. Stanford is asking for all maritime-minded folk to join in the effort of saving the *Kaialani* and make the project a Bi-centennial event.

Dr. Robert Cecile, who was elected Chairman of the Ohio American Revolution Bicentennial Advisory Commission at its organization meeting, reports that the Commission has formed three committees, one each for celebrations, exhibitions, and scholarship-education. Plans are being formulated for a symbol, a motto or theme, and a broad, state-based program which encourages county, municipal, organizational and individual activities and contributions in 1976.

"A Call to Action," ARBC's official film, the story of our Nation's Bicentennial celebration in a fourteen minute film is 16 mm in sound and color and is suitable for all age groups. "A Call to Action" may be obtained on a loan basis free of charge. Write: Office of Communications, ARBC, 736 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20276.

The Iowa American Revolution Bicentennial Commission held an "Iowa Tea Party" program for its meeting in Des Moines on



March 27th. Robert Dillon, Chairman of the IARBC, addressed over 200 volunteers representing all 99 counties in the state and urged them to ride home in true Paul Revere style and issue a "Call to Arms" to every citizen in every village and farm. Del Black, Chicago Regional Coordinator, represented the ARBC at the session.

Actor Glenn Ford presented a television special saluting America's 200th Anniversary on April 4th. The CBS special, narrated by Ford featured Lou Rawls, Connie Stevens and Bill Medley singing songs about America against backdrops of Philadelphia, Concord, Sun Valley and the Mississippi River.

## THE TRAINED PROFESSIONAL

### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a most interesting article in the April 1972 Reader's Digest by Jack Valenti. I was so impressed with the advice and counsel offered, particularly to our young people, on being truly professional in a chosen field of endeavor that I wish to share it with my colleagues today.

The article follows:

THE TRAINED PROFESSIONAL: A  
VANISHING AMERICAN?  
(By Jack Valenti)

One evening last spring, after a question-and-answer period with college students interested in motion-picture work, a 21-year-old film major told me of his intense desire to direct a feature movie. He then angrily denounced the Hollywood "establishment" for shutting him out.

What, I asked, was his experience in film making? He had shot a ten-minute, 8-mm. documentary about his college basketball team. Did he have a script prepared and ready to shoot for someone in Hollywood? No, but he had seen a lot of movies, and had some ideas about what he wanted to film. He didn't believe in scripts; he believed in improvising as he moved along. Nobody, he said sourly, would give him a chance to produce the movie he knew he was capable of creating.

That fragment of conversation was a duplicate, in many ways, of other campus conversations I have had. A widely prevalent notion today seems to demand instant achievement of goals, without any of the wearying, frustrating preparation that is indispensable to any task. As the exemplar of a way of life, the professional—that man or woman who invests every new task or duty, no matter how small, with discipline of mind and spirit—is a vanishing American, particularly among those who too often believe that dreams come true because they ought to and not because they are caused to materialize.

My wife sat next to the late Dean Acheson one night at dinner, several years after he had left political life to rejoin his law firm. "Tell me, Mr. Secretary," she said to him, "how did you adjust to becoming a private citizen after having for so long been at the height of political power?"

He smiled. "Well, it wasn't easy at first, but I finally adjusted because I determined I would do the very best a man could do in every job I took on. If I were working on a brief, I wanted it to be the best brief that could be prepared. In short, I was a professional. There is no better way for a man to find fulfillment, no matter what he does."

A good many years ago, I attended a golf clinic given by the late Babe Didrikson Zaharias, the legendary woman athlete. "How

can I learn to hit a golf ball the way you do?" I asked her.

"Simple," she said, laughing. "First you hit a thousand golf balls. You hit them until your hands bleed and you can't hit any more. The next day you start all over again, and the next day and the next. And, maybe a year later, you might be ready to go 18 holes. After that you play every day until the time finally arrives when you know what you are doing when you hit the ball."

Many ideas expressed by college youths are worthy of support. But so many proponents demand that their views be adopted now! They wander into the political arena and expect instant fulfillment; then anger and frustration sour their spirit when what they declare to be right is ignored. The plain fact is that too many of them are not prepared.

To their vision of altering the political landscape they bring lovely but fragile tools—passionate enthusiasm, idealism, dazzling rhetoric, even brilliant concepts. But they are turned off by the tedious homework of political life—the interminable task of learning how to teach, inspire and convert opposing forces into allies. The horrifying truth becomes clear: there is no shortcut, no magic carpet that sweeps them swiftly from desire to achievement.

Let me sit in a discussion where decisions are to be made and I can quickly and accurately point out the professionals. They know the issues, have untangled the crossing threads of logic and reaction, understand the facts cold, and can, because they have done the necessary homework, come up with suggestions that may lack passionate intensity but usually make the most sense.

I know this marks me as an old-fashioned drudge, but I would count the foremost asset of a respected man to be that discipline of self which instructs him in the knowledge of his craft. This means a dedication and a work schedule that sometimes can be rather dismaying. Still, there is no other way to acquire that standard of excellence which is the mark of the professional and the major specification for achievement.

## FLUSHING AIRPORT

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have long fought to close Flushing Airport in my district because I am firmly convinced it is a safety hazard. Situated only 2 miles from LaGuardia Airport, it is in the midst of what may be the world's most heavily traveled aviation crossroads.

The city of New York, in apparent disregard for the wishes and welfare of its citizens, especially those who live near this airport, plans to spend in excess of \$11 million of public funds to improve and expand this dangerous facility, making it an even greater threat to public safety.

Joining me in opposing this folly is highly respected Greater Whitestone Taxpayers Association. This group represents 40,000 homeowners who live near Flushing Airport. Because what they have to say is so important, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point their letter to me and one to Mrs. Janet Langsam, chairman of Community Planning Board No. 7, of the city of New York, which must make a recommendation on contin-

uation of the Flushing Airport expansion program.

The letter follows:

GREATER WHITESTONE  
TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION,  
Whitestone, N.Y. March 31, 1972.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,  
Congress of the United States, House of  
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROSENTHAL: At the March 27 Meeting of our Association, the principal topic discussed was the modernization of Flushing Airport located in the College Point Industrial Park. We had as our guest speaker Mr. Nat Kramer of Community Planning Board No. 7, representing our community, who presented the facts to the membership.

As outlined in the attached copy of letter to Mrs. Langsam, Community Planning Board No. 7 Chairman, the membership unanimously voted against the modernization of the Airport and for its removal from Northern Queens. The reasons for the decision were, as stated in the attached copy of letter, that increased activity at Flushing Airport would create a safety hazard because of its proximity to LaGuardia and would also result in an intolerable amount of noise and air pollution.

It is inequitable for the City to expect that the residents of Northern Queens must bear the hardship of two airports located in their community within a radius of five miles from each other. We heartily endorse your stand to move the Airport to another area of the City.

We have written personally to Mayor Lindsay and Borough President Manes informing them of our Association's stand on the Airport and asking them to give very careful consideration to our strong position to remove it from our community. We have not reached our decision haphazardly but have given the matter diligent thought and research.

The residents of Whitestone look forward to your continued support against the present site of Flushing Airport and its modernization. We will need all the help we can get to persuade the City Flushing Airport should be moved to a more suitable location.

With sincere appreciation for all your past assistance,

Sincerely yours,  
JOSEPH M. ROTA, President.

GREATER WHITESTONE  
TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION,  
Whitestone, N.Y., March 30, 1972.

Mrs. JANET LANGSAM,  
Chairman, Community Planning Board No.  
7, Kew Gardens, N.Y.

DEAR MRS. LANGSAM: We were happy to have Mr. Nat Kramer of Community Planning Board No. 7 as a guest speaker at our Association's meeting Monday evening, March 27, 1972. As you probably know, we devoted almost the entire meeting to the subject of the proposed modernization of Flushing Airport. Mr. Kramer did a fine job of presenting the pros and cons of upgrading and modernizing the Airport for general aviation. We feel he presented the facts to us to the best of knowledge.

After many pertinent questions relative to the modernization of Flushing Airport were asked by the membership, followed by discussion, a motion was made by one of our members to close and move Flushing Airport from its present site to an area where there is no other major airport nearby. The motion was seconded by another member and a vote taken. By a unanimous show of hands, approximately 200 members present elected to take the stand that this Association, representing 40,000 homeowners in Whitestone, does not want the Flushing Airport modernized but instead closed permanently and removed from Northern Queens. It was also de-

cided by majority vote that a replacement for the site could be discussed at another time. The most important factor to resolve at this time is the fate of Flushing Airport.

The reasons given by the members for the stand taken were that the presence of a modernized Flushing Airport accommodating a larger number of flights would be a serious safety hazard for the community due to its proximity to LaGuardia Airport. In addition, expanded service with heavier aircraft from Flushing Airport, coupled with the already huge number of flights from LaGuardia, would create an intolerable amount of noise and air pollution.

Please accept this letter as written confirmation that this Association, by unanimous approval, opposes the modernization of Flushing Airport and favors its removal from its present location.

The membership of this Association thanks you and your staff for the help and cooperation you have given us in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. ROTA, President.

#### VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK CITY CALLS FOR ENACTMENT OF RANGEL'S HYPODERMIC NEEDLE AND SYRINGE CONTROL ACT

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the easy availability of hypodermic needles and syringes—and thus their diversion into illegal channels—is a contributing factor to the spread of drug addiction in the United States. Those who experiment with heroin know that the needle which plays an integral role in drug abuse can be obtained at little expense with little difficulty, through the mails or, in some States, at the local pharmacy without a prescription.

In fact, a member of my staff was recently in Colorado where he was able to purchase hypodermic needles and syringes at drug stores without any questions being asked. Those needles and syringes cost him only 14 cents each, and although they were manufactured for use by diabetics, they are on sale in Colorado to anyone for less than the cost of a cup of coffee. Colorado is not alone, however. Other States have failed to crack down in this important area of drug abuse.

That is why I am pleased to commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the resolution passed by the executive board of the Veterinary Medical Association of New York City backing legislation which would permit the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce in hypodermic needles and syringes. The resolution states:

Because of the overwhelming nature of the national drug problem, and because of our concern with this problem as citizens and as humanitarians, be it resolved that the Veterinary Medical Association of New York, Inc., is in complete support of bill H.R. 12935 presented by Congressman RANGEL.

Those who are involved in the medical professions have expressed their concern over the tragic effects and ramifications of drug abuse. They have pledged them-

selves to the fight for strong congressional action on all fronts in the war against narcotics. Our recent establishment of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and our empowering the President to cut off foreign economic and military aid to those nations which refuse to cooperate in our attack against drugs are important steps. But we cannot stop now. Addiction is still spreading. Drug-related crime is on the rise. The pain and agony of heroin have reached every corner of this Nation. We must not fail to deal with the urgent problem of heroin paraphernalia. Congress must recognize that failure to act will guarantee the continuation of drug abuse.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to heed the words of the Veterinary Medical Association of New York City.

#### PITTSBURGH GETS HUD HOUSING ALLOWANCE PROGRAM

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Pittsburgh has been selected as the site for a unique and important housing experiment, called the "housing allowance" program.

Negotiations will begin shortly between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the city to work out the details.

What the experiment proposes is to make direct cash grants to approximately 1,000 low-income families for use in purchasing housing of their choice.

In the past, HUD subsidies were tied to specific houses or buildings. If a family left that house or apartment, it lost the assistance.

The new program will make the allowance directly to the family and the allowance will stay with the family throughout, no matter if the family moves from place to place or from house to apartment or vice versa.

The amount of the subsidy will be worked out among the federal and city officials as well as the form the allowance will take. It will be tied to the standard price for decent housing in Pittsburgh. Methods of choosing the families and methods of evaluating the experiment will be conducted by a consortium of researchers headed by Stanford University.

The housing allowance experiment will run for 2 years. In that time, the HUD analysts will gauge the type of housing secured by the families receiving subsidies and their migration patterns. Although only families from the city of Pittsburgh will be chosen to participate, once receiving their subsidies, the families are free to move anywhere in Allegheny County.

Pittsburgh was chosen from many cities throughout the United States for this experiment for a number of reasons: Its population of over 500,000 people; its high housing vacancy rate; the large

supply of livable houses in the area; its ethnic and racial makeup; and above all the tremendous interest shown by local officials and residents in securing the program for our area.

I am proud that through the efforts of myself and others, Pittsburgh has been chosen.

#### WEEKLY REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the first of a series of my weekly reports on "Crime in America."

#### WASHINGTON REPORT OF CRIME IN AMERICA

(EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the first of three weekly reports on crime and criminal justice in the United States.)

In a very real sense, all Americans are victims of crime. Statistics from the FBI show that an increasing number become victims of some form of crime each year. All of us must bear the cost of crime, estimated to be in excess of \$30 billion annually, in higher insurance rates, higher prices for goods and services, and in increased taxes to support the police, the courts, and the prisons.

There is an even more insidious cost—the fear of crime. The quality of life is seriously eroded when the fear of crime keeps Americans behind locked doors, away from downtown, and shut off from friends and neighbors after dark.

During the last decade (1960-1970), crime has increased 14 times faster than our population—176 percent as compared to a 13 percent population growth. Crime has spared no geographic region or level of society. In those 10 years, crime also has crept into the traditionally "peaceful" rural areas, showing in 1970 alone a 15 percent increase.

A partial count of the questionnaire which I sent to residents of the Ninth District shows that respondents think that crime is the most serious of our national problems. 40 percent indicated that they are personally afraid of crime in their areas. Concern about crime is also reflected in an increasing number of conversations and letters from Ninth District residents.

While the public's growing discontent and insistence upon action is often directed at the Federal government, the Federal government has surprisingly little direct control over crime in the streets. The Federal role is to give the strongest possible support to state and local police, courts, and prisons, which have the responsibility for curtailing crimes against life and property, the ones people fear most.

The system of criminal justice is comprised of (1) the police, the front line against crime, (2) the courts, which are struggling under increasing caseloads, and (3) the jails and prisons, most of them antiquated. The system has been the victim of neglect at all levels, and its shortcomings have become more pronounced under the pressure of increasing crime rates. While it may be smart politics to call for a "get tough" attitude, or demand "law and order," rhetoric simply will not stem the tide. In fact, any approach which only reinforces the present system with its weaknesses and shortcomings, is no longer feasible. We must look to reforms which:

Update, simplify, and standardize criminal codes across the country to conform to existing attitudes and customs.



Bring modern management and technology, such as data processing, into the judicial system.

Recognize and deal socially with such "non-victim" crimes as alcoholism and drug addiction which now clog court dockets.

Revamp our penal systems, which are little more than schools for crime, and not for rehabilitation.

Intensify the attack on drug problems, with more emphasis on destroying the economic attractiveness of the illegal drug trade.

Develop more and newer methods of dealing with young offenders before they become involved in serious crimes.

Provide continuing training for policemen, and recognition of competency with higher salary levels.

But even these reforms will be insufficient to reverse the crime rate if the causes of crime are not dealt with. Mark on any map of a large city where there are slums, poor schools, high unemployment, poverty, bad housing, and a high incidence of sickness and mental illness, and you will also mark the area where crime flourishes (as former Attorney-General Ramsey Clark pointed out.) Any effective effort to control crime must eliminate the conditions which breed crime.

Until an enlightened public insists on structural changes in the criminal justice system and improves efforts to eliminate the conditions which breed crime, the war against crime will continue to be an ever growing and ever costly effort to catch and contain criminals and, in the long run, it will not be enough to win the war.

#### CAN THE UNITED STATES DISARM WITHOUT SURRENDERING?

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today's passage of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act Amendments of 1972 by a vote of 349 to 20 is called into question by the evident relationship between Soviet Russia—with whom this country is conducting the SALT talks—and the North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi.

Recent news articles indicate that "the most high-powered Soviet military delegation ever to visit Hanoi" helped the North Vietnamese prepare for the present offensive, an offensive that later news articles reveal is "an attempt to achieve a total Communist victory in South Vietnam." In fact, Mr. Speaker, the headlines to this later article read, "Hanoi's Goal: Total Victory." This means defeat of the United States in Southeast Asia.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our Government has forbidden our military leaders and diplomats even to consider victory as an alternative in Vietnam.

A more recent news account appearing in today's paper emphasizes the relationship between the Governments of Soviet Russia and North Vietnam. The article points out quite clearly:

Hanoi's change from guerrilla to conventional warfare, with reliance on tanks and missiles, could not be sustained without massive Soviet aid.

This information translates into this statement of fact: The goal of Soviet Russia is, as it has always been, total,

absolute victory for communism in Southeast Asia; yet knowing this—and the facts are evident from recent news articles—this House has today passed a bill to extend the authorization for appropriations and to increase the funding \$4.5 million more than was authorized for fiscal years 1971 and 1972 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that this House has today authorized and increased funding for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to attempt to accomplish what is patently impossible without total and complete Communist domination over the world.

I ask that related news articles detailing the relationship between the Soviet Union and the North Vietnamese Governments, especially as it applies to the present Communist offensive in Vietnam, be included in the Record at this point.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1972]

#### HANOI'S GOAL: TOTAL VICTORY

(By Henry S. Bradsher)

SAIGON.—The leaders of North Vietnam have disclosed a decision "to mobilize all our forces" to try to achieve a total Communist victory in South Vietnam.

The decision apparently was the basis for the present all-out Communist offensive against the south.

So long as the United States "maintains, in whatever form," an American-backed government "in the southern part of our country, our people will have to fight on," the major policy statement said.

"On the path to total victory, there will still be many trials," Hanoi warned.

But the statement expressed determination to keep victory in the south as the main priority of North Vietnam.

The decision was taken "recently"—no date was given—at the 20th meeting of the North Vietnamese Communist party's Central Committee, which lays down basic policy for the country.

A resolution on the meeting's decision to step up the war effort was broadcast last night in Hanoi radio's home service.

Disclosure of the decision followed the capture in South Vietnam of Communist documents which outline a new war strategy.

It calls for the use of regular North Vietnamese army (NVA) units to tie down the army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN). Then Communist guerrillas are to begin attacking provincial defenses, and "spontaneous uprisings" are supposed to break the Saigon government's grip on the cities.

The NVA offensive has tied down most ARVN units already, even sucking reserve forces out of Saigon and other rear-area cities. Guerrilla attacks have been limited so far, and the Communist underground in cities has not yet risen up.

ARVN has been doing pretty well against NVA frontal assaults. It is holding in the north and counterattacking above Saigon.

But the Communist strategy means a possible threat to the rear, if it is carried out.

#### REFLECTS MAJOR DECISION

The Hanoi broadcast confirmed the deductions of observers of North Vietnamese affairs that a major policy decision had been taken before the Communist offensive was launched 13 days ago.

Observers think a policy shift began in Hanoi late last summer.

The Central Committee meeting apparently was held at the end of December or in January. The new policy which it adopted was kept secret until the offensive was underway, apparently for tactical reasons.

The change is from giving first priority to building North Vietnam's economy and let-

ting the war in South Vietnam be continued by small NVA units and guerrillas to hurling NVA main-force units into conventional warfare with ARVN while making economic construction in the north wait.

Now with complete confidence that no one is going to invade North Vietnam, Hanoi has completely denuded the country of organized combat divisions in order to press the offensive against the south with every soldier it can muster.

The North Vietnamese government insists officially that it is "People's Liberation Armed Forces" of southerners mounting the current offensive.

This is contrary to all the battlefield evidence. And the party resolution said bluntly that "our army and people . . . valiantly march forward."

#### "AN IMPERATIVE TASK . . ."

The resolution said the Central Committee meeting stressed that "an imperative task for our entire party is to mobilize—with the spirit of persevering in and advancing the anti-U.S. national salvation resistance toward total victory—all our forces, make outstanding efforts, courageously advance and, in close solidarity and co-ordination with the fraternal Lao and Khmer (Cambodian) armed forces and peoples, foil the Vietnamization policy and the Nixon doctrine in Indochina."

North Vietnam, it said, has "endeavored to provide adequate and timely support and assistance in human and material resources for the frontline."

The resolution repeated the communist demands that the United States destiny President Nguyen Van Thieu's government in Saigon as American forces disengage from Vietnam.

The United States must withdraw, it said, and "actually respect the South Vietnamese people's right of self-determination, stop supporting the puppet administration, and suppress its oppressive and coercive machinery in order to pave the way for the formation of a broad administration of national concord that will have the duty to organize a really true and democratic general election in the south."

Previous Communist statements have made it clear that Communist and pro-Communist elements must dominate Hanoi's idea of a "national concord" administration, and thus control the kind of elections which are to be held.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1972]

#### A LOOK AHEAD: LAIRD SAYS WAR IS FAR FROM OVER

(By Orr Kelly)

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird sees no quick end in sight to the Vietnam war.

In an interview yesterday, Laird predicted that the current North Vietnamese offensive would be defeated by the South Vietnamese after weeks of hard fighting. He also emphasized that the U.S. troop withdrawal would continue.

But when asked if he thought the current fighting might be followed by negotiations for an end to the war, he replied:

"Do I think a war that has gone on for 30 years is going to end? The answer is no."

Laird indicated that he recognized the dangers in sending B-52 bombers into high-risk areas of North Vietnam in an effort to blunt the enemy's current offensive. The big bombers struck near the city of Vinh, 150 miles north of the border, yesterday.

This was an apparent change from a policy followed since 1965, when the bombers were first used in Vietnam, of keeping the aircraft out of areas where there was a serious danger they might be shot down.

His concern, Laird said, is for the crew members rather than for the safety of the planes.

Laird was interviewed aboard an Air Force plane en route back to Washington from Norfolk, where he spoke at a ceremony celebrating the 20th anniversary of the founding of the headquarters there of the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, who is responsible for NATO forces in the Atlantic.

The current bombing campaign against the north, Laird insisted, is not an effort, as some critics have charged, to seek a military victory in the war.

"That is not the policy of this administration," he said. "Our policy is to get U.S. troops out of the war."

#### CRITICAL OF COVERAGE

Laird was sharply critical of some news accounts of fighting in Vietnam—and apparently concerned about the impact of news reports both in this country and in Vietnam.

"It makes it sound like those North Vietnamese are 10 feet tall," he said. "The South Vietnamese are doing very well. They have some hard fighting ahead, but I think they are going to succeed. I just hope they don't read about themselves before they've had a chance."

In virtually writing off the possibility of negotiations with the North Vietnamese, Laird indicated he still hoped for fruitful negotiations with the Soviet Union.

But both in his speech and in the subsequent interview, Laird called attention to President Nixon's remarks yesterday at a State Department ceremony for the signing of a convention against biological warfare.

The President, in an apparent reference to the Soviet-furnished equipment being used by the North Vietnamese, said a great power "should not encourage directly or indirectly other nations" to attack their neighbors.

In Cambridge, Mass., an anti-war group attempting to monitor the U.S. military buildup in Indochina claimed that between 8 and 30 warships, hundreds of planes and thousands of men are on their way to participate in or support stepped-up U.S. air and naval actions.

#### SAYS NINE SAILED

At least nine warships sailed from California yesterday, and the Cambridge group said it has confirmed that two carriers, a cruiser and five destroyers are en route to join U.S. 7th Fleet ships already operating off North and South Vietnam, the Associated Press reported.

The group—the Ad Hoc Military Buildup Committee—reported a number of vessels have left port with unconfirmed destinations. They include the carrier Saratoga, 8 destroyers and 12 destroyer escorts, two cruisers and three destroyers are on alert, the committee said. The attack carrier Midway also apparently was headed for Southeast Asia, United Press International reported.

At least 244 Air Force planes, including more than 100 fighter-bombers, have been flown to the war zone or nearby supply areas, the committee said.

Earlier, Laird had told a Pentagon group that additional air and naval units would be sent to Vietnam to meet the current crisis created by the Communist offensive.

"They are the additional needed insurance showing the determination of the United States as this massive violation has been undertaken by the enemy," Laird said.

Nixon met yesterday with U.S. Ambassador William J. Porter, chief U.S. negotiator to the Paris Peace Talks. A White House spokesman declined to reveal the substance of the session but said that Porter would return to Paris tomorrow.

Administration officials denied reports that Porter's trip and the timing of his return indicated that the talks would be resumed this week.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 12, 1972]

#### MOSCOW VIET DEAL DEBATED

(By Victor Zorza)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's call to the Kremlin to desist from helping Hanoi is the first public sign of a debate at the highest levels of the administration. Can Moscow now use its influence to push Hanoi into ending the war—and if so, can the United States push Moscow to push Hanoi?

In the administration debate, Dr. Henry Kissinger, the President's foreign affairs adviser, and Melvin Laird, Defense Secretary, are ranged on one side, and Peter Flanigan, the President's economic adviser, and the State Department are on the other side.

The issue, which was often debated in previous administrations, is now seen in an altogether new light. Hanoi's change from guerrilla to conventional warfare, with reliance on tanks and missiles, could not be sustained without massive Soviet aid.

#### QUESTION OF CREDITS

One of the main issues for next month's Moscow summit was a massive trade deal in which Soviet purchases of American goods would be financed by United States credits. The question which has now been raised is whether the United States should provide credits which could, however indirectly, be used by the Soviet Union to finance its own supplies to Vietnam.

Laird has urged Mr. Nixon to use Russia's desperate need for high technology, as well as for grain and other goods, in a Vietnam war trade-off at the summit. Publicly, he has said that the Kremlin supplies 80 percent of the war equipment used by Hanoi, and that the Soviet Union "is therefore a major contributor to the continuous conflict."

He believes that the prospects for peace rest "to a major degree with the Soviet Union." He wants the Kremlin to ensure that the arms it gives to Hanoi will not be used in the south, just as the United States would continue to ensure that Saigon would not use American-supplied arms against the north. But the Soviet Union, he complains, has so far placed no restraints on the use of its weapons outside North Vietnam.

#### AREA FOR NEGOTIATION

This, then, is the basis of the deal to be made in Moscow. Hanoi demands the ending of American aid to the Thieu regime as its price for ending the war. But, as Mr. Laird said in an interview with Michael Getler of the Washington Post, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States could abruptly shut off their aid program. He therefore believes that this "must be negotiated between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and I hope the whole area will be discussed at the May summit meetings."

Dr. Kissinger has long favored the idea of "linkage" between the trade and the political deals which were being readied for the Moscow summit. But Maurice H. Stans, now the GOP's chief fund-raiser for the election campaign, came back from Moscow last November, when he was Secretary of Commerce, with the firm belief that the trade deals ought to go ahead regardless.

#### "DICTATION" OPPOSED

Instead of making them depend on political progress, he believes that they would serve to improve the political atmosphere, which would ultimately make greater progress possible. His stand was shared in the White House by Peter Peterson, who was then the President's economic adviser, and has since succeeded Stans as Secretary of Commerce.

But Peterson's views were inherited in the White House, and continue to be supported, by Peter Flanigan. The State Department,

too, tends to accept the Kremlin's warnings, which have been emphatically publicized in the Moscow press, that the Soviet Union will reject the "dictation" implicit in the idea of linkage.

Hanoi is aware of what is going on. It has argued publicly that the big powers, obviously including Russia, want to settle "the fate of the smaller countries by economic pressure," and it rejected this "obsolete doctrine."

Its Foreign Minister, Nguyen Duy Trinh, has now brought it out into the open by saying that the "perfidious" Nixon is trying to limit Soviet aid to North Vietnam. And Mr. Nixon himself has indicated his growing support for the Laird-Kissinger line by warning the Kremlin against encouraging Hanoi, "directly or indirectly."

[From the Baltimore-News American, January 14, 1972]

#### RUSS WARN ON BOMBING

(By John P. Wallach)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Union used the hotline to warn President Nixon that resumption of bombing of North Vietnam this spring could seriously jeopardize U.S. plans for a Moscow summit meeting in May, Soviet informants disclosed today.

The Russians sources revealed that the call came directly from Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin and was made at the height of the recent five-day-round-the-clock intensification of U.S. air strikes that ended Dec. 30.

A report published in the London Observer last week said that Kosygin had urged Nixon to halt the bombing, the biggest U.S. aerial attack since the bombing halt in November, 1968. A White House spokesman termed that account "inaccurate" but would neither confirm nor deny it.

Questioned about the new report, State Department spokesman Charles Bray today also refused comment. Other U.S. officials speculated that Moscow was deliberately "leaking" the information to win "brownie points" with Hanoi before President Nixon's upcoming trip to Communist China.

Other sources suggested that the Russian warning may be Moscow's answer to the "leaked" warning by the White House during the India-Pakistan war that Nixon might call off his plans to go to Moscow if Russia encouraged the Indian army to invade West Pakistan.

The source of the U.S. warning was later identified as Dr. Henry Kissinger, national security adviser to the President.

There have recently been a number of public Soviet charges that the United States is colluding with China to betray North Vietnam—specifically that Nixon plans to make a deal in Peking undercutting Communist influence in Indochina.

Thus, some U.S. analysts see the "leaking" of such reports as aimed at depicting Moscow as Hanoi's only true friend among the Communist giants.

According to the Soviet informants, Kosygin also told Nixon that Moscow was stepping up its military aid to North Vietnam. A new Soviet-North Vietnamese aid agreement was signed in Moscow during the five-day bombing campaign providing for an undisclosed increase in Russian military and economic aid.

Western estimates put the current Soviet aid to Hanoi at over \$1 billion a year.

The hotline between Washington and Moscow, which went into operation on Aug. 30, 1963, has been used only once before, during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, according to Pentagon officials. Practice transmissions, however, are sent every hour.

U.S. analysts said that the "leaking" of



the story about the hotline may also have been aimed at China. Both Moscow and Peking publicly condemned the five-day bombing campaign against North Vietnam. But propaganda statements by the rival powers appeared to be directed more at each other than at the United States.

The Soviets are said to believe that Nixon would not have taken the risk of bombing North Vietnam without prior Chinese assurance that his scheduled visit to Peking would go through as planned.

Thus, the Soviet Union may fear a repetition of such bombings before the China trip, and may have felt the need to warn the United States of possible consequences.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1972]

THIEU SAYS SOVIET URGED A DRIVE BY HANOI  
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, Feb. 23.—President Nguyen Van Thieu asserted in an interview today that the Soviet Union had urged North Vietnam to open a military offensive here to block any efforts by the United States and China to end the Vietnam war during President Nixon's Peking talks. However, he said, South Vietnamese Army attacks and United States bombing kept the threat from materializing.

Mr. Thieu said he believed that the Russians were worried that Washington and Peking might find "a basic agreement to restore peace in Indochina" and were determined to prove that the key to any solution lay in Moscow, not Peking.

Ruling out any invasion of North Vietnam should the conflict continue, Mr. Thieu expressed willingness to join with that country and eight other Southeast Asian states in a kind of neutral bloc that would renounce foreign bases or alliances.

#### SEEMINGLY AT EASE

Speaking English and seemingly at ease, he brushed aside as untrue or exaggerated reports of differences between him and Secretary of State William P. Rogers concerning his "flexibility" on the terms for a peace settlement.

Of the enemy forces the President said: "Nothing came of the so-called offensive they were supposed to be mounting here during President Nixon's visit to Peking. I imagine they will try an all-out offensive later on to exploit political differences in the United States and to press Nixon to yield more in negotiations."

He said there was no doubt that the Communists had hoped to mount a major operation to coincide with the China trip. "They introduced a whole division into South Vietnam west of the Kontum-Peking area," he said.

"They also initiated small guerrilla attacks around the country," he added. "However, the main threat west of Kontum-Pleiku was set back by South Vietnamese ground attacks and U.S. bombing."

#### LIMITED OFFENSIVE FORESEEN

Mr. Thieu predicted another limited offensive at the time of Mr. Nixon's Moscow trip in May to demonstrate how strong the Communist position is in the Indochina war. He also forecast a strong offensive in the late summer, seeking to influence the American electorate against the President, and a final military attempt next year before Hanoi agrees to some form of settlement.

President Thieu, who has avoided the press for many months, was interviewed in his palatial office in the center of the capital. Three helicopters, three tanks, several jeeps and soldiers were distributed around the spacious grounds.

Mr. Thieu insisted that the incident between him and Mr. Rogers—the Secretary had said the United States was flexible on

the terms of Mr. Nixon's peace proposal including, by implication, when Mr. Thieu would resign in anticipation of free South Vietnamese elections—had been greatly exaggerated and was now forgotten.

#### HEDGES ON RE-ELECTION

Asked whether he would run for re-election if he resigned a month before free elections, as pledged in the U.S.-Saigon peace proposal, he replied:

"I cannot answer that yet. It is a very delicate question. My only dream is to bring peace to Vietnam. I am ready to return to civilian life as a simple citizen. When I proposed to resign a month before new elections I did so in all sincerity and honesty."

"I cannot predict anything else more precisely. I have not made a decision on whether I might run for re-election and I don't want the Communists to be able to exploit anything I might say."

"What the Communists really want is to defeat Nixon," he continued. "They know it will be very hard to impose their viewpoint if he is re-elected. Therefore they want to smash his Vietnamization program and also try to develop another offensive for a battlefield victory. They must have a victory on the battlefield first if they are to get any great concessions."

"If Nixon is re-elected I think Hanoi would still try another military offensive in 1973 when the American forces have gone from here. After that they might be ready for peace. But right now their tactic is fight and talk, talk and fight. Maybe sometimes in 1973 they might decide to fade away or to turn their main effort to Laos and Cambodia, seeking a political advantage there."

Clearly concerned over the superpower relationships developing out of the Nixon trip, Mr. Thieu is convinced that the President and his Chinese hosts are talking about the Vietnam situation.

"Certainly they will discuss it," he commented, "but they will not be able to agree on any solution for Vietnam. It would be unbelievable if they did not discuss it."

According to his analysis, "there is no doubt that Moscow pushed Hanoi to try an offensive now while Nixon was in Peking; Moscow wanted to demonstrate that it is impossible to negotiate over the head of Hanoi."

"Obviously" he said, "the idea of such a Communist offensive at this time was favored by Moscow, which wanted to demonstrate to Nixon that the only way he could negotiate a settlement in Vietnam was with the Russians, not the Chinese. Moscow will do anything it can to block efforts by Washington and Peking to solve this war."

#### "RUSSIA IS WORRIED"

Peking "is in a difficult position," Mr. Thieu said, adding: "It cannot abandon Vietnam and yet it is tied up by its own rivalry with Moscow. Nevertheless, both Washington and Peking can see that it is in the interests of the world not to have Soviet influence predominating in this region."

Mr. Thieu said the Russians did not originally want North Vietnam to invade the South because they feared American intervention, but now "Russia is very worried that China and the United States might find a basic agreement to restore peace in Indochina."

Looking to the future, Mr. Thieu said the Indochina situation must return to that outlined in the 1954 and 1962 Geneva agreements on Vietnam and Laos respectively.

He said he would like to see the development in Southeast Asia of a buffer zone with international guarantees against invasion. The zone should include both Vietnams, eventual reunification of which he doubted.

"Southeast Asia includes 10 states—North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Thailand, Cam-

bodia, Laos, Burma, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and the Philippines," he continued.

"These 10 nations—and I include North Vietnam—should discuss among themselves their common attitude, and we are perfectly willing to include Hanoi in such meetings."

"I do not think neutralization is the correct word to describe our goal," he said. "The three superpowers should be neutralized while the weak states in Southeast Asia should be turned into a buffer zone which is not violated by anyone."

"We do not want to be violated by anyone or to attack anyone. We do not want any foreign bases here or any alliances in this area."

[From the Far Eastern Economic Review, Mar. 4, 1972]

#### COMMUNISM: HANOI SWINGS OVER TO MOSCOW

Reports from Peking reveal that a serious rift has developed behind the scenes between Peking and Hanoi over North Vietnam's recent agreement with India to upgrade diplomatic relations between the two countries to ambassadorial level.

No reference to the agreement has yet been made by China's news media—a sure sign of Peking's annoyance.

There can be little doubt that the Chinese recognise the Soviet hand in this. The fact that Hanoi should have made such a move provides disquieting evidence for the Chinese leaders that Hanoi has been persuaded to abandon the carefully preserved balance, in its relationship between China and the Soviet Union, in favour of the latter.

Reports that the Russians are confident of persuading North Vietnam to recognise Bangladesh in the near future are causing added concern to the Chinese leadership.

Peking believes that Hanoi's "shot in the back" was engineered by Le Duan, First Secretary of the Lao Dong Party. Le Duan has long been suspected by the Chinese of being close to the Russians and there seems little doubt that it was he who was responsible for the initiative in respect to New Delhi.

North Vietnam has made no secret of its suspicions about the Sino-American detente. Despite assurances from the highest Chinese official sources, Hanoi has been making its disapproval embarrassingly obvious. The agreement with India—which was not, as widely believed at the time, an Indian move to spite Washington—was part of Hanoi's elaborate moves to demonstrate to China that it was willing and able to strike out on its own if pushed too far.

The Shanghai communiqué provided evidence of Chinese appreciation of Hanoi's sensitiveness. Even the Russians noted publicly that Peking did well to oppose the American position on the Vietnam War and reiterate support for the Vietcong peace plan. Of course there was nothing else Peking could do in the circumstances, for any prevarication would almost surely have seen Hanoi finally accusing Peking of betrayal.

It is significant, however, that the Chinese stand which won unusual support in Moscow still has not brought forth any such public reaction from Hanoi. Steadfastly refusing to make any direct public reference to the Nixon visit, Hanoi nevertheless indirectly attacked the Nixon trip four times in five days. These attacks have been particularly harsh in their references to Nixon, calling him a "malicious person" who built his political career on opposing communism and China but who now "boasts noisily about a generation of peace and a century of negotiation." The 2,000-word commentary in *Nhan Dan* could not make clearer Hanoi's disapproval of Chinese hob-nobbing with a "known reactionary aggressor" who had consistently followed "a policy of reactionary

opposition to world socialism and has tried by all means to divide the socialist camp and international communism."

No doubt Hanoi has every reason to feel intensely hostile toward Nixon, for even though Peking's news media suspended attacks on the Nixon Administration during the visit, there was no such suspension by Washington of American bombings against North Vietnamese positions.

The question is whether in such a situation Hanoi will take the extreme step of making significant departures in its foreign policy. It may be too much to take the proffered arm of Japan, caught in a similar position of having to find new friends. But it probably will be easier to forge fresh links with India, now a power in its own right. The most important after-effects of the Sino-Soviet honeymoon may yet be not in Taiwan but in Indochina and South Asia.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1972]

#### SOVIETS AIDING HANOI OFFENSIVE

(By Victor Zorza)

The most high-powered Soviet military delegation ever to visit Hanoi is now helping North Vietnam to prepare for the offensive which has been predicted so often.

The delegation is made up of the top commanders of the Soviet air defense forces—the commander-in-chief, Marshal Pavel Batitsky, as well as the commanders of the ground-to-air missile forces and of the radar networks. The delegation's arrival coincides with a number of indications suggesting that the Communist forces intend to launch soon their long-delayed offensive, and that they expect the United States to respond with the most fearful aerial bombardment of the war.

The recent buildup of the North Vietnamese air defenses makes it clear that they are preparing to take any punishment that may be coming to them—and the Soviet delegation has evidently come to inspect the buildup and to help in planning the preparations.

United States officials, who at one time were sure that a major Communist offensive was going to coincide with President Nixon's trip to Peking, are now more cautious. They believe now that the offensive will come between July and September in order to influence the election in the United States.

This is what the Kremlin would probably prefer, too. An earlier offensive, in what remains of the dry seasons, could run into the period of Mr. Nixon's Moscow summit in May, and prove to be a considerable embarrassment to his hosts. But the increasing stress in Hanoi propaganda on offensive action suggests that the North Vietnamese buildup is intended for an earlier date than Moscow would like.

Is this, perhaps the reason for the curious love-hate relationship that seems to be developing between Moscow and Hanoi? On the one hand, a constant stream of high Soviet officials, starting with the minister of culture, Ekaterina Furtseva, and ending with the latest military delegation, has been visiting Hanoi. On the other, friction between the two capitals is evident in Hanoi's resentment of Moscow's as well as Peking's sum-mitry.

The conversation between Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin and the North Vietnamese ambassador, described in the Soviet press as "frank"—which means that it was quite rough—has still not been reported in Hanoi newspapers. In welcoming the Soviet military delegation, the Hanoi press assured the Russians that North Vietnam was "endeavoring" to strengthen its friendship with them—which means that friction persists in spite of continued "endeavours" to remove it.

An article in the Hanoi party journal, *Tpa Chi Tuyen Huan*, asserts the right of the Vietnamese Communist party to run its affairs in its own way, and implies that not

only the Chinese but the Russians, too, had been trying to dictate Hanoi's policies.

An article on the same subject in the Hanoi party daily *Nhan Dan* was evidently so revealing that the first edition of the paper was held back, and another, with an anodyne version of an article on the anniversary of the Communist International, was substituted.

The Russians obviously believe that their massive military aid to North Vietnam entitles them to ask Hanoi to conform to Soviet interests. They would like, no doubt, to do what they had accused the Chinese of doing—that is, to play a major role in negotiating a settlement of the war with Mr. Nixon, in the hope of securing some concessions from him in exchange.

The Kremlin evidently fears that a wrongly timed offensive may interfere with this, but the North Vietnamese may well believe that a show of strength just before the Moscow summit could help them.

The *Pravda* correspondent in Hanoi reports that the North Vietnamese have told him that the dry season, which ends in April or May, is the time of "fiercest battles," and, he reported last week, "the dry season is not over yet." He was saying, in effect, that Hanoi is determined to strike before then—and he ought to know.

#### NARCOTICS FROM COMMUNIST CHINA

#### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from a visit to Taipei, Taiwan, the Republic of China, I had the opportunity of conveying to those free Chinese of Asia, on behalf of the thousands of my constituents and friends of Free China, our heartfelt best wishes in one of their darkest hours. It does not seem too long ago, that Japan while at war with this Nation was spreading the racist slogan over Asia, "Asia for the Asiatics." Those who flew with Gen. Claire Chennault, as well as thousands of others who fought as ground troops, will always remember the support rendered by millions of Free Chinese to defeat that power which was running rampant over the Pacific. The forces of fascism were defeated with the able assistance of the Free Chinese, but the specter of communism loomed on the horizon. As they fought the totalitarian enemy of Japan, so also have these Free Chinese fought the totalitarianism of communism.

One of the main strategic offensives being conducted by Communist Chinese at this time is the narcotics offensive. This is a deadly weapon attacking the minds of individuals and the essential fabric of society. Many American mothers and fathers bear mute testimony to the effect of this deadly weapon as they see the souls of their sons and daughters lost to the opium poppy from which all heroin is derived. Yet, apparently to give its foreign policy a better image, administration sources are strangely silent or indifferent to the deadly threat to the souls of the youth of America.

On June 30, 1971, William D. Blair, Jr.,

official spokesman for the administration as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, announced:

So far as we are aware, opium is not grown legally in the People's Republic of (Communist) China and none is exported by the Chinese Communist authorities.

In the Department of State bulletin for April 3, 1972, Nelson Gross, Senior Adviser to the Secretary of State and Coordinator for International Narcotics Matters, gives us eight pages on narcotics traffic worldwide, without any reference to the death-dealing traffic from Communist China.

In view of this administration silence and indifference, once again we look to Free China as we did in World War II, for assistance in breaking the curtain of silence over America so that the youth of America may be saved from the slavery of heroin.

At this time I would like to place in the *RECORD* an article brought back from our long-suffering friends of the Free Republic of China, giving hard, clear, unmistakable evidence of the Red Chinese Communist offensive to destroy American youth:

#### CHINESE COMMUNIST PRODUCTION AND SALE OF NARCOTICS

(By Peter Huang, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China)

Under Chinese Communist management opium poppy has been grown on a large scale in many parts of the Chinese mainland. It has been recently estimated that the annual production has reached more than ten thousand tons, amounting to a value approximating US \$800,000,000. The opium plantations are under two different systems of management: the ordinary opium farms and special opium farms. The ordinary farms are managed by the people under the supervision of the "people's government". Presently the total area is estimated at about 5,830,000 mu. The special opium farms are public or "state" enterprises, managed by garrison troops or government organizations, such as health departments, agricultural departments, and scientific institutes.

Opium planters may obtain loans from local "people's banks" for seeds, fertilizer, and farm tools; but the products must be sold to the "government" at the official or contract price, and the farmers are forbidden to sell the opium directly to the people. Farms of about 500 mu or more are jointly supervised and inspected by one or two productive supervisors sent by the agricultural departments of the "government". It is also stipulated that the opium farmers who fail to reach production quotas set by the authorities are to be punished, and those who produce over the quota are to be granted the status of "labor heroes" and "labor models."

In order to improve the quality of opium, the Communist authorities have assigned various scientific institutes to conduct research and experiments in this field. The Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Agricultural Science, Anhwei Agricultural College, Kweichow Agricultural College, Northwest Agricultural College, Yunnan University, Szechwan University and several agricultural colleges in Yunnan Province have all been assigned to such work. In addition, the Communists select model opium growers of different areas and assign them to other opium farms to exchange experiences. The "Ministry of Agriculture dispatches propaganda teams to the opium farms to teach the growers better techniques, such as the proper methods of seeding and sowing used in Yunnan, the methods of fertilization and extraction of pulp used in the Northeast, and the seed selecting method employed in Szechwan.



In order to improve the refining process, the Communist authorities in 1950 secretly began to seek out experienced opium technicians among the gangsters, many of whom had worked for Japanese opium refineries during the Japanese occupation. These technicians were recruited to work with Russian opium experts. More than thirty "special products refineries" have been established in Peiping, Tientsin, Dairan, Mukdeh, Chinchow, Yenchi, Shanghai, Chekiang, Hankou, Chungking, Sinkiang, Tibet, Sikang, Kunming and Kwangtung. These refineries manufacture opium products, such as morphine and heroin.

## II. EXPORT OF NARCOTICS

In 1952 the Communists set up a "Trade Center of Narcotic Exports" in Wantse Village, Chungshan County, Kwangtung, close to Macao. Stores that sold domestic products run by the Chinese Communists in Hongkong and Macao secretly signed contracts with the local gangsters, who were to receive the drugs in the "security zone" for distribution. However, disputes occurred quite often during the delivery of such goods. Toward the end of 1952 the United Nations disclosed the illegal transactions and warned the Chinese Communists. Thereupon the Trade Center of Narcotic Exports was closed down, and the Chinese Communists began to style the narcotics as "special goods" so as to cover up the transactions. A "Special Domestic Products Trade Company" was then established in Peiping with branches in many other cities. It is a smuggling organization supervised and conducted by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Foreign Trade Commission.

The commercial attachés in the Chinese Communist embassies in foreign countries take charge of the distribution and sale of the "special goods." Methods and techniques of smuggling have also been improved, resulting in a wider distribution all over the world. The border area bounded by Yunnan, Burma and Thailand, which is called "the zone outside of every jurisdiction," is used as a center of the world narcotic transactions. Rebellious troops of several minor nationalities (Kaching, Karens, and Shans) of Burma have been using the northern area of Burma as their base to attack Burmese government troops. These troops are led by the feudal masters of these minorities, who are both wealthy and influential, with the most powerful feudal landlord of the Shans as the chief leader. Aside from banditry, their main income is extracted from smuggling opium in cooperation with the Chinese Communists. These Burmese rebels have already set up a formal army.

October 15, 1970 the chief of the narcotic investigation division of the Hongkong Police revealed on that large quantities of narcotics were seized in 1969 by the Hongkong police—10,500 lbs. of opium, 310 lbs. of heroin, and 250 lbs. of morphine. All these came from the Chinese mainland. However, the police official said, the Hongkong authorities have always avoided political involvement when searching and arresting narcotics smugglers and distributors, who are either Chinese Communists or their agents. During the past year, in addition to raw opium, large quantities of heroin were also shipped to Hongkong and Macao.

At present there are three kinds of heroin in the underground market of Hongkong, namely the "Number 3," "Number 4" and "Golden Eagle." Four brands of heroin are refined locally in Hongkong: "White Rose," "White Dragon Pearl," "Pigeon Mark," and "Powder King." In the first half of 1969, opium was sold at 90 Hongkong dollars per ounce; in the later half, its price fell to HK\$60 because of the increase in supply. Heroin was sold at HK\$190 per ounce, and morphine

at HK\$350. The prices often fluctuate greatly. In early 1970, the narcotics investigation division of the Hongkong Police and the smuggling investigation unit of the Hongkong industrial and commercial bureau tightened their surveillance. As a result narcotics imported from the Chinese mainland decreased sharply, and Hongkong dealers had to turn to Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand for their narcotics supply.

The names of some of the dealers and refiners have been disclosed. In Hongkong, the narcotics dealers included Hsueh Fuyuan, Li Chien, Tung Yang-fa, Tung Yi-kang, and his brother Han Shih-hao, Yeh Kan-fu, and his nephew Yeh Chih-chun, Yang Shih-kang, Kuo Fu-sheng, Tao Chuan-tien, and Liang Chang a wealthy merchant. In Thailand the "999" brand of heroin is produced by technicians Wang Chin-piao (alias Yang Liang-fu), Li Si-kuei, Chang Kuang-al and Chang Chan-ao (alias Chang Ming-san); the "Camel" brand by Wang Hai-shan, and Chao Lao-si; and the "555" brand by Cheng Yao-sheng and Ting Sung-tsai.

These three brands of heroin are exported to many countries exclusively through the agent and distributor Cheng Yao-sheng. Those who actually carried the goods out from Thailand included Ma Ah-ching, Ke Yut-sai, Kung Chih-chang, and Tai Jui-ken; these people are either seamen or ship-cooks. Lu Chi-tung (alias Chiao Chi-lu), a waiter on the Tieh Hsing (transliteration) ship, Liu An-si (alias Liu Pao-chang), a cook in a Norwegian ship, and Liu Chieh, a seaman on the Lan Yen (transliteration) ship, are narcotics smugglers between Hongkong and the United States and Japan.

A few narcotics trade bases in Yunnan have also been disclosed. A Chinese Communist agent, Wang Cheng who has been stationed in a military base in Chenk'ang, Hunnan, was found to be in charge of narcotics trade with Burma. In early April, 1970, Wang Cheng negotiated with a Burmese Communist leader (Peng Chia Sheng, in Chinese) the building of a morphine refinery in Gyogon area.

However the negotiation did not result in any agreement because of conflicts of interest on both sides. Wang Cheng is still engaged in purchasing opium in that area and delivering it to Kunming refineries to manufacture morphine. At the same time, the customs at Wanting, Yunnan, has contacted another Burmese Communist leader (Lo Hsiang, in Chinese) for purposes of opium trade; the Chinese Communists purchase opium from Burma and then sell morphine, refined in Kunming, back to Burma.

According to some people from Kunming (revealed in Hongkong in September 1970), although the free markets in Kunming have been closed for a long time, there still exists an underground market where opium is on sale. Some of the purchasers come from as far as Shanghai, Nanking, and Chungking.

The quantities of narcotics exported from the Chinese mainland are estimated as follows: 1952-1957—2,000 tons annually, 1957-1964—8,000 tons annually, since 1964—over 10,000 tons annually.

At present the exported narcotics are transported through four main routes: (i) East China route—Shanghai is the main center, Amoy the second export port, and Hongkong the transferring post. From Hongkong, the narcotics are delivered to the Middle East, Australia, Europe, America, Southeast Asia, and sometimes Taiwan.

(ii) South China route—Canton is the main center, and Shenchuan, Shihchi, Humen, Nantou, Chungshan, Shehku, Lachiwei, and Hainan are export stations. Hongkong and Macao are the main destinations. Motor boats are used as the main transportation from Humen and Nantou to Hongkong and Macao. The narcotics are first delivered to Inner Lingting Island, and then to Macao

or Tayushan, an off shore island of Hongkong. From Tayushan they are delivered to Kowloon or Hongkong by small speed boats. In Macao, Nankuang Hong (company) is the headquarters of narcotics transaction and the minimum quantity of purchase is 10,000 ounces. The delivery of goods is usually made on the high sea near Tankanshan, which is very close to Macao. In Hongkong, narcotics dealers are mostly influential and well-financed corporations.

Another export station was set up on Lachiwei Island (near Hongkong and Macao) in November 1969 with docks and warehouses, which were completed in April 1970. Narcotics are transported from Canton by gunboats, packed in wooden cases with seals of "Ministry of Defence." Deliveries are made four to six times monthly. The docks are marked as forbidden areas until the narcotics are taken away by foreign ships through previous arrangements.

(iii) West China route, also called the Southeast Asian route—Chehli, Lungchuan, Tengchung, and Wanting are the main centers. Goods are transported via the border areas of Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore. They may also be transferred to Indonesia, Hongkong, Macao and other places. Some may be transported via North Vietnam to Cuba, Albania, and some of the African countries. According to the Hsingchou Daily and the Nanyang Daily, narcotics dealers consider the route from Yunnan via Thailand to Singapore and Malaysia as most profitable and call it the "golden throat." This route has therefore become the main line of the Chinese Communists' narcotics distribution to the free world.

(iv) North China route—Tientsin is the center; Tsingtao, Weihaiwei, and Dairen are the export ports; and Japan and Korea are the main destinations. Transferring stations have been set up in Kyushu, Hokkaido, Kobe and Osaka, where the Japanese Communists are rather active. The goods may also be transported via North Korea to East Germany and then to European countries, or via North Korea to Cuba, Albania and certain African countries and then to other countries.

Various methods are used for smuggling: (i) Seamen and pilots are used as carriers; secret places on board ship are designed to hide the goods.

(ii) Small fishing boats are used for transportation at night; the goods are unloaded at quiet coastal spots, or left in water with floats waiting to be picked up by divers.

(iii) Goods are parachuted from small airplanes at designated spots at night.

(iv) Submarines are sometimes used to deliver the goods to their destination.

(v) Narcotics may be mixed with flour, spice, sugar or soap. After delivery, technicians dissolve the mixture and extract the drug.

(vi) Cotton cloth is soaked in liquid morphine and then dried. The morphine can be extracted after delivery.

(vii) Narcotics may be packed with other goods in tins, toothpaste tubes, plaster figures, or other commodities.

(viii) Coffins, dead body of a baby, and even open wounds are sometimes used as hiding places.

(ix) The carrier may hide narcotics in his anus, in female private organs, or in a special layer fixed in suitcases.

(x) The opportunity of official visits made by diplomats, trade missions, goodwill delegations, cultural exchange groups, or tourists may be used.

(xi) After delivery, the goods are stored in many different places. Direct contact between the responsible Communist cadres and the agents, between the agents and the distributors, and between distributors and retailers is always avoided. It is, therefore, difficult for the police to track down the whole network.

## III PURPOSE OF THE TRADE

## 1. To increase national income

Back in 1952, the leaders of the Chinese Communists' National Planning Commission, "Ministry" of Finance, "Ministry" of Foreign Trade and leading local cadres of South China and the Southwest areas convened secretly in Peiping. The main topic discussed was "how to increase national income by exporting narcotics." Since then the growing, refining, and export of narcotics have been greatly increased, and the profit from this trade has become one of the regime's three major financial sources. (The Chinese Communists themselves maintain that the three major financial sources are: the white stuff—food grains; the yellow stuff—silver and gold; and the black stuff—opium.)

The chairman of the National Narcotics Control Committee of Japan, Tsusai Sugawara revealed that the Chinese Communists' annual export of opium to Japan amounted to 160,000,000,000; this less than one third of the Communists' total export of opium. The head of the U.S. Federal Narcotics Investigation has also pointed out that the Chinese Communists have been planting opium on a large scale for the purpose of earning foreign exchange.

An article entitled "How the Maoists Smuggle Opium" written by B. Bulatov, a correspondent of the Literaturnaya Gazeta of the Soviet Union, was published in the Literaturnaya Gazeta, 1969, number 12. Its Chinese translation was published in Chihshih Pen-tze Pan-yueh-kan (Intellectuals Fortnightly), number 30. According to this article, the annual production of opium on the Chinese mainland is about 8,000 tons. This would yield about 500 tons of heroin, if it were all used for this purpose. The minimum wholesale price of heroin in Japan, West Europe, and the United States is US\$20,000 a pound. If the entire annual production of opium were made into heroin and then sold abroad, the value realized would reach US\$10,000,000,000. However, not all the opium is made into heroin, and a certain amount should be allowed for damage. In addition, the expenditure on transportation, wages, bribery and other expenses should be deducted. The annual net income from the trade is estimated by experts to be about US\$800,000,000.

## 2. To finance subversive activities

Chinese Communist subversive activities in foreign countries are mainly financed from the profits of the narcotics trade. The chief of the narcotics investigation division of the Hong Kong Police, said in August 1970, that the net profit the Chinese Communists gain from narcotics trade in Hong Kong is over HK\$1,500,000 monthly, and the entire amount is deposited in the Communist owned "Bank of China" in Hong Kong. This money is used to purchase machinery from Europe and to finance their secret agents serving in the Far East.

In Burma, Laos, and Thailand, the Chinese Communist agents sell narcotics to the tribal leaders and pro-Communist local organizations at very low prices. One kilogram of raw opium is sold at only US\$30 or 7 ounces of gold. This is to win over the tribes to support the Communist guerrilla forces in those areas. A Reuters dispatch of November 30, 1970 disclosed that Chinese Communist guerrilla troops in the northern part of Thailand use "miracle medicine" to cure the village people of all sorts of pains, and morphine is the main component of such miracle medicine. The guerrillas have thus won the confidence of the local people and have obtained the supplies and shelter they need. With the cooperation of the people, the Communists have stored food and other necessities in villages, and are preparing to attack the outposts of the government troops.

Information from different sources discloses the fact that the "zone outside of

every jurisdiction" in the border area between Yunnan and Burma and Thailand has become a major center of the Chinese Communists' international narcotics trade. In the Southeast Asian countries, there exist more than ten big companies dealing in opium distribution. They are all well protected. The American Saturday Evening Post has revealed that these companies are under official protection. In other words, The Chinese Communist "Ministry" of Foreign Trade has invested large sums of money to bribe the authorities concerned. Obviously the Chinese Communists have infiltrated deep into the Southeast Asian countries with the help of narcotics.

## 3. To corrupt and weaken the people of the free world

The number of drug addicts in the free world is alarming, and the damage these drugs have caused to the people's physical and mental well-being is frightening. In Singapore and Malaysia alone, the consumption of narcotics is about 1,000 tons per year, or 1,000,000,000 injected doses of morphine. In Japan, the consumption is about 3,000 tons, and in Hongkong, about 800 to 1,000 tons. Dr. Donald Loubie, associate professor of the medical college of Cornell University and director of the New York state addict reformatory, estimates that 10,487 of the 12,049 male inmates of Hongkong prisons are drug addicts. Another estimate made in December 1968 by the Hongkong Narcotics Abstinence Committee from random samples indicates that of the whole population of Hongkong there are about 30,000 to 65,000 male and female addicts, or about three percent of the population.

## 4. To corrupt U.S. servicemen

An Argentine English-language newspaper Buenos Aires Herald published on October 31, 1970, a report made by the narcotics group of the U.S. Senate on the condition of the U.S. servicemen in Vietnam. This report presented to the Senate committee revealed the following information: (i) the Chinese Communists have been selling large quantities of best quality heroin at very low prices in Vietnam. The price there is US\$20 per ounce, while it can be as high as US\$4,000 per ounce in the United States.

The heroin is 90 percent to 100 percent pure. In 1969 casualties caused by overdose averaged two per month. In 1970, from January to October, the average increased to two per day. (ii) The number of addicts among the U.S. servicemen and officers in Vietnam has risen from 30 percent to 60 percent of all the troops stationed in Vietnam in the past six months covering May to October 1970. In some units the percentage is as high as 70 to 80; and the condition has become worse recently. On October 13, a group of U.S. soldiers openly admitted their use of morphine to CBS television.

According to a UPI dispatch of December 3, 1970, transferred here by the Central News Agency correspondent in Washington, the narcotics control unit of the U.S. Defense Department said that in Thailand all kinds of narcotic drugs are available and can be purchased at very low prices. Bangkok has become a major delivery station and U.S. servicemen are the main customers of the trade. This investigation was started after the juvenile delinquency group of the Senate listened to a report on the narcotics problem among the U.S. troops in Vietnam.

Most of the U.S. servicemen in Thailand and those from Vietnam visiting there stay in tourist hotels and many of the managers and waiters of these hotels are leftists. It has been reported that the cigarettes sold to the U.S. servicemen are doctored with morphine to trap the American customers, who may fall victims unknowingly.

In order to serve its political purpose, the Chinese Communist regime disregards inter-

national morality and sells large quantities of narcotics to the free world through its worldwide network. This extremely destructive intrigue should be stopped immediately, before it is too late.

## FARMERS GETTING LESS FOR MEATS

## HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent weeks over the price of beef at the counter. Just before the Easter recess I expressed my feelings on this matter and attempted to explain to my colleagues the situation as it is and the fact that our farmers are getting less for their choice beef than they were 20 years ago.

During the recess I was in North Dakota and ran across a guest editorial in the Dickinson Press by Mr. Raymond Schnell. Mr. Schnell is a past president of the North Dakota Stockmen's Association, past regional vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, and a member of the board of directors of the National Livestock and Meat Board.

I insert the guest editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

## FOOD COST DEFENDED

(By Raymond Schnell)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Schnell is associated with the operation of Schnell's Livestock Auction Market and is a past president of the North Dakota Stockmen's Assn., past regional vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Assn., and a member of the board of directors of the National Livestock and Meat Board.)

The American consumer is losing the battle of prices on all fronts except the most essential food front. I sympathize with today's consumer—many prices are too high—the dollar doesn't buy what it should for all the knowledge and information that we in the U.S. have at our disposal.

I do not agree that pointing the finger at food prices and particularly at the beef production industry is fair and justified. Actually food prices and again particularly beef have not contributed their fair share to the inflation everyone is fighting. Beef and other foods are the first to be singled out for criticism at a time of concern over prices. There are a number of reasons for this:

1. Food is the most significant part of the household budget.

2. Food is generally paid for in cash and therefore food prices are most noticeable at the first sign of a money shortage.

3. Over 20% of the things purchased in super markets are not food items but most consumers blame food for their total super market bill.

4. Prices on luxury items or "once in a while" purchases do not come under the same price scrutiny as food since they are either purchased when extra money is available or often on an installment purchase plan where higher prices are not as noticeable.

All this recent flurry over meat prices does give the housewife a real opportunity to get a very liberal and basic education on the economics of food production. Bureau of Labor Statistics show that in 1951 the average family spent 25.6% of their disposable in-



come for food while in 1971 it took only 16% of the disposable income to purchase more food that is packaged more conveniently, food that is more nutritious and more wholesome, food that conforms to much more rigid rules and regulations regarding cleanliness, additives, handling, etc. The farmer now only gets 40% of each dollar spent for food whereas the farmer received over 50% of each dollar in 1951.

The important lesson that can come out of these statistics has to do with how the American farmer was able to survive the impact of these very unfavorable figures. To a small extent price supports and subsidy payments attempted to help a few commodities, but in most cases though the payments were vital to production they did nothing to solve the problem. (The Beef Industry has not been a part of, and by and large does not want to be a part of subsidies or controls). Agriculture has done a terrific job of managing its labor, equipment and other resources to stay alive in these 20 years. We have made great strides in production per unit by use of better seed stock, (both crops and livestock) by modern means of controlling diseases, weeds, and insects, by economics in use of machinery, but mostly by increasing the production per man in agriculture. Today each man in agriculture feeds about 50 other people while in 1951 one farmer fed only 16 people.

The consumer of food does not usually pay attention to the fact that agriculture is the largest industrial consumer in the U.S. today. No other industry uses as much steel, rubber, fuel and many other products as do our farms and ranches. When the farmer or rancher buys the industrial goods he needs in his business he does not have anybody in industry or organized labor to do the things for the farmer that the man in agriculture has done to bring cheap food to his consumer. In the past 20 years wages have gone up 340% and business dividends have gone up 300% while prices received by farmers and ranchers have increased only 7%. Actually wholesale beef prices are below 20 years ago. Increases in productivity in industry could justify additional wage increases but instead many wage contracts which include benefits to labor also include limits on production. The result is that the entire increase in cost is paid by the consumer with absolutely no benefit from advanced technology or productivity. If this had happened in agriculture, food prices would be more than twice as high as today.

Agriculture as a whole and the beef industry in particular have kept faith with their customers. One hour of labor in 1951 bought 1.7 lb. of beef; in 1971 one hour of labor bought 3.3 lbs. of beef. Wholesale beef prices and beef prices to the producer are lower now than they were at the time that prices were frozen back in August of 1971. Fat cattle prices were higher in 1949, 1950 and 1951 than they are right now.

The fact that to now there have been no actual boycotts or disturbances on the part of the housewife indicates that they have a better knowledge of the relative values of the food they buy than those that are trying to stir up a "don't buy beef" movement. It is unfortunate for the beef industry that beef prices have to be the object of "buck passing" on the part of the chain stores and labor on one hand and to be the crutch for publicity and attention on the part of members of the consumer affairs bureaus and some publicity seeking politicians.

All the beef industry asks is that all of the facts regarding costs, prices, returns and other economic factors be laid on the table for all to see. The Beef business will remain strong in a free, open, competitive system if the public is fully informed.

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

## HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted today with a period of economic stagnation and change. While many of our goals and priorities are being reoriented, our competitive position in international markets is being challenged, and our continued ability to sustain economic growth appears in jeopardy. All areas of the Nation have experienced the widespread unemployment and distress which accompanies the current economic dislocation.

The New England region has been especially hard hit by recession and economic dislocation, with the unemployment rate for Massachusetts alone more than one-third above the national rate. While hampered by the natural disadvantages of a harsh climate, few natural resources, and high energy costs, New England nonetheless possesses a unique ability and readiness to develop and apply modern technology to critical domestic needs, and to revitalize the New England economy.

The role of the New England Regional Commission in planning, coordinating, and implementing a comprehensive economic redevelopment program is essential. The commission can foster a truly effective regional approach to the many common problems facing the New England area, and it permits the coordination of activities at all levels of government and with the private sector to reach programmatic goals.

My colleague and neighbor, Congressman MICHAEL HARRINGTON, recently presented an extremely thoughtful and cogent analysis of the economic needs and prospects for New England in testimony on economic development programs before the House Public Works Committee. Congressman HARRINGTON details the urgent need for immediate and far-reaching action at all levels of government to assure the economic recovery of New England, and points out the critical role of the New England Regional Commission in meeting this goal. I welcome the opportunity to bring Congressman HARRINGTON's testimony to the attention of my colleagues, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN HARRINGTON'S TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, MARCH 15, 1972

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to testify before the House Public Works Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs today.

What are the problems of the New England economy? Why is it necessary that the Federal Government devote attention to that area? What are the economic ills which in the past have hampered the economic growth of that area, and are equally dangerous to other areas all over the Nation? In the first place, New England is the oldest regional civilization and economy in the United States. It has not yet reached its limit, as

some would have us believe; nor is it without new industries, new developments, and new ideas. But as an older industrial community with long-established industries and traditions, too much of New England is still dependent upon outmoded methods and customs of the past. Its principal natural resources, such as fisheries and forests, are being depleted. The center of population is moving away. The fast-growing basic industries of the country are located elsewhere, for reasons of economic geography and resource development.

Unless important basic adjustments in the economic structure of the area are undertaken, the end of our present defense-inspired prosperity will accentuate what has been called the decline of New England. Its economic growth, industrialization, population, per capita income, manufacturing employment, and share in particular industries have not kept pace with the rest of the country. A disproportionately large percentage of the group IV areas of substantial labor surplus were in the six-state New England region, according to the latest classification by the Department of Labor.

The recession hit New England much more severely than the rest of the country. The decline in manufacturing employment was earlier and greater in each of the six New England States and in the region as a whole than for any other state or region or the Nation as a whole.

The recession referred to in the previous sentence is not the one from which we are just now beginning to emerge. It was the recession of 1948-1949, and the man who uttered these remarks was then Senator John F. Kennedy, in the first of a series of Senate speeches on the New England economy.

The sad fact is that despite the farsighted program outlined by Senator Kennedy in 1953 the New England economy has continued to decline in the intervening years. The most shocking evidence of this fact comes in the unemployment statistics for February: while nationally the employment rate declined to 5.7%, the rate for Massachusetts jumped to 7.5%. Thus, Massachusetts' unemployment rate is more than one-third above the national rate. At no time since we have been compiling these particular statistics has the Massachusetts rate been so far above the national figure.

My purpose in testifying today is to underline the urgency of immediate and far-reaching action of the federal, state and local levels to arrest the precipitous decline of the New England economy. And I stress that here because the New England Regional Commission must play a central role in this process.

The role of the Commission in formulating an economic recovery program for New England is essential because regional economics has long been the stepchild of public policy in America. Our concentration has been far too exclusively on national trends; and the problems of large sectors of the country which may be deviating from national trends have been neglected. The regional commission, with its Congressional mandate, its liaison with Federal departments, and its status as the major governmental agency linking the six New England Governors, is ideally suited to serve as a leader in analyzing the nature of our problem, and in prescribing solutions for it.

The basic problem with the New England economy is that our natural disadvantages have caught up with us. As President Kennedy said in the remarks I have just quoted, "New England is the oldest regional civilization and economy in the United States." New England is still "old." Forty-seven percent of all housing units in the region were built before 1920, as compared with a figure of 27% for the Nation. Approximately 3,500 school classrooms were built over 50 years

ago and are on non-fireproof construction. A large portion of the region's households are still served by individual sanitary drainage systems rather than by municipal systems. Even New England's population is growing old. 10.7% of New England's population is over 65 years of age, compared with a national average of 9.9%. And 36.9% of the region's population is under the age of twenty compared with 37.9% of the Nation as a whole.

For a long time, the head start we garnered from being first allowed us to overcome the natural disadvantages of our location, climate, lack of resources, and inadequate energy supplies. But as other regions of the country developed as well, our position eroded. The remote location of New England is one corner of the United States makes it impractical to manufacture most consumer durables in our region; our lack of natural resources rules us out for many other types of manufacture. And the inordinately high cost of power in the six States adds a further burden to any industry operating among us.

But not all of our disadvantages are nature's fault. Man-made errors have gravely compounded our difficulties. The most glaring example of this is the field of energy, which I have just mentioned. To a certain extent our energy costs are high because we lack resources. But to a far greater extent, New Englanders are being forced to pay an unconscionably high premium to the oil and gas producers of the South and Southwest by a national energy policy that is discriminatory, inefficient, and counterproductive. If we were permitted freely to import oil, we could lower our energy costs considerably. But a restrictive oil import quota system is maintained by Presidential decree in the face of a recommendation to the country by the President's own commission, and New Englanders pay the price.

The high cost of oil has also affected New England's electric power rates, but the cost of fuel alone does not entirely account for the region's oppressively high electric rates.

In 1952, Senator Kennedy proposed the development of New England's hydroelectric resources. But the Congress of the United States has defeated every legislative proposal to construct a much needed hydroelectric facility at Dickey, Maine, which would have provided 794,000 kw. of low-cost power for the region. New England's power rates are now, as they were then, the highest in the country. And they are rising over 8% annually, as compared with 5.7% for the rest of the nation. These excessive rates, coupled with an inadequate supply that results in our now-common summer brownouts, have helped cripple the region's possibilities for economic growth.

Nor is this the only example of government culpability for the economic decline which threatens to plunge us into a period of complete stagnation. New England enjoyed a temporary boom in the late fifties and early sixties as industries proliferated to meet the mushrooming needs of the Federal government in the military and peace fields. It was clear, of course, at the time of that explosion that a cutback would be coming. None of us advocates that our economy be propped up by unneeded weapons. But despite the warning of many farsighted people, nothing of any consequence was done to prepare the new industry for the inevitable decline in this type of spending. And we in New England are now suffering from the consequences. At a time when our nation badly needs the skills of the highly trained technical and scientific talent concentrated in New England to deal with our aggravating social and economic problems, little more than lip-service is being paid to them.

The Federal government is particularly responsible for the region's high unemployment rate. No other section of the country is so dependent on the federal government as

a purchaser of its goods and services. In 1960, 35% of the goods shipped from New England were purchased by the federal government. This compares with a national average of 25%. 56% of all communications equipment exported from New England is sold to the federal government as was 65% of all transportation equipment, mostly in the form of sophisticated aircraft hardware, much of which is produced in my own District in Lynn.

Much has been said and written about conversion in recent years, but about the only benefit that has accrued from all of this discussion has been to the paper industry, which has undoubtedly profited greatly from the publication of reams and reams of studies.

The time has come to begin acting on these studies. And it is the role of the New England Regional Commission to see that this action is taken.

While New England has lost any comparative advantage it may have had in much of traditional manufacturing, we rate in considerable advantage in what must become the growth industries of the next twenty years if our nation is to achieve the goals we have set for ourselves. Simply stated, New England at this point is ahead of any region in the country in its readiness to apply our modern technology to the solution of the problems that most affect our crowded urban society. A recent study by the First National Bank of Boston pointed out that right now New England enjoys a comparative advantage in the fields of pollution control devices, biomedical technology, and computer peripheral industry.

These industries have one thing in common—they are unlike traditional manufacturing industries which manufacture goods primarily bought by individual consumers for their individual or family needs. The goods they help produce are goods that serve a common, rather than individual purpose, and they serve common purposes which individuals cannot accomplish alone.

Examples are such commodities as clean air and water, expanded medical care, new cities and towns, adequate and environmentally clean energy, and mass transit. These goods differ from normal goods and services only in that they cannot be provided by one industry. You can't produce a clean river in a factory. To produce these goods, we will have to create an active working relationship between the federal government, state and local government, private industry, and research and educational centers. Only by acting in harmony can we solve the problem of making our country a livable one once again.

The "factories" which will help produce these goods will be organizations such as the New England Regional Commission. They will be responsible for coordinating the activities of all the levels of government with the private sector to achieve certain programmatic goals.

New England is an ideal candidate for an experiment in this new form of economic growth. It is a microcosm of the United States. Three states are heavily metropolitan, three states are characterized by small towns in a rural setting. The region suffers from all of the problems that affect the nation as a whole. Its air and water are polluted in many areas. Its infrastructure is growing obsolete—new roads, rapid transit systems, port facilities, electric generating units all are badly needed. There is room available for the creation of new towns to relieve urban congestion. And most important, there is a highly skilled labor force that can adapt to meet these new priorities.

However, the government should not make the same mistake that it has made many times in the past. We have retrained aerospace engineers to be urban engineers, only to find that there was no market for these men because the cities were broke. Before

undertaking massive new programs, we must make sure we have the necessary market for the product. Only an intergovernmental body, operating with a broad and flexible mandate, will be able to coordinate the activities of many diverse agencies, governments, and industries, to achieve meaningful results.

Although it has laid the necessary foundation, the New England Regional Commission has not been given the amount of funding sufficient to undertake a comprehensive economic redevelopment program. Of course the Appropriations Committee hearings scheduled for the end of the month is the proper place to discuss the actual funding of the program.

But, in closing, I wish to reemphasize that the economic revitalization of New England will not only help New England, but will have far reaching consequences for the economic health of the entire United States.

## THE NEED TO RESTRICT CHAIN LETTERS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, although the Congress has made progress in its efforts to stop the flow of unsolicited smut traffic through the mail, postal officials have no legal recourse against mailers of chain letters which contain implied threats to the recipients if the instructions contained therein are not followed. Postal officials try to discourage chain letters in every way possible. However, at the present time, it is not illegal to send a religious or any other kind of chain letter through the mail, as long as it has no monetary aspects and as long as the letter is sent in a sealed envelope. The need for legislation to restrict the mailing of chain letters containing statements implying or predicting harm or misfortune to recipients failing to follow the specified instructions is discussed in the following newspaper article written by a St. Petersburg Independent columnist, Mr. Ron Wiggins:

### PRAYER CHAIN LETTER CURSED?

(By Ron Wiggins)

This morning I received a chain letter "for good luck."

At the top of the letter it says: "Think a prayer."

Just below that it says: "Trust in the Lord with all your heart and all will acknowledge him and he will light your way."

The letter explains itself. It originated in the Netherlands and claims to have been "around the world nine times."

My good luck, it says, is on the way. "You are to receive good luck within four days after receiving this letter. It is no joke. You will receive it in the mail. Send 20 copies of this letter to friends you think need good luck."

I am further instructed to send no money and to complete my mailings within 90 hours.

So far, I am intrigued by the proposition, especially the part where I am to receive "good luck" in the mails. You see, I sent a short story to a magazine two weeks ago and I would certainly account it good news if they sent me a check.

And if I understand the letter, the good luck is already on the way, that's out of my



hands. Unfortunately, bad luck is in store if I fail to keep the letter going. Let me give you the rest of it.

"Do not keep this letter, It must leave within 90 hours after you receive it. A U.S. officer received \$7,000. Don Elliott received \$60,000, but lost it because he broke the chain.

"While in the Philippines, General Walsh lost his life six days after he received the letter. He failed to circulate the prayer. However, before his death he received \$775,000 which he had won.

"Please send 20 copies and after you do, see what happens to you on the fourth day. Add your name to the bottom of the list and leave off the top name when copying the letter."

Notice how the letter is sketchy on the interesting parts. Who is the U.S. officer who received \$7,000? Who is "Don Elliott," how did he come by this \$60,000, and how did he lose it?

What is General Walsh's first name? How did he win the \$775,000? What caused his death? World War II perhaps?

How does our omniscient creator of this letter stay abreast of the fortunes of the recipients? He (or she) has a lot of people to keep track of.

For example, if I sent my 20 copies to people in St. Petersburg and if they in turn mailed 20 copies and so on down the line, it would take only four mailings to run the recipients up to 160,000 persons.

Seven mailings would reach a number of people equal to 20 to the sixth power (20 times 20 times 20 times 20 times 20 times 20) which equals more than 1-billion persons.

An additional mailing, again with everyone participating, would equal 25-billion or more than six times the number of people on earth. You will admit that's quite a workout for the ZIP code.

Now, I'll tell you what I think about these chain prayer letters. I think they're garbage. Here is my translation of what a "prayer" writer is saying:

"Because I have written you, God is going to do something nice for you. But I have also wished a curse upon you. Either you invest \$1.60 worth of postage and hours of your time reproducing this letter or God will cause you a calamity."

Even if I believed God puts his terrible swift sword in the hands of every lunatic with a typewriter, I would still throw the letter away for the sake of the next 20 persons. At best, the letter is a source of anxiety to the impressionable.

I called postal authorities to see if the threats implied in the letter are illegal, and I am grieved to report that the Post Office has no legal recourse against matters of prayer letters.

"It is not illegal but we are dead set against them," stated Postal Inspector Fred Rader of Tampa.

On reflection, I have decided to send out copies of this letter after all. Copies will go to U.S. Rep. Bill Young, and U.S. Sens. Lawton Chiles and Ed Gurney. Perhaps they can help tighten up the postal laws.

I am today introducing a bill which, I feel, can effectively deal with this problem without violating any constitutional provisions. Under my proposal, any chain letter containing predictions of misfortune to recipients and all other chain letters otherwise legally acceptable in the mail must be clearly marked with the sender's name and return address, as well as the following notice: "Unsolicited chain letter." My bill also provides postal patrons an opportunity to register with postal officials their desire not to receive chain letters from any mailer, similar to the law already on the books relative

to the receipt of sexually oriented advertisements.

Mr. Speaker, the right to protect one's home from unwanted, uninvited, threatening material is essential, and I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this long overdue legislation.

## WE'RE SPENDING OUR WAY TO DISASTER

### HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee is a lawmaker whose name is synonymous with fiscal soundness. His article in the April 1972 issue of Nation's Business can only enhance his well-deserved reputation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House and only wish it could be "required reading" at every level of government. The article follows:

#### WE'RE SPENDING OUR WAY TO DISASTER (By Representative GEORGE H. MAHON)

The United States Government is headed toward the fiscal shoals.

No government, not even the richest on earth, can continue to overspend, or under-tax, by multi-billions of dollars nearly every year and still not eventually plunge itself into financial disaster.

The budget submitted to Congress in January projects deficits of \$38.8 billion in the current fiscal year and \$25.5 billion in the 1973 fiscal year starting July 1.

But these figures understate the severe financial crunch in general federal funds.

If you eliminate the trust fund surpluses (from Social Security and other sources) that are counted in the so-called "unified" budget from which the figures are taken, the deficit for the current fiscal year will be an estimated \$44.7 billion.

That is the true deficit.

By the same method, the 1973 deficit is now estimated at \$36.2 billion. In other words, in these two consecutive years alone we stand to really go in the red by an additional \$80.9 billion!

And we still face 14 months of uncertainties and relentless pressures before the books finally close on fiscal 1973.

Counting the new budget, in the last 43 years we have had deficits in 32 years, good times and bad times, no matter what budget concept is used. Eliminating the trust fund surpluses, we have had 37 deficits in 43 years.

Just in fiscal years 1970 through 1973, the national debt—a debt that casts a heavy shadow over coming generations—will have soared from \$367 billion to an incredible \$490 billion, and maybe higher if the new budget projections don't hold.

In other words, about one fourth of that enormous debt is being piled up in this four-year period alone!

We are spending over \$21 billion a year just to pay interest on the debt. That sum was sufficient to run the entire federal establishment only about 30 years ago.

The trend is toward larger and larger deficits. They are almost a national habit. We went into the red about \$10 billion a year during the Sixties. Thus far in the Seventies we are going in debt at nearly four times that rate. This is a dismal picture of a nation spending itself toward oblivion.

How long do the American people think

they can afford that track record, or anything like it?

#### SHARING THE BLAME

Who is to blame for the distressing record? The President? The Congress? The American people? I think nearly all of us are. Large segments of the population tend to demand more and more government services, and at the same time there is a demand for lower taxes.

Public attitudes shape the ultimate course of events—for better or worse. You can't spend what you haven't got without going in the hole.

There are times when that is unavoidable—but was it unavoidable in 37 of the last 43 years?

This is an election year and the usual pressures are magnified. The emphasis is on spending, not on finding ways to raise revenues to pay the bills. To yield to these forces is to water the seeds of our destruction.

I, along with others, have said many times over the years that we must restrain government spending if we are ever to secure and maintain fiscal stability. There simply are not enough dollars in the national till to pay for all the programs that a majority might agree are worthwhile when considered independently of the fiscal realities.

Everybody knows that a need can be demonstrated for more money—for education, for research to cure cancer, for essential flood control projects, for weather forecasting, for many other purposes. Our population and economy are growing, and our general living standard is rising.

We do need to take closer note of our really urgent needs and to evaluate our priorities more sharply. National survival is our No. 1 priority, as everybody knows. We therefore must spend whatever is necessary to defend ourselves and our way of life—or why bother about much else?

But most of all, I believe, we need to equate federal programs—not to mention state and local programs—with the willingness of the American people to pay the bill. We are not doing this, and as far as I can determine there is no assured plan to do so. The realization that he who dances must pay the fiddler seems to be disappearing from our philosophy.

The 1973 budget says that "deficit spending at this time, like temporary wage and price controls, is strong but necessary medicine." I contend that deficit spending is more like soothing syrup than strong medicine. A majority will generally favor spending more and paying less. We have taken this soothing syrup too long.

The point has been made many times: No democracy can avoid collapse if it ignores what is undeniably strong medicine—national discipline and restraint.

#### PAY AS YOU GO

We are to some considerable extent an undisciplined people, but we cannot continue to go on this way. The American system cannot survive independently with high rates of inflation, an escalating national debt—and one of their root causes—whopping deficits which are simply the result of spending beyond revenues in hand or in sight.

I have a rather straightforward philosophy about federal spending. Except in time of war or deep emergency, why not restrict public spending to the revenues in hand or in sight? Pay for it or put it off until we are willing or able to do so.

Does anyone really believe that with deficits in the \$20 billion to \$40 billion range we can win the fight against inflation or stabilize the economy?

In this fiscal year alone, the government will have to borrow about \$45 billion to pay its bills. That means, in part, borrowing from the highway, Social Security and other trust

funds. But most of the borrowing will have to be from the private sector—about \$38 to \$40 billion. Borrowing these huge amounts will no doubt have a marked effect on the economy.

A principal current objective is to help stimulate the economy. The long-run effect can well be inflationary. More and more deficit spending is just not the long-run answer to our economic problems. All Presidents tend to look at the economic future through rose-colored glasses. They understandably seek to be as optimistic as possible. Their original budgets reflect it. But we know from hard experience that uncertainties and contingencies tend to alter the picture; the realizations often do not match the projections.

The all too frequent end result: New—and often bigger—deficits are piled atop old ones. The \$38.8 billion unified budget deficit for fiscal year 1972 originally was estimated at \$11.6 billion.

#### PLAY-WORLD BUDGETING

I am sure most Americans are confused when they read about a federal funds budget, a unified budget and, now, a full employment budget.

The federal funds budget deals solely with estimates of general Treasury revenues and expenditures, exclusive of those earmarked a unified budget and, now, a full employment and other trust funds.

The unified budget was introduced a few years ago. As I mentioned earlier, it reflects all receipts and outlays of the federal government, including those of the trust funds.

For fiscal year 1972 President Nixon presented the full employment budget as the declared foundation for the federal budget. This concept is not new to economists, but never before had it been the official yardstick for budget expenditure policy.

Full employment budgeting asks us to play like we had a full employment economy—actually, that unemployment is reduced to about 4 per cent. It asks us to play like the federal government had all the revenues that full employment would produce. Under the ground rules, we then relate what is actually proposed to be spent with these imaginary revenues and produce a play-world surplus.

All this is supposed to influence what actually happens and benefit us in the end—or at least shield us from fiscal harm. The theory is that a budget deficit is not bad, not inflationary, if spending doesn't exceed the play-like revenues.

It seems to me there are grounds for saying that this pretending does in fact influence what actually happens, but *not* to our benefit. We are lulled to some extent by our play-world surplus into complacency. Sugar-coated deficits, so it would suggest, are to be preferred over fiscal discipline as a "strong medicine," so we continue to spend more than we actually have.

Glossing over real-world figures that were drenched in red ink—I think it can be said—helped lower our guard in fiscal year 1972 to the point that we are now running an estimated \$8 billion deficit even in terms of the full employment budget. Alice could afford to live in Wonderland. We cannot.

What is to be done? How do we use budget and fiscal policy to attack the scourge of inflation and get our fiscal house in better order? To begin with, obviously, we must focus our attention on our real-world deficits. We are faced with a budget that is basically out of balance, and a primary reason for this is a shortfall in revenues.

#### REVENUE AND A FACT OF LIFE

Take last session. The net result of all Congressional actions and inactions on estimated fiscal 1972 budget spending was about a standoff, yet the unified budget deficit skyrocketed \$27.2 billion over the original \$11.6 billion estimate.

Spending increased over the estimate by \$7.4 billion, but \$6 billion of that was in the so-called relatively uncontrollable programs more or less mandatory under present laws.

Revenues, on the other hand, dropped \$19.8 billion from projections. Economic sluggishness and overly optimistic revenue projections accounted for the major part of the falloff, but tax reduction played a part. Congress cut taxes by about \$15 billion over a three-year period.

The main fact of life we must face is that the American people seem to want the public goods and the jobs that government produces. Merely approving the new legislative initiatives proposed in the 1973 budget would result in added costs of about \$33 billion by the fifth year.

Last year we voted \$1.5 billion for an accelerated war against cancer. The President proposes development of a space shuttle. It will cost billions, but provide badly needed jobs. This year, Congress is besieged by a proliferation of groups pressing for full funding of their particular programs in areas of health, education and so on.

Congress, in the last few sessions, has been engaged in the reordering of priorities that some still call for. We have added monies for education, health, the environment, while we have reduced in the areas of defense and foreign aid.

There is a limit to which the trade-off with defense can be carried. In my judgment we have about reached it. No longer can Congress safely make large reductions in the defense budget to finance increases in domestic programs. I agree wholeheartedly with the President that in the interest of peace and in our own defense we must accelerate our defense programs unless meaningful international agreements are reached which reduce the need.

The outlook is not good for actually restraining spending by anything like the large amounts necessary to offset our huge deficits. But that is only one side of the budget.

Five times in the last 16 years we have cut the federal income tax (we increased it in 1968 when the nation was facing a financial crisis in part related to the war in Viet Nam). The new budget message points out that individuals will be paying \$22 billion less in federal income taxes in 1973 as a result of changes in the tax structure since President Nixon took office.

We have reduced income to the point where the annual increase in revenues resulting from the growth of the economy will barely cover the built-in costs of our ongoing programs—let alone finance new initiatives, whether of the President or of Congress. And new initiatives come along all the time.

Let me end by saying—as I have said in the House of Representatives—that in my judgment we have about reached the fiscal crossroads.

Even the most unsophisticated student of the fiscal situation must agree that when the new Administration takes office next January, there will have to be a dramatic reduction in government spending or action will have to be taken to increase revenues. Otherwise, we shall be that much closer to certain fiscal disaster.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 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?

#### SBA LOSES OUTSTANDING ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, when A. H. Singer leaves his position as associate administrator for investment of the Small Business Administration, it will not only be a loss to SBA, to the SBIC industry, but a loss to the many thousands of small businesses throughout the Nation that are seeking equity capital and long-term loans through the investment company program.

Art Singer has served as associate administrator for investment for 3 years—having been appointed to that position March 10, 1969. This tenure of office is a record. He has served longer than any other person in that important position since the passage of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

He has served with distinction and honor. He has been an administrator of the first water. As a regulator, he has been firm but fair. He has brought a business approach with all its practical aspects to a program long in need of such an approach.

During his tenure, the SBIC industry has been placed on a more firm and stable basis than at any other time in the act's 13-year history.

Art Singer has done much to turn around the image of a vital program. His untiring efforts have brought the reputation of the industry to its highest point and to a position of prestige in the financial community.

During the years, since the enactment of the Small Business Investment Act, the single and most important factor that has prevented the expansion and growth of the small business investment company industry has been the lack of continuity of leverage funds which is vital. Art Singer fought hard and long to alleviate this deterrent to the stabilization and growth of the industry. Last December, the Congress passed and the President signed into law, Public Law 92-213, which will provide a stable and ready source of funding for SBIC's essential in providing this institutional source of capital for small business. This legislation is also a major step to facilitate private sector participation in long-term debt capitalization of the SBIC industry.

I was proud to have played a part in that legislation and I personally know the position that Art Singer played in providing Congress with full justification for its consideration and enactment.

He has streamlined the investment division and did much to eliminate duplication, excess paper work, and has pro-



vided sound direction for the promotion, regulation, and funding under the SBIC program.

Mr. Singer has been a significant moving force in the formation and licensing of minority enterprise small business investment companies. These MESBIC's provided the seed money for socially and economically deprived small businessmen.

A native of El Paso, he has been a successful small businessman. Before coming to Washington, D.C., in 1969, he was president of the Alemite Co., of the Southwest.

He previously served his country with distinction as a combat veteran of World War II. As major in the infantry, he received a bronze star medal, a combat infantryman award, and the Pacific theater medal with three battle stars.

As a Congressman and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I should like to commend and congratulate Mr. Singer for a fine job.

#### THE USE OF TRANQUILIZING DRUGS AND BRAIN SURGERY ON INMATES IN CALIFORNIA STATE PRISONS

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, during the last year, as I have traveled around the country, especially in the State of California, I have noticed an increasing concern on the part of citizens with regard to the treatment afforded persons incarcerated in State prisons as well as the competence of officials who have been entrusted with the control and maintenance of those institutions.

One matter of particular concern has been the suggestion of the use of powerful tranquilizing drugs and brain surgery to control inmate behavior.

Where these programs have been suggested, their voluntary nature and the aggressive and violent nature of the proposed subjects have been emphasized. The comments of Dr. George Bach-Y-Rita of Harvard University are informative in this regard. Dr. Bach-Y-Rita was retained by the California Department of Corrections in connection with the Maximum Psychiatric Diagnostic Unit at the California Medical Facility at Vacaville. This program would have used lobotomy and drugs to control inmates who, allegedly, were prone to violent and aggressive behavior. In abandoning the program, Dr. Bach-Y-Rita was quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner for March 12, 1972 at page 16, section A, as saying:

I decided that prison is not the place to do research. There is pressure on a man to acquiesce, and offering pay under conditions where a man does not have reasonable alternatives other than research is not the same as in a free society. A convict does not volunteer as a free man does.

With regard to the selection mechanism whereby such programs—assuming that all subjects were volunteers—would identify those who were aggressive and violence prone, attention should be given to a paper written by Robert E. Doran, a member of the staff of the California Department of Corrections. This paper illustrates that totally inadequate criteria are used by often incompetent personnel to make decisions with regard to who should be placed in "solitary confinement," called "The Adjustment Center" in California prisons, as being violent, aggressive, or uncontrollable, and who should be released from "solitary confinement." There are virtually no safeguards against mislabeling.

However, beyond the issue of the "voluntariness" of such programs and the aggressive and violent nature of the subjects, most persons who have addressed me on this subject have expressed a moral revulsion at the notion of the State attempting mind or thought control. There is a certain immorality associated with the imposition of controls over the individual's mind by most civilized people. Having deprived a prisoner of all self-determination, having assumed absolute control over his behavior, the State now seeks to possess his mind: to create a passive, docile automaton. This is the moral question which has been raised throughout this country with regard to chemotherapy.

Not only is there concern with regard to the morality and ethics of chemotherapy, but there is a political concern. Already, we are aware that the "adjustment centers" of the California prison system are being used more and more to house the concerned and activist blacks who refuse to surrender their dignity and their minds to the State. Activists in the prison reform movement see the suggestion for chemotherapy as a new technique for solving what is perceived by prison officials as an increasing problem: control of black militants within the prison population. Having been unable to break and silence the militants with solitary confinement, prison activists feel that the prison officials have now hit upon programs of chemical therapy to silence them, to convert them into mindless model prisoners.

To allow such programs to be established is once again to attack the symptom and to completely ignore the cause. The underlying cause of militancy in our prisons is the complete denial of the humanity of the inmate; the total deprivation of any semblance of self-determination and dignity. The existence of a virile and rampant racism both within and without the walls is also a substantial factor. Rather than attacking the inmate we should attack the underlying conditions and causes. This phenomenon was best expressed by Mr. George Jackson, a former inmate of San Quentin prison, who was killed on August 21, 1971. In Soledad Brother he declared:

The text books on criminology like to advance the idea that prisoners are mentally defective. There is only the merest suggestion that the system itself is at fault. Penologists regard prisons as asylums. Most policy is formulated in a bureau that operates under

the heading Department of Corrections. But what can we say about these asylums since none of the inmates are ever cured. Since in every instance they are sent out of the prison more damaged physically and mentally than when they entered. Because that is the reality. Do you continue to investigate the inmate? Where does administrative responsibility begin? Perhaps the administration of the prison cannot be held accountable for every individual act of their charges, but when things fly apart along racial lines, when the breakdown can be traced so clearly to circumstances even beyond the control of the guards and administration, investigation of anything outside the tenets of the fascist system itself is futile.

To permit the use of Federal funds for the support of programs designed to control inmate behavior through the use of chemical tranquilizers and surgery is immoral and should be made illegal. To permit tampering with the minds of militants under the guise of programs to control violent and aggressive inmates is immoral, inhumane, and unconstitutional.

#### FAIR HOUSING ESSAY AND POSTER CONTEST OF COLORADO

**HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure today to meet with the winners of the First Annual Colorado Fair Housing Essay and Poster Contest, which was sponsored by Region Eight officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and by the Colorado Department of Education and the Catholic Education Office of Denver.

More than 2,000 seventh through ninth grade students throughout the State of Colorado participated in the contest.

The three essay winners were Carol Cook of Timnath School, Timnath; Deanna Kay Saucedo and John Wisotski, both of J. F. Kennedy Junior High School in Denver. The Poster winners were Wendy Bruce, Cheyenne Mountain Junior High School, Colorado Springs; and Amy Guy, West Jefferson Junior High School, Littleton.

The three essay and two poster winners are presently enjoying an all-expense paid trip to Washington. They are accompanied by Robert Barela, Assistant Regional Administrator for Equal Opportunity of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Denver; Sister Rosemary Wilcox of the Denver Catholic Archdiocese and June C. Radtke of HUD in Denver.

While I cannot share with the House the actual Fair Housing Posters, I can share the Fair Housing Essays which I call to the attention of my colleagues.

The essays follow:

TIMNATH, COLO.

THE ARCHIE BUNKERS OF AMERICA

Well, here we are, in a supposedly "free" country, and we have to have a law that says that the "different" people in our society can buy a house.

It makes me sad to think that we, the people of the United States of America, need a law against discrimination. Unfortunately, the "Archie Bunkers" of America make this law necessary.

I have mixed feelings about this law. I am glad that everybody can buy the house they want and that they can afford. But it makes me sad that they can buy their house, and they can't buy their neighbors' friendship. What I mean is, just because that person, (of the minority) is able to buy his house, doesn't mean that his neighbor will accept him. So really, the law doesn't solve everything. Maybe if the so-called "Archie Bunkers" would put themselves in the minority, they would realize what's happening. Perhaps if more people would think about how our "free" country was supposed to be according to our Constitution and Bill of Rights, it might become a reality.

I hope the whole world doesn't become this way. Maybe with today's younger generation, things will change.

CAROL J. COOK.

#### WHAT FAIR HOUSING MEANS TO ME

A man once said, "I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal.'" This man was Martin Luther King, a man who shared his dream with anyone who was willing to share and gave to anyone who was willing to accept. He was my brother.

I believe that fair housing cannot begin with fair housing, it must begin with a miracle called brotherhood. What is brotherhood? I asked myself, I did not know. I asked a small child, he replied, "A word—or is it two words? I dunno." Is this what we teach our children? That brotherhood is merely a word? I took it upon myself to find the meaning of the word brotherhood. First I searched within myself, I found that brotherhood was in each of our hearts, it was like a tiny tree trying to thrive, but something kept crushing the tiny tree. I wanted to find what crushed the tiny tree, I found only one thing, something called prejudice. I found that prejudice was in each of our hearts also, but it was a small weed. It too was crushed, but to grow it only needed a touch of darkness and hate, and when it received this it grew and grew. But this weed could be rid of, it just had to be pulled and thrown away. It grows back very quickly but a little smaller this time. Again it is pulled and it grows but still smaller, until there is nothing left of the weed. The small tree has gained strength from the new light and now it grows and flourishes. Yes, it takes time but it is worth every second in the end.

I had found what brotherhood was inside each of us, but what is brotherhood when many of us are together? I thought maybe it was like a forest, all the trees fighting to see the new light. But what if there were too many weeds? And soon the small trees were crushed and the weeds were strangling each other in the mass of darkness and hate. Then brother would hate brother and each would hate himself. But if each man would be led by his heart, then the trees would find that lost light and brother would find brother and walk together as one.

I searched myself and I guess I've searched you too, just to find the meaning of the word brotherhood. I found good and I found bad, but mostly I found what I was searching for. Again I ask myself, "What is brotherhood?" and my only answer is "Brotherhood is when a man may live where he wants, with whom he wants and how he wants." This is the answer I found. Have you found an answer? Ask yourself "What is brotherhood?"

DEANNA KAY SAUCEDA.

#### WHAT FAIR HOUSING MEANS TO ME

Two years ago, a Spanish-surnamed family moved into our neighborhood, which is a typical, white, middle-class area.

Soon after they had moved into their new home, my family and I left for an extended vacation. While we were away, our grandfather was staying alone with our home. Our new neighbors visited him often and took him to the shopping center several times. I felt this was something extraordinary for these people to do, since they had only met us once.

After returning from our vacation, we became more acquainted with them. One of their daughters, who was then attending college, is an artist. One evening, she spent many hours helping my sister with an art project. I feel she is an outstanding person, because of all the time which she had taken out of her busy college schedule to do this.

The family's son, who is in elementary school, also has artistic talent. He has drawn a picture of our house for my mother, and it is something which she treasures.

The oldest daughter's concern for others is shown in the career which she has chosen. She is now a full-time speech therapist in the Denver Public Schools. Their youngest children are two little girls who occasionally come by to say "Hi!" and spread a little sunshine.

Late last summer, we visited their home for an authentic Mexican dinner. Near Christmastime, their mother took a Saturday out of the busy holiday season to teach my sister how to make Mexican cookies.

Fair Housing means a great deal to me. If it had not been for Fair Housing Laws, this Spanish-surnamed family may not have been able to move into our neighborhood. This would have deprived my family and I of a warm, lasting, and meaningful friendship and the opportunity to learn about their culture.

JOHN B. WISOTSKI.

#### A TRIBUTE TO HARRY ASHTON STRANGE, EASTERN REGIONAL PRESIDENT, FOE

#### HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in honor of a distinguished constituent, Harry Ashton Strange, of Millville, N.J.

The occasion for this honor will be a testimonial dinner on Saturday, April 15, 1972, in Millville. I have the honor of being guest speaker.

Harry Strange currently is serving with distinction as eastern regional president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles and it will be members of this fine organization from throughout New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania who will join me in honoring him Saturday evening.

While on leave from the Navy in December 1945, Harry's father and Arthur Styles, a past worthy president of Millville Aerie of Eagles 1836, signed up the young sailor as a member of the fraternal order.

Harry served on a number of committees in the Millville Aerie and in 1952 was elected into office. He served as Aerie president in 1953 and 1954, then as

trustee from 1957 until 1960 then as district three president.

Elected New Jersey State president of the fraternal order for 1959 and 1960, Harry Ashton Strange continues his dedicated service now as regional president.

Harry and his devoted wife Mary reside on Burns Road in Millville.

#### COLLINS' STATESMANLIKE PROPOSALS

#### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic situation in Northern Ireland is a matter which concerns all of us. It is a problem which has been much discussed in the United States and is one to which the best thinking of all citizens of the world must be directed to offer solutions which might bring the conflict to a close.

At the 75th biennial national convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America held in August 1970, a good friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Cornelius J. Collins, national vice president of that order, to which I am honored to belong, made an excellent contribution to this discussion in his report to the convention. Mr. Collins' moderate, compassionate, and reasonable address has now been printed in the January-February issue of the National Hibernian Digest. His remarks are worth considering by all of us, and I present them at this point for the consideration of my colleagues:

#### REPORT OF NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT CORNELIUS J. COLLINS

Thank you, Mr. President, Msgr. Lawlor, Reverend Fathers, my fellow National Officers, my fellow delegates to this National Convention, let me express my appreciation for the confidence you have shown in me as your National Vice President for the past two years. I am deeply grateful for the opportunity I have had to travel throughout this country to help to build Hibernianism stronger. It has enabled me to see the very real difficulties which we face, in trying to maintain an expanding and vigorous Order, and in especially trying to reach the youth of our people.

I believe it is our duty, however, of the present members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians to suggest solutions to the problem of increasing our membership.

May I offer briefly a suggestion which I hope you will give serious thought to in the near future.

I believe that the next National Board should consider offering a modest insurance plan to its members. It can help, and I am certain it can be done at little expense and a great benefit to Hibernianism. We know how such a plan has helped the Knights of Columbus expand and prosper.

I hope this Board will give it a high priority in its consideration.

Now let me turn to a matter which must be of great concern to all of us. Even though some of us aspire to high office to the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, no one in this world today can ignore the tragic and explosive situation in



Northern Ireland. We all wish the situation did not exist, but it does. It won't disappear, and we cannot hide from it. We cannot pretend that this problem is not there. And England is the problem.

Those who speak for England, Mr. Paisley for example, who sits in the British House of Commons, as well as in the Ulster Parliament, tell us that the war in Ireland is religious. He even disrupts an Ecumenical Mass in a country not his own for the sake of airing his propaganda. The sad truth is that the victim of English oppression in the North is the common man, be he Catholic or Protestant. The oppressors are not interested in religion of any kind. They are interested in keeping the poor people down. They want to deprive the mass of our people of their proper place in justice and law.

It is clear that religion is not the cause of the problem. Four major churches of North and South standing together in a tighter ecumenical partnership than has existed in a generation, William Cardinal Conway, the Prelate of Ireland and Archbishop of Armagh, sacred to the memory of St. Patrick who distribute our funds in the Northern Relief Campaign in Ireland, the Rev. John Carlin of the Presbyterian Church has joined him in seeking an end to the war. Their position is supported by Archbishop of Dublin George Sims, and by Rev. George Good, President of the Methodist Church. So the religious speak out with one voice.

We see, therefore, that violence could quickly be ended if the extremists would lay off.

As I noted in my travels last year to Ireland, the Orangemen are still fighting the wearing of the green. 26 counties free in 1922, and 6 still cry for freedom. The problem is complex, and there is no easy solution. But we must recognize the tragedy and we must search for a solution.

There are those here today who may want to seek high office who would have us ignore the tragedy. They would have believe it is none of our business, but may I humbly offer a suggestion which I believe to be the first step towards a solution. We must convince our Senators and our Congressmen that if the peace keeping force of the United Nations should replace the militant British troops immediately, then a solution can be worked out in peace.

There may yet come a time when the only proper course will be violent oppression with united action.

Let us not shrink from our duty if the day should come to pass. But let us do all in our power to exhaust all peaceful remedies.

The United Nations has acted in several areas to combat oppressions; Korea, Vietnam and the Far East, and we never forget the brave Irish soldiers who died to bring peace to the Congo.

We can pressure our elected officers to get the United Nations' support, and we should pressure our President to warn England to stop oppressing the people of the North. England owes her very existence to the United States of America, and the United States of America owes much of its success and property to Irish stock. Certainly it is not too much for the United States to help Ireland, if only in the form of officially protesting England's policies in the North. Aren't we at least as deserving as South Vietnam?

Let us not forget the history, the background of the current crisis in the North of Ireland. The debate can range far across the sea, where some of the blame lies, where the blame lies, or where none of it lies. But today I do say to you, the time for debate is past. The time for work and shame has gone. Leave to the historians of the future to render the verdict. We will have faith in that verdict for we know the truth, and now the time for deeds of faith, the support of the government of the United States and the physical support of the United States and the

physical support of the United Nations peace keeping force. We cannot sit idly by watching the conflict grow hotter and hotter.

We cannot simply watch the flame consume the hope and the ambitions, and, yes, even the very lives of the oppressed people of Northern Ireland. Now is the time for candid deliberations, deeds which would go out to the serious dedicated concern for the lives and welfare of our fellow beings.

I ask each of you listening to me today, each of you to heed this message and to carry it back to your Hibernians when you return home. If we work together, we can succeed together, and each of us can be the spark that will ignite the heart of our people to join together in this noble cause.

Let us heed the word of a recent United States Chaplain who said, "I am only a man, but I am a man, what can I do? What should I do, and what I should do, with the grace of God I shall do."

Thank you very much. God bless you.

## CONGRESSMAN WALDIE SURVEYS OUR "DANGEROUS PLANET"

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have long considered our colleague, JERRY WALDIE, one of the more articulate Members of this body. And while JERRY needs no testimonials from me, he has demonstrated anew his way with words in an article, "Warning: This Planet Is Dangerous to Your Health," which he wrote for the United Christian Herald.

And while most of the rest of us must absorb much of what we know of the environment vicariously, the rugged Mr. WALDIE backpacks right to the scene. His report describes conclusions reached during a 55-mile hike through the High Sierras with his teenage sons.

But of far greater importance than his commendable prose style and physical condition is the high degree of perception with which JERRY regards the ongoing struggle between man and nature.

The solutions he offers are not easy ones, calling as they do for considerable reordering of our sense of values—but they should appeal to anyone who truly cares about the quality of the world we live in.

JERRY's article follows:

WARNING: THIS PLANET IS DANGEROUS  
TO YOUR HEALTH!

During a recent congressional recess, my two teenage sons, Jon and Jeff, and I took a ten-day back-packing trip in the Sierra-Nevada Mountains. We started east of Bass Lake and hiked over Isberg Pass down into Yosemite Valley, a total of 55 miles with several detours, to fish the high, cold lakes.

It was good to test ourselves against the mountains to see if we could still cope on a more fundamental level. We waded the rushing streams and ate what we caught, packing any extra trout in wet moss for a later meal. And the silence of rock and sky did not interfere with the things that needed to be said between the busy congressman who operates on one intense Washington schedule and his sons who usually operate on another.

The Sierras are a beautiful and formidable mystery. As a boy growing up in a slower, less crowded, pre-war California, that range of mountains lived in my imagination with

legends of the Donner Party, Kit Carson and one of America's first ecologists, the prophetic John Muir, founder of the Sierra Club.

These mountains were the last barrier our western-moving ancestors had to surmount. Advancing with little but courage, they regarded the wilderness as an adversary. And finally they tamed it.

Today we still tend to believe that the great West is wild. Our frontier psychology persists, fostered perhaps by TV horse-operators and movies, long after the necessity for such an aggressive stance toward nature has passed. We still believe in the virtue of rugged individualism which glorifies the domineering self over nature and community. But, to our grief, nature has been mastered and nearly mutilated, and community is a languishing ideal in our beleaguered cities.

The frontier has faded like a dream; the city is the reality for two-thirds of all Americans.

Most of us go to nature to find a few days' release from the anxieties and ills of urban living. Imagine my sincere concern, then, hiking through the high country, to find signs of city-bred carelessness everywhere—littered paper and containers, reckless trail-blazing and over-use of campsites and facilities.

My son Jon pointed out that though we rarely saw wildlife, we passed hundreds of backpackers. As we climbed down out of the Sierras into Yosemite Valley, John Muir's "untouched paradise," the debris seemed to mount higher.

I drew a couple of conclusions from our tough 10-day trek. One was that a man in his 40s has to be in good physical shape to match his teenage sons and the wild country. The other was that access to wilderness areas must never be "improved." Roads, pleasure trails, ski lifts not only destroy scenery, they overturn undergrowth, trees and the very earth itself, crowding animals into an ever-shrinking area.

Of course backpacking isn't the most serious threat to our environment. But it is in the wilderness that we feel most cheated when we discover that human misuse has scarred yet more of nature's beauty. In the city we have come to accept pollution as an expected byproduct of "progress." But we still expect the high country to be pure.

In my home county, Contra Costa, northeast of San Francisco, there is a mountain less than 4,000 feet high. Mount Diablo stands on the edge of the great Central Valley of California. From its crest one used to be able to see more of the earth's surface than from any other place in the world save one: Mount Kilimanjaro rearing up from the African plains. It was a panorama which rivaled that of man's first view from a space capsule—from the silver, snow-capped line of the Sierras 150 miles to the east to the craggy cliffs of the Farrallon Islands 30 miles outside the Golden Gate.

Today there are times when you can barely see the mountain from the smog-infested valley below.

Who's to blame? Through what unconscious waste has the California and America of our youth vanished?

Without wasting time in futile recrimination, we need to take an objective look at the condition of our environment, and then to act swiftly on what we discover.

Here's my thumbnail assessment of the condition of our national ecology.

Air—Some people imagine that with all the talk about air pollution things are getting better, but the fact is that air quality slipped again in 1971.

The worst pollutants are: sulphur dioxide, produced by coal-burning factories like electric plants, irritates the respiratory tract; soot and ash, also from coal burning, can cause gastric cancer, and carbon monoxide, released from the incomplete burning of

gasoline in cars and trucks, puts an extra burden on anemic persons and also damages hearts. Deaths from all respiratory ailments are on the rise.

Air pollution is also killing plant life, which produces the oxygen we need. The pollutants blowing out of Los Angeles are killing Ponderosa pines 100 miles away.

According to the National Wildlife Federation, the total cost to your family in medical bills and in taxes to clean the air is now about \$310 a year and must go higher.

Water—Industrial waste dumped into rivers and bays is the cause of 65 percent of our water pollution. Paper companies, organic chemical firms and the petroleum industries are the greatest offenders. Municipalities pour in another 20 percent of the waste, and the run-off from our farms contributes the last 15 percent.

There are over 1,000 oil spills from ships and wells every year.

A survey of 969 public water systems showed that 41 percent delivered inferior quality water and nine percent delivered potentially dangerous water.

Americans are removing fresh water from underground sources twice as fast as it can be replenished. By 1980 we will need 700 billion gallons, but only 650 billion gallons will be available under the earth.

Near Phoenix, Ariz., so much water has been removed from the underground that the earth's surface is beginning to sink and crack.

The one bright light is that public action helped halt the slide toward worsening water quality in 1971. But it will take a five-year investment of over \$40 billion to bring our water up to a decent standard—a fair portion of this expense, I believe, must come from the industries that contribute to pollution.

Another task for the public is the transformation of its own preconceptions. In the western United States there is a traditional demand for more and more water resources. Believe it or not there is a plan to bring water from Canada to irrigate crops in the Southwest—crops that could grow in other parts of the U.S. simply by the rainfall. I believe citizens have to put pressure on governmental agencies like the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior to consider nation-wide water management.

Land—Each year about two million acres of soil are lost from crop production. Half, fortunately, is preserved in parks and wildlife reserves, but the other half disappears under highways, airports, the urban sprawl and the waters of flood-control systems.

We occupy the land in 12 gigantic metropolitan centers. By the year 2000, 70 percent of our people will be crowded into only 10 percent of the land—with all the problems of over-population.

Animals—In 1968 there were 78 endangered species in the United States alone; by 1971 that number had risen to 101. Man's encroachment of land is the most serious threat—every highway and housing development steals habitat from all other life forms, most of which cannot readily adapt to just any kind of environment.

The canvasback duck population has fallen 25 percent in five years. Sightings of the California condor dropped 50 percent in 1970 alone.

Chemicals, like mercury, in our rivers and lakes are killing fish, and DDT spread throughout the food chain is killing birds by softening eggshells, thus preventing hatching. Endangered species can be incubated by artificial means, as is being done in several universities, but the question now has to be to share the earth with us, or do we want only caged, laboratory animals?

Minerals—Most of us act as if we believe that the mineral wealth of the earth is virtually unlimited. But calculating from known reserves and the increasing rate of consumption, it is estimated that we have remaining about 20 years worth of zinc, 30 years of tin and petroleum and 35 years of copper and uranium.

But the time Jon and Jeff grow to be my age, many of the minerals so necessary for sustaining modern civilization may be depleted.

At the root of the peril in each sector of our environment is not merely industrial carelessness, but the sheer number of human beings alive today—everyone hungry for food, space, air, water and wealth. The way each of us uses the earth and then disposes of what we use affects the ecological balance.

We Americans are energy and resource glutted. With only six percent of the world's population we consume 30 percent of the world's energy. We are used to regarding figures like that with nationalistic pride because we have been taught that the biggest is best, and that any kind of increase, any kind of growth, is progress.

We know from science that there is another kind of growth in organisms which is deadly—cancer, a runaway growth of cells. Is there such a wild, runaway growth in our technological society? If there is we have to learn to heal ourselves.

And we will have to do it without cutting back on job opportunities. There is a notion among some people who know a little about ecology that the solution to our problems is to cut back on production and to constrain technology. That is an easy thing to entertain as an idea, but pretty hard to "swallow" when you lose your job, as have 100,000 aerospace engineers in Seattle and Los Angeles.

As Peter F. Drucker, the social scientist, stressed recently in an article in Harper's Magazine, "Most environmental problems require technological solutions. To control our biggest water pollutant, human wastes, we will have to draw on all sciences and technologies from biochemistry to thermodynamics."

Our main task is not to constrain our technical advance, but to change its direction—that means spelling out new national priorities that are consonant with peaceful aims, Christian sensitivity and ecological rationality.

The billions that we spend on war contribute to the waste of our land. The major public product of the military industrial complex is fear. By selling fear to Americans, the vested war interests hope to expand their systems geared to manufacture destruction.

We must have the courage to deny that fear, and to say we want employment with peace. We want scientists and engineers of peace, so that America might be beautiful and bountiful again.

I am one who believes Americans have that kind of courage. The people who crossed the Rockies and the Sierras can surmount today's problems. What is needed now in America is some cool, clear-headed "pioneer" cost-accounting.

The pioneers faced the dangers and knew what they had to pay to overcome them. We should be as knowledgeable. You may have bought an "economy" car, but recently voted down a mass transit bond. Do you know the total cost of automobiles? Have you figured insurance, repairs, gasoline, and gasoline taxes which support the \$5 billion Highway Trust Fund, courts, accidents, medical expenses and the cost of cleaning up auto-pollution?

Ralph Nader, the consumer advocate, has called the automobile the most inefficient, costly and dangerous invention ever devised by man. And there are many other products we can buy without knowing the total cost.

What can the public do? First, alert the entire population. We have made real gains in this area in the last two years. Many churches have been in the vanguard.

First Congregational UCC in Santa Barbara, Cal., scene of the disastrous oil leakage from off-shore wells, conducted a campaign of community information, alerting people about industrial abuses, home use of detergents and other products and the effects of suburban crowding. The church sponsored an "ecology tour" to show members the effects of waste in their own neighborhoods.

Danville UCC in my home county has also sponsored a variety of informational services on environment, including a newsletter and a series of ecology themes in worship [see Leaders' Digest, page 49].

Our second hope for environmental sanity comes through legislation. More important than the much publicized, but not always effective, government fines would be a program of incentives. Everyone knows how strenuously the automobile manufacturers are fighting emissions controls. If the government were to reward progress in the field with tax incentives, instead of threatening with fines, perhaps the minds of the manufacturers would change.

One of the most useful tools in legislative protection has been created in Michigan. In 1970 the state provided a law which gives any citizen the right to bring suit against polluters even if his own health and property are not being threatened. Each person can now be on guard for wastage of public parks, roads and rivers.

As a congressman, I know how effective letters and visits from concerned citizens are. You can help expand the conscience of your representatives.

Another great hope for putting our house in order is recycling. Here our engineers can really effect progress. New products have already been developed from waste. A revolutionary new "asphalt" made from ground-up glass and shredded tires has been found to last four times longer than conventional highway materials.

Recycling has been found to be economically profitable too. Private enterprise has discovered money in waste. Some churches, like St. Agnes Roman Catholic Parish in Concord, Cal., under the leadership of Father Edmund L. Hayburn, now include gathering of glass and aluminum for recycling as part of their ongoing money-raising projects.

It is estimated that a modern recycling plant in a city of 200,000 could make a profit of \$100,000 a year processing waste and retrieving ferrous metals, glass, paper fiber, aluminum, sand and steam.

Finally, our ultimate hope lies in a new sense of ethics. Ethics have been construed by most of us, for too long, to be only a matter of personal morality—something between an individual and his God. In fact the biblical tradition puts ethics and personal morality in the context of community. We cannot be assured of personal betterment unless the betterment of the whole community of men and women is assured.

In simple language that means pulling together, Americans have been doing it since our inception as a nation—through the wilderness and across the mountains, during two great and terrible wars, and today working together for the establishment of new priorities for peace in the world and in our cities, and for ecological management of the gifts we have been given.

There is no real alternative. We sacrifice and live together, or we will privately prosper but communally perish. I hope that the message we learned on the mountain can be applied in the valleys and cities. For it is among men and women and all living things that our frontier of new promise lies.



THE TRANS-ALASKA VERSUS CANADIAN PIPELINE—THE CANADIAN MINISTER OF ENERGY'S PRESS CONFERENCE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Canadian Government has repeatedly expressed a very grave concern over the possible ecological consequences for the west coast of Canada posed by the trans-Alaska pipeline route. For this, as well as for economic reasons the Canadians have asked the U.S. Government to seriously consider a trans-Canadian oil pipeline route.

I would like to place in the RECORD today the transcript of a recent press conference held in Washington by the Honorable Donald S. Macdonald, the Canadian Minister of Energy, Mines, and Resources. The press conference was held on March 30, 1972, following meetings Mr. Macdonald held with White House Aide Peter Flanagan, General Lincoln, the head of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, and Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton.

The text of Mr. Macdonald's press conference follows:

PRESS CONFERENCE: HON. DONALD S. MACDONALD, MINISTER OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

AIDE. The Minister will have a brief statement to make. And then he'll take questions.

Minister DONALD S. MACDONALD. Thanks, Dick. Ladies and gentlemen, I think most of you know the principal purpose in our coming to Washington at this particular time. That is to get acquainted with a number of the individuals who have been responsible for the United States' side of certain energy questions which are of mutual interest. On this basis, I met Mr. Flanagan in the White House yesterday, General Lincoln this morning of the President's Office for Emergency Preparedness, and, of course, Secretary Rogers Morton a little later in the morning.

The principal purpose in meeting Secretary Morton was to talk to him about what is, of course, an issue of great interest in the United States, but also in Canada, and that was the proposal which has been before the American courts and the American body politic with respect to the construction of a Trans-Alaska pipeline. From the Canadian standpoint, there are two issues which it was useful to make and which I took the opportunity of referring to today. The first was the continuing concern of the Canadian Parliament, the Canadian government, and particularly of Canadians on the West Coast about the prospect of a very massive movement of oil down the West Coast, as a result of a trans-Alaska pipeline and, particularly, into the more confined waters of Puget Sound. The Secretary, I think, recognized the concern which is felt by Canadians on that particular one.

The second purpose was to make it clear to him that the Canadian government is, and has been for some time, interested and preparing for an application, which undoubtedly will be coming sometime towards the end of this year, perhaps early next, for the construction of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline. And because there seems to have been a little uncertainty in the past about the government's intentions and what, in fact, it was doing, I left with the Secretary today a brief resume of the programs that we have under-

way, also with a prognosis as to when we'd be in a position to consider this question.

I think, Dick, there'll be copies available for the conference; the purpose really being to supplement the information that the administration already has with regard to the Canadian activities, particularly with regard to the fifteen million dollar program that we've had underway by way of environmental and other studies to prepare for a pipeline application. And the talk this morning was interesting, of course, from the opportunity of meeting the Secretary, but also from the standpoint of hearing firsthand his viewpoints, particularly with regard to this issue.

So if there're any questions, I'll be glad to respond to them.

Q. Mr. Macdonald, what kind of reaction did you get to the idea that Canada would like to combine with the U.S. to build this pipeline?

Minister MACDONALD. I got the—I think the principal reaction was the one that there are a number of concerns which the administration has expressed in the past and which were reflected, I think, in the Environmental Impact Statement; namely, that one of the objectives of the United States administration is to get the Alaska oil to market as quickly as possible, and that it appeared from an analysis of the timetable that the Mackenzie Valley route would not be the most expeditious from this standpoint.

Q. Are you discouraged then with the Americans on the question of the Mackenzie Valley route?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, there was certainly interest expressed this morning on what we were doing and about the possibilities of the Mackenzie route. At the same time, I had the impression that, with so much effort and study invested in the Trans-Alaska pipeline, that it rather looks as though they would be giving that priority in their consideration.

We, of course, are interested in meeting any further questions they might have about the Mackenzie Valley possibility. But I think that we'd have to face the fact that they're primarily looking at the moment at the Trans-Alaskan pipeline.

Q. (Inaudible.)

Minister MACDONALD. Without being able to grant your hypothesis, Don, I think—I really don't think that in terms of blocking, no, I don't think there's any. This, after all, is a pipeline that would go entirely across American territory and then the tanker route would be through the high seas. I think we'd confine ourselves, and could only confine ourselves, to diplomatic action. And we have, of course, taken that in the past—in past months.

Q. Mr. Minister, did you discuss the pros and cons of the corridor approach versus an oil pipeline and a separate gas line?

Minister MACDONALD. You mean in Canada, in particular?

Q. Well, just the whole problem of getting the oil and gas to market. Did you discuss the advantages of a corridor approach versus two separate lines?

Minister MACDONALD. Yes, Yes, we did. And we pointed out that there would be economic advantages, in terms of construction, from the standpoint of putting the two together at the same time; that the corridor, the Mackenzie Valley corridor, was for us important not just from the standpoint of transmitting particular gas and oil to the market, but also in opening up—really providing Canada's first overland access to the Arctic of this kind. And our interest in this area I think they noted. Particularly, they were serious about the progress that had been made in the Mackenzie Delta with respect to developing Canadian oil and gas resources there. We, of course, couldn't be very definitive at this point, because, as you know, the

field is still being drilled and the exact extent of it is not known.

Q. Did you express any feelings to Mr. Morton regarding the choice of a corridor through Alaska coming out at the Porcupine River as opposed to the coastal route?

Minister MACDONALD. No, we didn't discuss how the joinder would be made if there was to be one.

Q. You mentioned earlier that you expected an application for a pipeline across Canada being made by the end of this year or sometime next year. Do you mean an oil pipeline or a gas pipeline?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, the companies that are working most prominently in this field are the natural gas companies. And I should say that the application I'm expecting will be one I think related primarily to the Canadian field. But, of course, one of the options that the consortia who've been working on this have been considering is the possibility of linking that line up with Prudhoe Bay for natural gas.

Q. But it is gas?

Minister MACDONALD. At the moment, the people working on it most prominently are working exclusively in the gas field.

Q. You don't have any reason to expect an application for an oil pipeline in that same pathway?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, I wouldn't like to rule one out.

Q. Did you—did you ask Mr. Morton today if he would encourage the oil companies working on the Alaska line to consider applications for a Mackenzie line and under what terms?

Minister MACDONALD. No, I didn't specifically ask him to do that.

Q. Could you see the administration, concerned for getting the oil to market as quickly as possible, perhaps changing the time frame of the Canadian application?

Minister MACDONALD. I'm not sure—I'm not sure how much flexibility we have in that regard. There certainly will be time required for a proper judicious hearing of the application before the Canadian Tribunal. And there will be—I think we'd have to acknowledge that, in terms of construction preparations, the Trans-Alaska pipeline has got a distinct lead.

So I think there is a time lapse there. How extensive it'll be might be a matter of debate.

Q. How much time—how much delay would you estimate there would be in getting oil to market from the Alaska route—delay through the Canada route?

Minister MACDONALD. The estimates run from two years to three and a half to four. They run through that time frame. How scientific they are and how well detailed they are, I don't know.

I think one of the things that does appear to be clear is that, initially at least, the principal interest in the Alaska route is directed at the possibility of supplying the refineries on the West Coast of the United States; that is to say, in meeting West Coast demand rather than interior—the demand in the Chicago market. And the viewpoint of course was strongly stressed that a Mackenzie Valley line would—unless there was extensive extension of the facilities, across the mountains would not meet that particular problem.

Q. Did you talk with Mr. Flanagan about the question of the pipeline? If so, what approach did he take?

Minister MACDONALD. No, Mr. Flanagan indicated that this was the Secretary's responsibility. And we didn't talk at . . .

Q. Did you talk about questions of Canadian exports, oil imports?

Minister MACDONALD. We referred to that question. We also talked with Mr. Flanagan about the security problem; that is to say, the insecurity of both eastern—eastern Canadian and eastern United States refiners

being dependent, as they were, on Eastern Hemisphere oil and the possibility that the supply might be cut off. We didn't really arrive at any final conclusion on this. That discussion, I expect, will continue.

Q. Would you anticipate that the Alaska oil problem, as related to Canada, will be discussed by the Prime Minister and President two weeks from now when the President goes to Ottawa?

Minister MACDONALD. I would say not. I don't think it will be.

Q. What else did you talk about other than the pipeline?

Minister MACDONALD. Those are the two issues. We also talked about our—about the continuing concern that Canadian uranium is, at the moment, embargoed from coming into the United States market and our feeling that it would be a wise and appropriate action on their part to lift the embargo.

Mr. Flanagan, as they say, noted with interest our representations.

Q. Did you get any indication that the administration is planning on letting more oil in, or is that dependent on that East Coast problem you've been discussing?

Minister MACDONALD. We didn't really get a definitive answer on this one. There was a strong feeling of concern about the dependence on overseas shipments. And the impression I carried away is that Canadian oil will continue to have access to the United States market and that, indeed, it may—that access may improve.

But there was no—there were no definitive undertakings in this regard.

Q. Mr. Macdonald, suppose import restrictions were removed on Canadian oil. There's an indication that the demand in the United States for Canadian Oil would be in excess of that you might want to export, because it might pre-empt some supply which you'd want for Ontario refineries, which might put you in the position of allocating oil. Is that—is that the situation, or what is the situation?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, I suppose there is an upper limit, both in terms of pipeline capacity and also reserves beyond which we couldn't go. I think our position would be we'd like to be tested in that regard and find out what the consequences are.

Q. Can you give us your impressions, in talking with Mr. Morton, that the Mackenzie Valley route for Alaskan oil is pretty well a dead issue?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, I think that—I think it will receive consideration. I'm not overly sanguine about the prospects of selling it at this point. But I think that—I think we did receive good consideration this morning and that our point of view will be considered by the administration.

Q. But then they'll build the Alaska pipeline? Was there any talk of new regulations to guard against the danger of accidents, oil spills and tanker releases?

Minister MACDONALD. No, we didn't get down to those details. And, of course, in Canadian terms, my colleague, the Minister of Transport, has got direct responsibility there.

Q. Did Mr. Morton give you any indication when he will announce his decision to grant a permit for the Alaskan route?

Minister MACDONALD. No, No, he didn't. I think the only timetable we talked was, I think, a forty-five day limit, which is imposed on him by law. But when after that forty-five day period he would be making his announcement wasn't altogether clear.

Q. Did you discuss natural gas exports...?

Minister MACDONALD. Not primarily, no.

Q. Is there any prospect for additional export of gas from Canada to the United States unless there are major discoveries, apart from the Arctic gas?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, you probably know that our National Energy Board made a decision during the fall that the Canadian

reserves at the moment should—would require—the state of the reserves would require that there be no fresh export permits. Until there is a change either by way of northern gas or improved finds in the Alberta—in the lower latitudes of Canada, I wouldn't think there'd be an early export, further export.

Q. This cubic foot increase this past year did not change that category?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, I would think not. But I'd have to refer that one to the Chairman of the National Energy Board.

Q. Mr. Macdonald, you said at the outset that Secretary Morton expressed some interest in what you're doing in the Mackenzie River Valley and the idea of a pipeline through Canada. That's a very hot aspect of the issue down here. Just what kind of interest did he express? Here we haven't even asked you for your own findings (words inaudible)? What is his interest...?

Minister MACDONALD. Well, I think his interest is that he recognizes that this has been posed as an alternative. He wanted to know what extent we had defined the problems of a physical kind; that is to say, the ecological, engineering problems involved there; equally, what kind of concept we had for the financing of the Mackenzie line.

I would think that, from his standpoint, his interest was in trying to become more fully advised on the facts and of our particular view of the prospects of bringing this into early realization.

Q. So you got the impression the decision is almost imminent and has already, in theory, been made?

Minister MACDONALD. No, I can't say that at all. I think we got a very open-minded hearing on this question and that naturally the position was reserved.

Q. Well, how much of a chance for success do you think you're going to have even after getting your viewpoint across?

Minister MACDONALD. Whether on the stock market or in political questions, I don't like to speculate.

Q. What do you think the best—the best argument you have is against the argument that the Trans-Alaska line offers the quickest and cheapest way to get the oil to market? The companies have, after all, invested a lot of money up there and are understandably eager to get some of it back.

What is your best response to that?

Minister MACDONALD. On the quick payoff stake, if that's the only consideration, I really haven't got an answer in the sense that, you know, if they want to get the oil to market quickly, we would concede that the quickest way to get it to market is by way of the Trans-Alaska pipeline.

On the broader issues, the long-range threat to the West Coast ecology, the fact that some of the greatest demands for oil are in the central part of the continent, and our feeling that in terms of safety of the line that the Mackenzie Valley line is, in our opinion, a safer one, we think that there are some favorable arguments.

So it's really a question for—it depends on what your priorities are. If your priorities are those in time, then I would say that the TAPS Line has definitely got the advantage. In the other respects, I would think that the Mackenzie would be quite competitive with the TAP proposal.

Q. Mr. Minister, are you now looking towards a broad coordination of energy policy between the two governments?

Minister MACDONALD. I don't see that at the moment. I think we have—while we are in a position of having very substantial reserves not only of oil and gas, but opportunities to produce electric power, I don't see anything in the nature of a continental energy policy. What we intend to do is to determine our own needs and our own priorities in Canada on what energy we'll develop, how we'll use it, and whether we'll

sell it. And it's only after having done that that we will then talk—would consider using the surplus for export to the United States.

Q. Are we really in a position to talk about tying ourselves into a Mackenzie oil pipeline short of a decision on an energy policy, a coordination of energy policy?

Minister MACDONALD. I think probably we are. We're talking there—at least insofar as they are concerned, if the United States will participate, we're talking about providing a conduit very much like the conduit that is provided to us by the interprovincial pipeline. Of course, to the extent to which we might seek at an early date to bring Mackenzie Valley oil to market and gas to market, that does indeed raise questions of overall energy priorities.

Q. Was this point raised by the Secretary today to you, this aspect of the question?

Minister MACDONALD. What aspect?

Q. Well, the aspect, as you say, if you were going to talk about moving Mackenzie oil through a Mackenzie pipeline, then you have to talk about—well, it raises questions, as you say, about the coordination of policies. Did the Secretary, when you talked about the Mackenzie line, raise this aspect?

Minister MACDONALD. Not coordination of policies. The point that was raised was, again, very much the question that was before Mr. Flanagan's mind; namely, he put before us the concern of the United States that its long-run apparent deficit on energy, and especially at its reluctance of becoming increasingly dependent on imported oil; that is, imported from off the North American Continent. So that the distinct impression I had is that he would expect that exports would continue from Canada, although we didn't talk about levels or particular ways that this might be increased.

Q. If there's a gas pipeline built or an oil pipeline built through Canada, would the Canadian government help with the financing, or would it be privately financed entirely?

Minister MACDONALD. We have a tradition in Canada back through the years of government participation in utilities of these kind, going right back to the intercolonial Railway and the CPR, and most recently in the Trans-Canada Pipeline. And it's conceivable that if we decided that it's of national advantage to have this pipeline constructed, then if a government guarantee was required to assist in the financing, then the government of the day, I'm sure, would have to give serious consideration to making it available.

Since I can't be certain of the financial terms now, I can't really go much further than that.

Q. If it were built, would you anticipate the government getting some continuing income, such as a transmission tax, from oil coming through the pipeline?

Minister MACDONALD. I really haven't reflected on that. That hasn't necessarily been the case in other participations. But I really haven't thought that through.

Q. Would there be any substantial contrasts between a Mackenzie pipeline to bring natural gas in the delta and a line out of Prudhoe Bay, between the Canadian gas competing against Prudhoe Bay gas in the same markets? And would this influence any Canadian decision?

Minister MACDONALD. Pretty clearly, they'd both be coming in the same market. I suppose the only conflict that might occur would be the adjustment of the two streams in such a way, as they came down the pipeline, that they both an opportunity to get to the market. But my understanding of the demand is that almost as much that can be made available would find a market.

Q. Do you see any potential problems in an application for a gas line to bring Prudhoe Bay gas to Chicago, in terms of Canadian interests?



Minister MACDONALD. That is Prudhoe Bay gas?

Q. Right. Across Canada.

Minister MACDONALD. I suppose—I suppose our real preference is to have a dual line; that is to say, both oil and gas. I don't think it would be—I can't see that it would be a problem, however, in bringing that gas to the Chicago market by way of Canada.

Q. What you're saying is you wouldn't deny transit for an oil line—that is, for a gas line if you didn't get the oil line you wanted. Is that what you're saying?

Minister MACDONALD. I think that would have to be considered by the Energy Board at the time. Our distinct preference is to have a line for them both, essentially to bring our product to market. If it can assist in the financing of it to bring Alaskan product as well, then we'd be interested in that.

Q. Are you—are you saying that you can not guarantee that they would get that right of way?

Minister MACDONALD. Ultimately, under Canadian law, the National Energy Board has a right to say yes or no on this one.

Q. Did you raise that point with Secretary Morton on the possible question of right of way, sir?

Minister MACDONALD. No, we didn't—we didn't talk—for gas alone, you mean?

Q. Yes.

Minister MACDONALD. No, we didn't talk about that exclusively or specifically. I think they have very much in mind the fact that in order to realize the Prudhoe Bay field, they've got to bring gas to market. But they weren't very specific as to how they would achieve that objective.

There was no, I should make clear—no specific request for a Canadian right of way for that purpose.

Q. The U.S. government seems to be fairly confident—in fact, in the impact report—that it's almost certain that a gas line will cross Canada. Do they have any basis from talking with Canadian officials or Canadian government for that...?

Minister MACDONALD. Speaking for myself, as I just said, nobody's ever asked me. But as to whether they've ever asked anyone else, I'm not sure. I'm not sure that anyone else has got the authority to give them that assurance.

Q. Mr. Minister...

Minister MACDONALD. Yes, sir.

Q. ... if Prime Minister Trudeau and President Nixon are not going to talk about the pipeline in their meeting, do you plan to meet again with Secretary Morton in the future about this?

Minister MACDONALD. No immediate plans. I think there may be. I could anticipate some talks between officials on a further clarification of some of the more technical questions that came up this morning. But I don't—I'm not anticipating myself meeting the Secretary in the near future.

Q. Mr. Macdonald, Secretary Morton well knows that there's a very good prospect that running the pipeline through Alaska may be further delayed by court action. (Rest of question inaudible.)

Minister MACDONALD. I think it certainly would affect some of the judgments with regard to time. The Secretary didn't indicate that he expected further delay through the courts. But, of course, there's no reason why he would have said that to me.

He has said so in public that that is a big possibility.

Q. Mr. Macdonald, did the Secretary raise a question of the oil spill threat on the East Coast of the United States posed by oil coming into American shores through a pipeline...?

Minister MACDONALD. He specifically raised the question of Portland. I responded that my understanding, not being a master mari-

ner, is that Portland is not as difficult a water to navigate in as is Puget Sound. And of course, we're not talking about the same volumes of oil.

But, indeed, the question was raised as to the possible dangers to the American coast of Canadian oil proceeding through Portland.

Q. Mr. Macdonald, is it your impression that the time difference between when a Canadian oil line should be completed and when an Alaskan oil line should be completed is narrowing or widening at this point?

Minister MACDONALD. I would think it's narrowing, if anything.

Q. So if it's two to four years now, it might be one to three years...?

Minister MACDONALD. No, Dave, when I say it's narrowing, I think it may narrow from four to two. Two is the most recent figure I've heard, which is a better one than four. Narrowing in that sense. Whether it'll keep dropping, I don't know. It seems to me that there are certain rigidities which would prevent us from going below the two level.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

# HOUSTON CHRONICLE ENDORSES CANDIDACY OF HON. BOB CASEY

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Houston Chronicle has endorsed the candidacy of my colleague, the Honorable Bob Casey, Representative of the 22d District of Texas.

I have known Bob for the entire time he has served in the U.S. Congress; and for a period of time he was a member of my Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. I can certainly attest to his sincere interest and concern for the future and well-being of his district and his constituency as well as his ability to represent them well in the U.S. Congress.

The editorial follows:

### REELECT BOB CASEY

Congressman Bob Casey is a man who is attuned to the needs and wishes of the 22nd Congressional District as no other man could be.

Look at his accomplishments, look at his record, look at the stand he has taken on the important issues of today and his unequalled qualifications for an eighth term in Congress will be recognized.

Congressman Casey has introduced in Congress a constitutional amendment which would prohibit forced busing of school children. He is opposed to the consolidation of school districts to achieve racial balance. He told a recent congressional hearing.

"The federal courts of this nation have far exceeded their powers and jurisdiction in school matters and the result is deterioration in the quality of education in this country."

Congressman Casey is for economy in government. Unless there is fiscal restraint, he says, the federal government will spend itself into economic disaster.

Seniority puts Rep. Casey in position to exercise a measure of control over runaway spending. He is a member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee.

Just recently, he was designated chairman of that committee's legislative subcommittee,

which handles allocations of funds for the operation of Congress and certain agencies, such as the General Accounting Office. Casey is also a member of the appropriations subcommittee handling the Labor Department and Health, Education and Welfare Department budgets.

On the day the new session of Congress opened this year, Rep. Casey took the floor to remind his colleagues that the U.S. space program is vital, useful, imaginative and resourceful.

"Our national defense effort and our security are closely interlaced with our space program," Casey says, and in addition he points to the many technological benefits the program has produced.

Casey is against amnesty for draft dodgers and deserters, calling any such move "an insult to the men and women who have served and now serve in Vietnam."

Casey has a long and splendid record of service to this area. He was first elected to Congress in 1958. Previously, he was city attorney in Alvin, an assistant district attorney in Harris County, a member of the Texas House of Representatives and county judge of Harris County.

His credentials are unmatched.

The Chronicle endorses Rep. Casey for reelection to Congress from the 22nd District.

# HAWAII BATIK ARTIST JEROME WALLACE WINS RECOGNITION IN PARIS

## HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Jerome Wallace, a world renowned batik artist who makes his home in Anahola, Hawaii, a community on the Island of Kauai, recently closed a most successful exhibition of his works in Paris. Mr. Wallace, whose work has been exhibited throughout the United States as well as in many foreign capitals, no doubt won many friends for the United States during this most recent exhibition.

The Paris Post of the U.S. Information Service—USIS—assisted Mr. Wallace greatly in planning and publicizing his exhibition. In his final report on the project, the USIS Public Affairs Officer in Paris, Mr. Burnett Anderson, noted that:

After two months of resounding success, the huge exhibition of batiks by the American artist Jerome Wallace finished its Paris showing. Due to the heavy attendance and publicity, the show's original run at the Hotel de Sens/Bibliothèque Forney was extended for two weeks. Approximately 11,000 persons saw the exhibition, the largest mounted by USIS this year. Reports on the show were on television and radio. Many articles were written about the show, its creator and the unusual medium of the batik as an expression of art and life.

Several French museums have asked to borrow the exhibition and the post has already committed it to major museums in Brest and Lyon. It will be exhibited in Brussels under USIS sponsorship and requests have come in from Bucharest and London.

The presence of Jerome Wallace in Paris has been a major asset. Wallace is already a colorful and popular figure here; his personal explanations of the techniques he uses to create the stunningly beautiful batiks have been listened to with great attention. A film on his work, adapted by the post for use in

France, has been seen by thousands of visitors as has a slide show about batik work and Hawaii.

The post has no doubt that this exhibition has added luster to the already high reputation of American creative arts, Mr. Anderson concluded.

Mr. Wallace has kindly donated the most magnificent of his batik designs to the Museum of Modern Art of the City of Paris. I understand that the museum has loaned the batik to the U.S. Embassy in Paris for a period of 6 months, and that this outstanding example of Mr. Wallace's work is currently on display at the main entrance of the Hotel Talleyrand Building at our Embassy.

With the thought that my colleagues will find it of interest, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which further describes the work of Hawaii artist Jerome Wallace.

The article follows:

#### BATIK ARTIST EXPERIMENTS WITH NEW-OLD TECHNIQUES

Jerome Wallace doesn't have to sell coconuts to feed himself any more. His brilliant batiks today are bringing in from \$750 to \$1,200—and he is selling plenty of them.

An article in Honolulu Magazine, January, 1970, "Jerome Wallace, Zipper on the Generation Gap," by Cynthia Eyre, traced the path of Wallace's rising star.

A large-scale exhibition of Wallace's works are on exhibit through Dec. 20 at the Wichita Art Museum.

In the beginning, Wallace's batiks were not selling, Miss Eyre writes. Then one day a tourist dropped by the gallery where Wallace's paintings were hung—a tourist who happened to be an executive of the Oslo Craft Museum. After corresponding for a year, Wallace sent a show to Oslo.

Impressed by his work, the National Museum of Sweden purchased one of his batiks for the permanent collection. Done in an abstract expressionist style, the painting on silk is entitled "He Said His Name Was Kip" and portrays a brilliant sun rising from the dark sea off the shore of Anahola.

Wallace explained the techniques of his craft.

"What exactly is batik?" he was asked.

"It's an Indonesian word meaning 'wax writing,'" Jerome explained. In very simple terms, it's a process of hand-dyeing fabrics (or leather or paper) by using wax as a dye-repellant to cover certain parts of a fabric. Then dyeing the uncovered parts, drying the fabric and dissolving the wax.

"Originally batiks stemmed from Bali and I spent months in the mountains there learning the old ways from natives. But they haven't changed for 800 years. It became monotonous, so I started playing around with new materials and methods. Now, every new work is an experiment. Some are flops, so I roll them up and forget them for a few months. But, every now and then, I break through to something exciting. And I use brushes like a painter."

Wallace gathers the materials for his dyes from the fields, woods, and the sea.

"Cotton blossoms are good for yellows and kukul nuts for red-rusts," he said. "I burn kukul nuts and mix the soot with oil for black, browns and tan. Noni bark and kukul bark produce the yellow-oranges. I can apply sliced avocado seed directly onto the fabric for orange. Lichens and mosses make green. There's a little purple snail that comes in as a host with Portuguese men-of-war. It produces the violet that Romans used for dyeing their togas purple. I stick to natural dyes as much as possible but I do buy powdered indigo."

He explained the methods he uses to prepare the fabric. For 30 to 40 days, he soaks the heavy silk in coconut milk, then boils the silk. Next he works on the fiber so colors will penetrate. Some paintings are created with as many as 35 applications of color.

A tour through his studio in Kauai, Hawaii, reveals enormous glass jars, almost two feet tall, filled with dyes, finished and in process.

"In one end of the shack," writes Miss Eyre, "hang batiks so stiff with wax they resemble a clothes line of bright cottons caught unexpectedly in a freeze. The colors are so dazzling the room quivers. A cupboard holds huge chunks of beeswax which Jerome buys from a Kauai beekeeper. The scent pervades the warm air."

He heats his wax in a deep fat fryer, so he can control the temperature.

Attired in "hippie" garb, festooned with a heavy beard and mustache and flowing black hair, Wallace definitely does not conform to the conventional. Yet he is vitally interested in society's welfare.

He is a member of the Mayor's Committee on Children and Youth, and was a Republican candidate for County Council of Kauai in 1968. The fledgling politician picked up 15 per cent of the vote.

Wallace's reputation is spreading as the world becomes acquainted with his work. A year ago, a team of photographers shot a color documentary of him at work. House and Garden Magazine commissioned him to design a do-it-yourself batik kit to be advertised for \$10.

Wallace said he was a "little embarrassed" about the Happy Hermit Batik Kit. "It's one of those gimmicks that says you, too, can be a famous artist by just following the numbers."

For himself, Wallace doesn't need any numbers to follow. His mind is a storehouse of color and design.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

#### HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, I submitted for the RECORD the testimony of Mrs. Sandra Bergman of the District of Columbia Mental Health Association. Mrs. Bergman discussed the needs of the children in the District and demonstrated that expenditures we may make now will not only save the lives of thousands of children, but will also save the taxpayers many times the amount they may now spend.

Today, I am going to submit the testimony given by Irving H. Chase, president of the National Association of Mental Health, before the Ways and Means Committee last fall. Mr. Chase discusses the relationship between mental health and comprehensive health insurance. Several health bills offer little or no coverage for mental insurance, yet, as Mr. Chase points out, mental illness is insurable. If we are to have a comprehensive health care bill, it is vitally important that it provide coverage for all illnesses, mental as well as physical. If it does not, then its title will give lie to its actual intent.

Mr. Chase's testimony is enlightening, and I commend it to my colleagues:

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Irving H. Chase)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Irving H. Chase. I reside in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and I am president of Henry Thayer Company of Cambridge, Massachusetts, engaged in the business of food processing and packaging.

I am appearing today in behalf of the National Association for Mental Health. I am President-Elect of this Association and Chairman of its Council on Public Affairs.

The National Association for Mental Health is the national citizens' voluntary organization working toward the improved care and treatment of the mentally ill; for improved methods and services in research, prevention, detection, diagnosis and treatment of mental illness; and for the promotion of mental health.

I have been an active citizen volunteer in the field of mental health since 1958, when I became president of the Mental Health Association of Central Middlesex (Massachusetts). Since then I have served as a director and then president of the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health, from 1967-1970. I served also as a member, representing citizen-laymen concerns and interest, on the following bodies:

The National Advisory Mental Health Council.

Advisory Committee to the Commissioner of Mental Health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on Construction and Utilization of Community Mental Health Centers.

Advisory Committee to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on Comprehensive Health Planning.

Myths die hard, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to talk briefly today about a modern myth which, while not yet dead, is beginning to show evidence of terminal illness. I am speaking of the long-held belief that including coverage for mental illness in insurance plans causes rates to soar. It's an important myth, and its influence is readily seen in proposals for national health insurance. It is a dangerous myth. It is leading those who introduce legislation for national health insurance to omit coverage for mental illness entirely or to limit it sharply.

The intent of this testimony is to give information regarding the following:

- (1) Mental illness is insurable.
- (2) Community Mental Health Centers are effectively treating mental illness.
- (3) The focus of any program of national health insurance should be to facilitate the development of Community Mental Health Centers.
- (4) Principles for Mental Health Provisions in National Health Insurance.

#### MENTAL ILLNESS IS INSURABLE

A study<sup>1</sup> was made of 256 patients who were members of Group Health Association, Inc. (GHA), a prepaid group practice plan in Washington, D.C., and were referred for outpatient psychiatric therapy. These patients were members of GHA for a full 12-month period both before and after their psychiatric referral. After referral, there was a significant reduction in their utilization of physician's services and laboratory and x-ray procedures by this patient group. The reduction in overall utilization was approximately 30%. This study suggests not only that the provision of mental health services reduces the amount of non-psychiatric medical care provided to a given population, but even more important, results in provision of medical care which

<sup>1</sup> Goldberg, I., Krantz, G., Locke, B.: Effect of a Short-Term Outpatient Psychiatric Therapy Benefit on the Utilization of Medical Services in a Prepaid Group Practice Medical Program, Medical Care, September-October, 1970, Volume 8, No. 5.



is more appropriate to the illnesses of the patients.

Another study<sup>2</sup> compared the utilization of 152 patients who initially received mental health services from the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan in 1960, with a carefully matched control group of an equal number who were high medical care utilizers but who had not received psychiatric services. Among the control group there was no significant difference in medical care utilization for the first three years, but in the fourth and fifth year the control group increased their medical care utilization significantly; 27.2% in the fourth year and 13.2% in the fifth year. But for the group who had received psychiatric care, there was a decrease in non-psychiatric medical care utilization of 21.4% the first year, 39.2% the second year, 48.2% the third year, 52.3% the fourth year, and 62.5% the fifth year.

Although the Kaiser study did not compute the differences in cost of medical care between the two groups, the pattern of utilization seems to indicate the difference in costs was even greater than the difference in numbers of visits. The most expensive form of medical care is, of course, hospitalization, and the group which had received psychiatric care did experience a significant decrease in inpatient services during the five years of the study as contrasted with the year preceding the study.

The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York has analyzed its experience in providing mental health services<sup>3</sup> to the more than 60,000 subscribers in its Jamaica Medical Group.<sup>4</sup> During a three-year period, the average annual utilization for psychiatric consultation was 11.4 per 1,000 or 1.1%. The rate for those who had consultation plus at least one treatment visit was 8.3 per 1,000 or .8%. During the demonstration project, 949 patients were accepted for treatment and 16,264 mental health services were provided. Of those services, 88% were individual services to patients alone or to patients with members of their families, 11% were group health therapy services, and 1% were psychological testing.

The above figures on utilization and distribution of services by type coincide very closely with figures reported by Group Health Insurance of New York and for the United Automobile Workers program. Group Health Insurance recorded a utilization of 7.5 per 1,000 for adults age 20 and over during the period of their study, while the first year utilization of the United Automobile Workers was 6.6 per 1,000. The 88% figure for individual therapy reported by the Health Insurance Plan nearly coincides with a 93% figure reported by Group Health Insurance and a 91% figure reported by the United Automobile Workers.

Basing their actuarial assumptions on their experience during the demonstration project, the Health Insurance Plan has established a premium rate for mental health services of \$.90 per month for a one person family, \$1.80 per month for a two person family, and \$2.70 for a family of three or more persons. These rates are based on the following assumptions, all of which are high when compared to the studies just described.

1. the average annual utilization rate will reach a level of between 1½ to 2% per year;
2. the average number of services will be

about 15 services per year for each patient treated;

3. group therapy services will constitute about 10% of all mental health services provided;

4. the proportion of inpatient mental health services will increase from about the 4% found in the demonstration project to about 10%.

Final and conclusive evidence is not yet available as to whether the provision of mental health services results in reduced use of other health services.

However, the evidence from the HIP experience and the UAW program does give impressive data establishing the fact that mental health benefits does not require big increases in premium.

#### COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS—A VIABLE APPROACH TO THE TREATMENT OF MENTAL ILLNESS

The Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 provided Federal matching monies for the development of Mental Health Centers, which are mandated to provide five basic services including inpatient, outpatient, partial hospitalization, education-consultation, and emergency services to population areas not less than 75,000 nor more than 200,000 residents.

The Act was amended most recently in 1970 when it was broadened and extended to June 30, 1973.

In 1969, one out of 10 patient-care episodes in mental health facilities in the United States took place in Community Mental Health Centers. At that time there were 205 Community Mental Health Centers in operation, making services available to approximately 10% of the United States population. At the present time, there are 452 funded centers; when in full operation, these will serve approximately one-fifth of the population.

The median length of stay for inpatients in a Community Mental Health Center is 18 days, which is similar to the length of stay in psychiatric units of general hospitals (17-18 days).

Though many factors influence change in the utilization of mental health services, the introduction of Community Mental Health Centers has been a significant factor in the remarkable decrease over the past five years in the resident population of State Mental Hospitals. The decrease in resident population between 1969 and 1970 was the largest to date, a drop of 35,000 patients, or 10%. In a sample of continuation staffing grant applications, about half the centers reported they were effecting a decline in the use of the State Mental Hospital serving their catchment areas. However, this trend is limited by other factors. State Hospital admissions for alcoholism and drug addiction, which often come through the law enforcement system, have been increasing. Also, when Centers first begin operation, they have a pronounced case-finding effect before they have adequate resources to provide treatment services and thus may temporarily increase admissions to State Hospitals. Community Mental Health Centers are beginning to serve significant numbers of alcoholics and drug users. In 1969, 7% (18,000) of total admissions to Community Health Centers were alcoholics and 2% (4,500) were drug addicts.

Community Mental Health Centers have brought many agencies together into a coordinated system of mental health care. Nearly 1,600 different agencies are currently affiliated with 452 funded centers. A special study of affiliation agreements in nine Community Mental Health Centers found that of a total of 68 mental health service agencies located in their catchment areas, 64 were affiliated with the centers providing coordinated services. At the present time, about one-third (111 of 316) of the State Hospitals

in the country are formally incorporated into Community Mental Health Center programs through affiliation agreements.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE SHOULD FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Make no mistake about it, enactment of "National Health Insurance" presents at once an opportunity and threat, for, depending on its terms, it can act as a powerful stimulant to the development of comprehensive Community Mental Health Centers, or it can result in their economic starvation. Stimulation of growth will result if compensation for treatment in these settings is given favorable terms. Starvation will occur if a program is adopted with little or no mental health coverage followed by withdrawal of existing federal financing of comprehensive Community Mental Health Centers.

We, therefore, are scrutinizing each proposal for federal financing of health care with this overriding question in mind: Will its enactment facilitate the development of comprehensive community mental health centers?

#### PRINCIPLES FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROVISIONS IN NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. Chairman, I should like to close by presenting the following Principles for Mental Health Provisions in National Health Insurance, as adopted unanimously by the Board of Directors of the National Association for Mental Health in June, 1971.

##### Scope

Programs in mental illness should cover a broad range of activities including prevention; active treatment, both inpatient and outpatient; rehabilitation and long-term care and there should be continuing evaluation of all programs. Collateral services to families of the mentally ill should be included.

We cannot accept another insurance program which, in the name of economy does not in fact insure individuals against intolerable losses. This is neither humane nor financially defensible.

##### Limitations

There should be no limitations as to age, sex or condition. Any limits on mental health services should be structured to encourage the development of Community Mental Health Centers and to discourage over-utilization on the part of the patient or the provider. Limitations should be determined by regulations based on clinical experience and subject to approval of Citizens' Boards.

##### Professional services

Payment should be provided for individual visits to psychiatrists and other qualified therapists. There should be no patient fee or co-insurance for at least the first seven visits per spell of illness.

##### Clinical outpatient services

There should be full compensation for services rendered in qualified clinics, or comprehensive Mental Health Centers. Home visits by qualified staff members of such facilities should also be covered. Reimbursed services in a clinical outpatient setting should include services provided by all personnel necessary to the treatment program.

##### Partial hospitalization

Costs of partial hospitalization should be fully paid without regard to the setting, subject only to qualification.

##### Inpatient services

Provisions for coverage of inpatient services should be structured to encourage:

(a) Evolution and development of comprehensive Community Mental Health Centers, and

(b) Improvement of public mental hospitals. There should be a requirement that these two systems be adequately linked so as to provide a continuum of services to all

<sup>2</sup> Cummings, N., Follette, W.: Psychiatric Services and Medical Utilization in a Pre-paid Health Plan Setting, Medical Care, January-February, 1967, Volume 5, No. 1.

<sup>3</sup> The demonstration program provided outpatient and inpatient psychiatric treatment with no upper limit on the number of services and with no cost to the patient.

<sup>4</sup> Fink, R.: Financing Outpatient Mental Health Care Through Psychiatric Insurance, Mental Hygiene, April 1967, Volume 55, No. 2.

*Prescribed drugs*

Prescribed drugs should be available without separate charge to the consumer.

*Education and consultation/research and evaluation*

The important functions of education, consultation, research and evaluation should continue to be funded through grant mechanisms. They should be encouraged in all mental health settings.

*Manpower and training*

To be truly effective, any final plan must automatically influence and facilitate the recruitment, training and geographical distribution of all categories of manpower necessary to a comprehensive mental health program.

*Citizens' boards*

There should be boards of citizens with ultimate responsibility for governing the program. They should set standards and establish continuing vigorous evaluation of all providers. This must include both individuals and organizations who seek payment under National Health Insurance. There should be substantial representation on all the Citizens' Boards from minority groups and the poor and from professional and lay persons with knowledge in mental health and mental illness. Laymen so serving should not be engaged in providing services to the mentally ill and should constitute a majority of the Boards.

*Method of payment*

The program must permit participation by qualified providers with options as to prepayment or compensation for services rendered.

As programs emerge which are demonstrably more efficient than others they should be rewarded by preferential funding.

*Discrimination*

All providers shall be required to provide services to all persons regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, or ability to pay.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting us to present our views on National Health Insurance, this decade's most important health proposal.

## LONG-DELAYED JUSTICE

## HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the wheels of government, like the mills of God, grind exceedingly slow, but unfortunately they do not always produce just results. The case of the Tjernagel family in Iowa exemplifies the sometimes maddening indifference of huge government bureaucracies to the legitimate claims of the individual citizens they are supposed to serve.

On December 8, 1968, an aircraft belonging to the Iowa National Guard, but flying a training mission for the U.S. Air Force, crashed into the Story County farm of Peter Tjernagel and completely destroyed it. In the ensuing 40 months, both State and Federal Governments denied their responsibility for the damages. The widowed Mrs. Tjernagel, deprived of rightful compensation, has been forced to depend on the charity of her children.

The clear inequity of the case has aroused considerable public indignation

in Iowa, as the following articles from the Des Moines Register and the Ames Daily Tribune will show—and rightly so. This intolerable inaction cannot be allowed to continue. Justice delayed for so long is in effect justice denied. As representatives of the people, we have an obligation to insure that their Government serves their needs. I have urged the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings immediately on the private bill introduced by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, for the relief of Mrs. Tjernagel. The justice of her claim must be publicized and due compensation paid to her at long last.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 9, 1972]

## PLEA FOR PAYMENT TO IOWA VICTIM

The Iowa attorney general's office has asked Richard G. Kleindienst of the United States Justice Department to change his opinion about paying the claims of Mrs. Marie Tjernagel of Story City for damages from an Air Guard jet plane crash 40 months ago.

In a letter to the U.S. director of the Office of Budget and Management last January, Kleindienst opposed private bills offered by Iowa Senators Jack Miller and Harold E. Hughes and Representative H. R. Gross for payment of claims to Mrs. Tjernagel and others who suffered damages from the Dec. 9, 1968, plane crash near Story City.

## HOME DESTROYED

The crash destroyed the Tjernagel farm home and possessions. The family received a \$5,000 emergency payment from the Air Force shortly after the accident.

But since then, claims for \$133,000 in damages by the Tjernagels and several others have been lost in a dispute over who is liable, Iowa or the U.S.

The Air Force refuses to pay the damages for fear of establishing precedent; so does the state, which claims the plane was on a federal mission at the time of the crash.

In the latest move in the Tjernagel case, John E. Beamer, special assistant to the Iowa attorney general, wrote Kleindienst that because of Kleindienst's opposition to the bills of Senators Miller and Hughes and Representative Gross the judge advocate general's office of the Pentagon refused to participate in a settlement of the matter.

In his letter to Kleindienst, Beamer said the U.S. Justice Department "apparently was unaware of commitments made" by the Air Force in the case.

## ON FEDERAL MISSION

Beamer said the record shows without dispute that the plane in the crash was on a federal mission and that from Dec. 9, 1968, until May 14, 1971, the Air Force indicated to the Tjernagels and state officials that the Air Force was "assuming complete responsibility" for claims resulting from the crash.

"The people of Iowa have questioned why the state and federal governments cannot cooperate to the extent of agreeing to pay the victims immediately and then fight it out later as to who is responsible," Beamer said in his letter to Kleindienst.

Beamer said such a "remedy would certainly be acceptable to the state."

Beamer compared the Tjernagel dilemma to the situation of Clarence McCarville, 59, and his 86-year-old mother, Emma, after their farm home was destroyed by a Wisconsin air guard jet crash near Cresco Mar. 5, 1968.

Since the crash, the McCarvilles have lived in a chicken coop on their farm site. Air Force officials told the attorneys for the McCarvilles they must sue the state of Wisconsin to recover damages.

## FOUR YEARS

"It is now more than four years since the crash occurred and the McCarvilles are still living in a chicken coop," Beamer said.

Beamer also told Kleindienst that on Mar. 28 (last Tuesday), the Iowa attorney general's office received "yet another claim for damages involving a military aircraft."

The claim is for \$41,126.43 for damage caused by an Army Guard U6A DeHavilland Beaver fixed wing aircraft during a heavy storm last July 8 at the Nevada, Ia., airport.

A letter from Joseph H. Rouse, acting chief, Army claims service, Fort Meade, Md., said a claim filed by F & H Enterprises for \$41,126.43 in damages to its helicopter when it was hit by the Iowa Army Guard plane during the storm should be paid by the state.

The National Guard pilot "followed prudent procedures in tying down" his aircraft but the tie down ropes furnished by the Nevada airport were not "of sufficient vitality" to hold the plane in place in the winds of 80 miles an hour, Rouse said in his letter to Nevada officials.

## ARMY DAMAGE CLAIM

Beamer termed the Army request for compensation from the state "incredible" and said under the amended Iowa tort claims act, effective July 1, 1970, "claims of this type are specifically excluded."

"State officials question if we will ever see the end to these claims involving military aircraft," Beamer wrote Kleindienst.

"In the light of this background, we urge you to reconsider your position as to not jeopardize any payments to the Tjernagels or McCarvilles based on prior commitments and assumed responsibilities by the Air Force."

Mrs. Tjernagel's husband, Peter, died at the age of 58 a month after the jet crash destroyed their home northeast of Story City.

Since then Mrs. Tjernagel has lived in Story City. She has two sons, Michael and Martin, and two daughters, Sigrid and Ingeborg.

When U.S. Representative Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) inquired about the Tjernagel claim last September he was told by an Air Force officer the responsibility for paying the claim was the state's.

## Air Force view

"The Air Force has been unable to identify any individuals in authority who promised either the state of Iowa or the claimants that the Air Force would settle and pay their claims," said Air Force Col. James J. Shepard in a letter to Congressman Smith.

"The state of Iowa was aware of the cause of the crash," Shepard wrote. "The accident . . . was determined to have been caused through pilot error in that an attempt was made to engage in acrobatic flying at altitudes too low and at speeds too fast to permit recovery of the aircraft."

"This activity is in violation of Section 328.14, Iowa code, and constitutes a breach of due care in the circumstances."

"The statutes, case law of Iowa and collateral investigation demonstrate that an adequate remedy exists at law against Iowa for those damages."

"Therefore, no administrative payment may be made by the United States. Claimants' attorney was advised of the Air Force denial on that basis by letter May 14, 1971."

[From the Ames, Iowa, Daily Tribune, Apr. 6, 1972]

## THE TJERNAGEL CASE

It would seem to be quite clear that a majority of the public which has been told about the case of the Tjernagel family of Story City agree something should be done.

Primarily, that something takes—in their opinion—the shape of some sort of financial compensation for the damage done to the family's farm home and the injuries they have sustained.



The Tjernagel family farm was the scene of the crash of an Iowa Air National Guard jet aircraft on Dec. 8, 1968. The two airmen in the plane were killed; the fire which followed the crash destroyed most of the buildings on the farm, and the family moved off the farm to Story City, where Peter Tjernagel the husband and father, died less than two months later. Since then the Tjernagel family has sustained one setback after another.

It would seem that those who serve the public would seek to provide for the public will, and find some way to help the family. But alas, more than three years after the event, no way has been found by either state or federal officials to meet the need. Only a \$5,000 "emergency" grant to them has been made; no other provision has come along.

However, the token payment—for obviously this is all it has been—might be taken as an admission of responsibility of some kind at the federal level.

Moreover, there is every reason to believe that some form of compensation has been paid to the families of the two Air National Guard aviators who were pilot and radar observer in the aircraft that crashed into the Tjernagel farm on that cold December evening. It would be in the normal order of things that the death benefits payable to beneficiaries of military personnel who die while on active duty would have been paid as a matter of routine.

State officials contend the State of Iowa is not liable in this case because the aircraft was on a federal mission at the time of the accident. Federal officials contend that the aircraft is state-owned, and thus the responsibility lies with the state of Iowa.

At this impasse, the point where no one seems inclined to offer a solution—and the thing about the whole affair that apparently incenses the public most of all is that there has been no inclination on the part of any official parties to find some way in which the Tjernagel family can be helped. The substantial size of the loss serves to add to the indignation. Had the loss been smaller, it would be possible for it to be overlooked easily; in the case of the Tjernagel family, the large amount of harm, the continuing inconvenience and the need of the entire family for some help compound the damage.

We believe the public seeks, for the Tjernagels, not relief, not charity, but justice. We think it's time some public official accepts the responsibility for finding some route to justice for the family. We also believe it is most reasonable for this just compensation to come from federal officials on whose orders—or the orders of their predecessors—the plane was in the air on that night.

# FRASER STATEMENT ON UNDERSEA LONG-RANGE MISSILE SYSTEM (ULMS)

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. FRASER, Mr. Speaker, that portion of our nuclear arsenal that is based at sea is almost universally seen as more secure and less provocative than our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles and our strategic bombers. Congress should approve programs that improve the survivability of our sea-launched ballistic missiles—SLBM's. But we shall be squandering this Nation's limited resources if we endorse without change the administration's fiscal year 1973 strategic systems proposals.

For too long Congress has uncritically approved every strategic arms request that is sent to it by the Department of Defense. Our aim in this look at ULMS is to eliminate from the administration's proposals costly and excessive elements not needed now for our security.

We find that funding the new ULMS 1 missile is a prudent way to add to the security of our existing SLBM force. The longer range of the ULMS 1 missile will expand the ocean area in which our submarines can patrol while remaining in range of assigned targets. Less time will be spent in transit to patrol areas and better onstation availability will result. The larger area in which our submarines will be able to hide when ULMS 1 is deployed in existing ballistic missile submarines will also complicate the anti-submarine—ASW—task of any nation seeking to track our boats.

But an accelerated program of construction of new, larger submarines—ULMS—is imprudent since no discernible threat requires the crash program proposed by the administration. The waste inherent in a too-rapid ULMS program will add to the taxpayer's burden without justification.

There is another way to enhance the security of our SLBM force. Little attention has been paid to arms control in the area of ASW. But if restrictions on ASW capabilities could be negotiated, SLBM forces would remain invulnerable. In combination with an ABM limitation, an ASW agreement would produce a secure and stable nuclear deterrent force. As we point out in the final paragraph of our paper:

The long-range prospects for a stable mutual deterrence may well depend on the continued survivability of sea-based deterrent forces. Accordingly, much more attention should be directed in the future to this ASW problem.

ASW talks at SALT should be a priority item.

The report on ULMS follows:

## REPORT ON ULMS, A RESEARCH PAPER

(Sponsored by Senators ALAN CRANSTON, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and MARK O. HATFIELD; Representatives JONATHAN BINGHAM, ROBERT F. DRINAN, DONALD M. FRASER, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, JOHN E. MOSS, F. BRADFORD MORSE, WILLIAM F. RYAN, and FRED SCHWENGLER—For consideration by the Military Spending Committee, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Chairman; Congressman OGDEN R. REID, vice-chairman of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law)

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Navy's Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) has been in the study and design phase since its inception in 1969. We have supported the ULMS program in the past as a long-range hedge against threats to and as an eventual replacement for our Polaris and Poseidon missile-firing submarines. We agree with the Administration that our sea-based deterrent has the best prospects of all our strategic offensive systems for long-term survivability, and we fully support all efforts necessary to preserve its strength and survivability.

The ULMS program was funded last year at a level of \$104.8 million. This year's request—including \$35 million in presently deferred supplemental fiscal 1972 funding—is \$977 million. Approximately \$330 million of the pending request is earmarked for work on a new long-range missile system (ULMS 1) and the balance for new submarine devel-

opment and production work. It is the Navy's present intention to be able to deploy the new missile in our current submarines in 1977 and the first new ULMS submarine in late 1978.

There are two possible justifications for the almost 10-fold increase in fiscal 1973 ULMS funding. It can be viewed, first, as a response to Soviet submarine fleet expansion, and second, as a modernization and replacement program for our Polaris and Poseidon submarines. We do not believe that large-scale funding for a new submarine system as opposed to funding for a new long-range missile system can be adequately justified on either of these grounds at this time.

**Soviet Submarine Expansion.** It is true that the Soviets have already deployed 25 Yankee class ballistic missile submarines and that another 17 are now under construction. It is true, also, that deployment of all those submarines by the end of calendar year 1973 would give the Soviets one more modern ballistic missile submarine with sixteen more sea-based missiles than the United States. While this Soviet buildup is grounds for serious concern, it does not justify an accelerated new submarine construction program at the present time.

For one thing, numbers of submarines and sea-based missiles are only two indicators of a nation's sea-based deterrent strength. Such factors as numbers of warheads, submarine detectability, missile range, and geographical considerations also play an important role. And in each of these areas the United States has and will enjoy for some time to come significant advantages over the Soviets.

Second, it is impossible to predict what additional improvements in their sea-based deterrent the Soviets may undertake or what success they will enjoy in their endeavors. They may seek to deploy considerably more than 42 ballistic missile submarines, or they may stop at or near that number. They may or may not seek to put in their present submarines longer range missiles with independently targetable weapons to match the Poseidon program.

It is time that the Soviets have developed a new SLBM with a range equal to that of Poseidon; but it is also true that they have yet to conduct one successful MIRV flight test of either a land-based or sea-based missile.

Third, an accelerated new submarine construction program is not needed now to protect United States interests against this ill-defined Soviet threat. Even under scenarios much worse than might be expected, we could defer such action for one or two years yet still respond in plenty of time to prevent the Soviets from gaining any significant advantages in sea-based deterrent strength.

Fourth, an accelerated new submarine construction program now could jeopardize SALT negotiations for numerical limitations on the size of sea-based deterrent forces. The Administration has increased this prospect by its implication that work on ULMS might proceed with little change in the current timetable even if such limitations were achieved, as a replacement rather than a supplement to our Polaris submarines. If ULMS, in fact, is not negotiable, it is difficult to see how it could provide the Soviets with incentive to accept such limitations.

We could have a much better bargaining position at SALT if we proceeded now with work on a new long-range missile system only. Initiation of such work would serve as ample evidence of our determination to protect our sea-based deterrent. A new submarine construction program would be the logical next step if sea-based force limitations are not achieved.

For all these reasons, we should not allow Soviet expenditure of \$100 million on a 42d ballistic missile submarine to propel us into a \$30 billion investment on ULMS and the world into a new sea-based arms race. As President Nixon noted in his recent foreign

policy message to the Congress: "The capabilities of both the United States and the USSR have reached a point where our programs need not be driven by fear of minor quantitative imbalances."

There are other positive risks, too, inherent in the present accelerated program for ULMS development—risks of cost growth and schedule slippage and risks of premature commitment to an ill-advised design.

**Modernization and Replacement.** An accelerated new submarine construction program cannot be justified any time in the near future simply as a necessary modification and replacement of our Polaris and Poseidon submarines.

First, none of our current submarines will reach the end of their projected 25-30 year service lives until the 1985-1990 time period. The prospect of physical obsolescence cannot be used to justify anything like a 1978 initial deployment date for a new replacement submarine.

Second, all foreseeable prospects for technological obsolescence can be countered just as effectively by appropriate modifications to current submarines as by the development of replacements for them. Incorporation of a new longer range missile system, such as the ULMS 1, would increase their survivability, improve target coverage, and increase their time on station. It is also probable that putative ULMS advantages such as quietness of operation and reduced maintenance times could also be reduced by a gradual modification program. Under these circumstances, we believe that money spent for new submarine replacements would be money wasted at the present time.

Third, money spent now might be money wasted for another reason as well. While our current submarines are secure today from Soviet ASW techniques—and while they could be made more so by an appropriate modernization program—we know very little about the long-term nature of the ASW threat. What form the threat will take, and what steps will be required to counter it, is impossible to predict at the present time. There is a danger, therefore, that any new submarines we build today could be rendered obsolete in much the same way and at much the same time as the submarines we now have.

We do not believe that the ULMS program, as presently structured, can be justified. Accordingly, we oppose that program and make the following recommendations for an alternative course of action. The fiscal year 1973 impact of these recommendations would be to reduce the Administration's budget request for ULMS from \$977 million to \$380 million. This amount would still permit a major initiative in fiscal year 1973 to increase the survivability of our sea-based nuclear deterrent.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) We call upon the President to express the willingness of the United States to defer for one year the accelerated development of a new submarine system, in return only for Soviet agreement to serious negotiations at SALT on the subject of sea-based force limitations. It is our belief that the President should be able to obtain such a commitment from the Soviets during his Moscow trip in May, at which time an interim SALT agreement restricting ABMs and land-based missiles is now expected to be signed.

(2) If such a commitment is obtained, the United States should make clear that its continued restraint during subsequent negotiations will be directly dependent on the restraint exercised by the Soviets themselves. In our view, such restraint will be shown if both sides forego major additional ballistic missile submarine construction activities and confine their efforts to improving the capabilities of their current submarine fleets. If

such restraint is exercised—and there are no developments threatening the survivability of existing sea-based forces—there should be ample time for negotiations to proceed without simultaneous submarine buildups on either side.

(3) Approximately \$650 million of the \$977 million fiscal year 1973 ULMS request now pending is earmarked for work on a new submarine and its non-missile subsystems. If a Soviet commitment to negotiations is obtained, we believe that \$600 million of this amount should be disallowed. Such action would provide for a slight increase over fiscal year 1972 ULMS funding of roughly \$40 million for non-missile work. We believe that \$50 million should be more than adequate in fiscal year 1973 to continue Navy submarine design studies and preliminary development work.

(4) In allocating this \$50 million to specific uses, the Navy should be guided by two objectives. First, it should seek to reduce to the greatest extent possible the risk of cost growth and schedule slippage which would be inherent in a decision to greatly accelerate the pace of ULMS development in fiscal year 1974. Second, it should minimize as much as possible the risk of premature commitment to a particular submarine design. Major development expenditures on a new propulsion plant, especially, should be avoided at this time.

(5) During the next year both the Department of Defense and the Congress should conduct an in-depth review of alternative new submarine designs. Special attention should be focused on the Navy's present plan to build new submarines which would be faster and much larger than our Polaris and Poseidon fleet. It should be clearly demonstrated that all costly design requirements are justified by a clear-cut military need.

(6) Approximately \$330 million of the pending ULMS request is earmarked for work on the new ULMS 1 missile system. This funding should be fully approved. Development of a long-range missile system—together with other modifications to our current submarines on which the Navy is now working—will significantly enhance the survivability of our present fleet against all foreseeable threats. If development of this new missile system proceeds at the presently projected rate, it should be available for initial deployment in 1977. In the absence of any major change in the ASW threat, both the new missile and our current submarines should remain an integral part of our sea-based deterrent well into the 1990s.

(7) The Navy should accord high priority to its current "SSBN Defense" program, the purpose of which is to identify and develop suitable counters to new ASW techniques which could jeopardize our Polaris and Poseidon fleet. The knowledge gained from this program should be used to make future reductions in the detectability of that fleet and as a continuing source of ideas for new submarine designs.

(8) If SALT negotiations proceed well, the Navy timetable for a new submarine construction program should be determined both by changes in the ASW threat and the eventual need to replace our current submarines. Such a program should be undertaken in sufficient time to meet any changes in the ASW threat which have been identified and which cannot be countered by modifications to our Polaris and Poseidon fleet. Unless such threat changes have been identified, it should not be necessary to move beyond the study and design phase of a new submarine construction program until fiscal 1976 or later. That starting date would provide ample time for the leisurely development of a new submarine system.

Even if development times were stretched from the roughly six years implicit in the Administration's present timetable to as

much as 10 years, the first new submarine would still be available in 1985, at which time the oldest of our current submarines would be only 25 years of age. It would then be possible—with a construction rate as low as two or three submarines per year thereafter—to replace all our current submarines inside their projected 30 year lives. We believe that this timetable, either the development or production phases of which could be compressed if the threat required, makes much more sense than the commitment now of vast sums to a new submarine system of unknown long-term value.

(9) As soon as possible, the issue of restrictions on strategic ASW operations should be placed high on the SALT agenda. Our sea-based missile submarines are now secure for the foreseeable future, but the possibility of a new ASW breakthrough—one which cannot be countered by any new submarine design—cannot be dismissed out of hand. We recognize that restrictions on ASW research are not now feasible, since compliance with them could not be verified. It should not be impossible, however, to work out verifiable restrictions on the actual deployment of strategic ASW systems or on the use of such systems when deployed.

A detailed analysis of the reasons for our conclusions and recommendations follows.

#### BACKGROUND

The Navy's ULMS program was initiated in 1969 to provide a long-term hedge against threats to our Polaris and Poseidon submarines and an eventual replacement for them. The program has been in the study and design phase since that time. Funding requests have been small, but growing, and the parameters of the new program have been rather ill-defined until recent months.

Three factors have recently combined, however, to make fiscal year 1973 a year of decision for ULMS within the Executive branch and to influence the decision finally made.

First, prior year funding had taken the program to a possible jumping off point. A choice had to be made for the first time between keeping the program in the preliminary development stage and moving forward in a major way.

Second, the need for such a choice had given rise to a dispute within the Defense Department and the Navy itself over the most appropriate course for ULMS development. In very simple terms, some experts believed that the time had come to develop and build a new submarine for deployment in the early 1980s, while others argued that a new submarine system was not yet needed, since all foreseeable near-term threats could be countered instead by incorporating a new long-range missile system in the present Polaris and Poseidon fleet.

Such was the substance of the ULMS-EXPO controversy which surfaced briefly in the press last summer. Development of the EXPO (for Extended Range Poseidon) missile, its supporters argued, would enable us to defer major development expenditures on ULMS until at least the mid-1970s, with no risk to the long-term survivability of our sea-based nuclear deterrent.

This ULMS-EXPO controversy was fudged over, rather than resolved, in the Defense Department's decision-making process. Symbolic of this fact was a change in name for EXPO. To minimize its apparent "threat" to the ULMS submarine system, it was renamed the ULMS 1 missile and made an integral part of the ULMS development program.

The scope of the new program was first defined in a September, 1971 Development Concept Paper (DCP) on ULMS. The paper called for the phased development of both a new long-range missile system for our Polaris and Poseidon submarines and a new submarine system. Fiscal year 1973 funding was tentatively established at the time in the \$400



million area, with the major part of the total earmarked for work on the new missile. At the same time, sufficient funds for submarine development work were provided to support a 1981 initial deployment date.

Only thereafter did a third factor come into play, in the form of a faster than expected Soviet submarine buildup. Secretary of Defense Laird commented on the point in his recent posture statement to the Congress:

"The Y-Class ballistic missile submarine force of the Soviet Union could be as large as our Polaris/Poseidon force by the end of next year, rather than in 1974 as I predicted last year."

A decision was therefore made in January to accelerate development and construction work on the new ULMS submarine system. Fiscal year 1973 funding for ULMS was set at \$942 million and an additional \$35 million in fiscal year 1972 supplemental funding was also requested. The Senate Armed Services Committee decided to defer action on the supplemental request and to consider it in conjunction with its fiscal year 1973 authorization hearings.

As presently constituted, the ULMS program calls for the development of a new submarine system and two associated missile systems. The submarine itself would be more than twice the size of our Polaris and Poseidon submarines. It would be able to carry more missiles (20 to 24 per boat, compared to 16 for Polaris and Poseidon), at a faster maximum speed, and it would incorporate the latest available quieting techniques. The proposed fiscal year 1973 funding of about \$650 million for submarine work would support deployment of the new submarine as early as 1978. Approval of this funding by Congress would probably commit us to that course. As Assistant Secretary of Defense Moot noted earlier this year: "You do not move this fast unless you intend to build submarines and new missiles."

The 4,500 mile ULMS 1 missile is still funded in the new program at essentially the same amount. This funding is designed to support a calendar year 1977 deployment of the new missile in our current ballistic missile submarines. Work on the 6,000 mile ULMS 2, which would fit only in the new ULMS submarine, is scheduled to begin at a later date.

The Navy has said little for the public record about the likely long-term costs of the ULMS program. Estimates from other sources, however, have ranged to \$30 billion for a 30 submarine program, an average of \$1 billion per ship through the first ten years of operation. The following table, based on known information about ULMS and comparisons with the Polaris and Poseidon programs, shows that these estimates are by no means unrealistic; in fact, they may be low:

ULMS PROGRAM 10-YEAR SYSTEMS COST PROJECTIONS	
Research, development, test, and evaluation	
	Millions
Submarine costs, including all non-missile subsystems and integration work	\$800
*Maneuvering reentry vehicle (MA RV) development for new missile systems	600
*Development of the ULMS 1 missile	2,100
Development of the ULMS 2 missile	1,500
Procurement	
Submarine costs (30 submarines at an average ship construction (SCN) cost of \$400 million)	12,000
ULMS 1 missile (supply for 500 launchers at an average cost of \$8 million each, including spares, integration, etc., sufficient for 31 Poseidon submarines or a somewhat smaller mix of Poseidon and ULMS submarines)	4,000

ULMS 2 missile (supply for 600 launchers at an average cost of \$11 million each, including spares, integration, etc., sufficient for 30 ULMS submarines with 20 tubes each) ----- 6,600

#### Operation and maintenance

30 ships at an average of \$30 million per year for 10 years, including all costs of crews ----- 9,000

#### Dedicated ULMS refit facilities

1 facility per 15 ships, first at cost of \$1.8 billion, second at cost of \$1.2 billion ----- 3,000

Total ----- 39,000

Further appreciation of the extremely high long-term costs implicit in the Navy's present plans can be seen also by comparing the costs shown in the table above with the costs of alternative action.

An ULMS 1 missile program, by itself, would include only the starred items and might come to \$6.7 billion.

It would also be possible, if limited new submarine construction were deemed necessary to match a continued Soviet buildup, to build new submarines of the same general size as our existing submarines, but to put in them all available improvements consistent with such size constraints.

In essence, this approach would limit the speed of the new submarines to the speed of our current submarines and the range of its missiles to the 4,500 mile range of the ULMS 1. At the same time, however, it would enable us to respond more quickly to a continuing Soviet buildup. The first new submarine could be constructed in 1-2 years less time and the construction rate thereafter could be twice as fast using the same facilities—perhaps 5 or 6 submarines per year, compared to 2 or 3. A program of this kind would also be easier to "turn off" after the number of ships needed to match Soviet construction had been built, since it would involve far lower start-up expenditures.

This alternative would involve ship development costs no larger than \$100 million, average SCN costs per ship of \$225 million, O&M costs of \$20 million per ship per year, and no new refit facilities. On these assumptions, a 10 submarine construction program, not including missiles, would come to \$4.35 billion, compared to \$9.6 billion for 10 ULMS submarines (which would require one new refit facility).

#### AN ANALYSIS OF THE PENDING ULMS REQUEST

##### I. The sea-based deterrent in perspective

For the past three years Congressional critics of our defense policies have called repeatedly for increased United States reliance on sea-based strategic systems. This call has been a persistent theme in the opposition of many of us to programs like the Safeguard ABM, the new bomber defense system, the B-1 bomber, and the Minuteman III MIRV program.

A casual observer might be tempted to conclude that the tables have suddenly been turned. Just as the Administration appears to have heeded our call—by seeking acceleration of the ULMS development program—we seem to have changed our tune as well—by raising objections to the program.

Distorted as such an interpretation would be, our own critics may well espouse it. For that reason, and to lay the groundwork for our specific objections to the ULMS program as presently structured, a brief statement of our views on the role of sea-based systems in our strategic arsenal seems very much in order at this point.

**Strategic Offensive Force Requirements.** We believe that a stable mutual deterrence with the Soviet Union should be the basic goal of our strategic defense policy. We also agree with the Administration's statement

of the three requirements of strategic sufficiency which must be met if we are to achieve that goal, in determining the size and composition of our strategic offensive forces.

First, they must be of sufficient size to give us a second strike capability adequate to deter an all-out surprise attack by the Soviet Union. That is, they must be able to absorb a surprise first strike yet still inflict on the Soviet Union a level of retaliatory damage sufficiently large to deter such a surprise attack from taking place.

Second, they must be sufficiently large that the Soviet Union cannot cause considerably greater urban/industrial destruction than the United States could inflict on the Soviets in a nuclear war. Parity is implicit in the concept of a stable mutual deterrent. Moreover, the level of damage needed to achieve deterrence is an inherently subjective judgment, which can best be given an objective status through shared perceptions on both sides.

Third, our strategic offensive forces must be composed of stabilizing systems, systems which provide the Soviet Union with no incentive for striking first in the heat of a crisis in order to mitigate the damage it would otherwise absorb.

**The Primacy of Sea-based Systems.** Measured against these criteria, sea-based strategic systems have significant advantages over their land-based counterparts, advantages which stem from their highly survivable and less provocative nature.

Both land-based missiles and bombers are fast becoming potentially vulnerable to preemptive enemy attack. In fact, if multiple warheads with improved accuracies are introduced, it will be easier and easier for one strategic booster to destroy more than one land-based counterpart on the other side.

Because land-based systems are becoming increasingly vulnerable, it is difficult to determine the reliance which should be placed on them in sizing one's forces for an adequate second strike capability. One effect is to drive the definition of such a capability ever higher and to encourage a build-up on both sides. The existence of these vulnerable forces also provides a destabilizing incentive for a damage mitigating strike in time of crisis.

The vulnerability problem is more severe with respect to land-based missiles than bombers, since the latter can be safely launched subject to recall, while adoption of a launch on warning policy for land-based missiles—or the construction of an extensive ABM defense—would itself have destabilizing effects. And land-based missiles are doubly dangerous because of their own provocative nature. They provide a destabilizing incentive to strike first not only in the hope of mitigating population damage, but also for the purpose of forestalling such a damage mitigating strike against oneself.

While bombers are not provocative because of their long flight times and while they can be launched subject to recall, they do have less warning time of an attack than missiles—so little, in fact, that one cannot place high confidence in their ability successfully to escape.

Sea-based strategic systems do not suffer from these defects. They are not vulnerable because they can hide in the ocean and not be found. They are also inherently less provocative. Even if accuracies are eventually developed which would permit the use of sea-based missiles against land-based missile silos, the destabilizing effect will be small if few such silos exist and if both sides have moved the bulk of their deterrent forces to sea.

**The Policy Implications.** In our view, the foregoing considerations have clear-cut policy implications. They dictate, in simplest terms, that both the United States and the Soviet Union should place increasing reliance on sea-based missiles as their primary de-

terrent force. This, we believe, is the best path to a stable mutual deterrence, in which both sides have credible and stabilizing deterrent forces and in which parity is achieved at reasonable total force levels.

A policy of increased reliance on sea-based missile forces does not imply that all land-based systems should be phased out completely on both sides. The United States and the Soviet Union have invested large sums in existing land-based systems. The potential vulnerability of these systems is growing, but it is not yet severe. And even when it reaches greater proportions, the timing required for a coordinated attack on land-based missiles and bombers simultaneously will be very difficult to achieve.

These considerations suggest the wisdom of retaining existing land-based missiles and bombers in our strategic force structure for the foreseeable future, as relatively inexpensive but very useful insurance against technological breakthroughs which could threaten our sea-based missiles. At the same time, the dim future prospects of all land-based systems argue against major reliance on or large-scale commitments to new replacements for existing systems.

Emphasis should be placed instead on insuring the viability of our sea-based missile forces. These forces should be sized so that they by themselves will provide a credible second strike capability. We should also take all steps necessary to insure their continued survivability against technological breakthroughs of the future.

Such is the perspective in which we view the role of sea-based missile systems. It has been our perspective in the past and it will remain so as we proceed to evaluate the need to accelerate work on ULMS.

## II. The condition of existing sea-based forces

Our sea-based deterrent is presently comprised of 41 nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines, developed in the late-1950s and deployed over the seven-year period between 1960 and 1967. Since each of these boats carries 16 missile tubes, they provide us with a total force of 656 sea-based missile launchers.

Three different types of missiles are presently carried by the submarines. Some of the ten oldest submarines still carry the Polaris A-2 missile, which has a range of 1,750 miles and a single nuclear warhead. Most of the 31 remaining submarines still carry the Polaris A-3, which can hurl three MRV warheads over a 2,880 mile range.

These 31 boats are now being converted, however, to carry the new Poseidon missile. The Poseidon is comparable in range to the Polaris A-3, but each Poseidon missile will carry an average of ten and up to fourteen independently targetable MRV warheads. About ten submarines have already completed the Poseidon conversion process, and the remainder will have done so by 1976.

The Poseidon conversion program will produce a massive increase in the number of individual targets which our ballistic missile submarines can strike, a much bigger increase than could ever have been achieved by building additional submarines and fitting them with existing missiles. The targeting capacity of the 31 converted submarines themselves will expand ten-fold, from 496 to 4,960. The total expansion, of the ten oldest submarines are included, will be from 656 individual targets to 5,120.

The awesome size of this post-conversion force can best be gauged by contrasting it with the spectrum of high priority targets available in the Soviet Union. We could destroy 25 percent of the Soviet Union's population and 50 percent of its industrial capacity by targeting only its 100 largest cities. If the secondary effects of such a strike were considered, the damage would be much higher still.

This destruction level—25 percent of population and 50 percent of industry—was long regarded by the previous Administration as the level needed for an adequate second strike, or assured destruction capability.

Assuming two MIRVed warheads per city, ten such warheads per missile, and sixteen missiles per submarine, this level of damage could be achieved—with 12 missiles and 120 warheads left over—by only two ballistic missile submarines on station. This is a primitive calculation, but makes the point quite fairly. Even if necessary allowance is made for additional redundancy, other targets, missile reliability and the fact that existing ballistic missile submarines are on station less than 60 percent of the time, the massive size of our already programmed post-1976 sea-based missile forces is readily apparent. One could reasonably regard it as more than adequate to deter an attack on the United States.

These calculations assume, of course, that our submarines are and will continue to remain invulnerable and that no effective defenses will be erected against their missiles after they have been launched. The validity of these assumptions deserves exploration, since they are obviously critical in gauging the adequacy of our already programmed sea-based forces.

**Future risks—ASW.** Everyone agrees that Soviet ASW techniques pose little threat to our ballistic missile submarines at the present time. The reasons can be stated very simply.

First, ASW operations have to be carried out in sea water, an environment which reduces the detectable range of all electromagnetic radiation far below that available in the atmosphere. Accordingly, traditional methods of detection based on electromagnetic radiation—methods such as radar and infra-red detection—are rendered ineffective, and the only sensing device of practical utility today in detecting nuclear submarines is sonar.

Second, sonar itself is subject to a variety of problems and cannot effectively locate submarines except at relatively short range.

There are two kinds of sonar detection methods, passive and active. Passive sonar entails no more than listening for the sound radiated by a submarine. Active sonar entails transmitting pulses of sound and detecting the echoes reflected from a submarine.

Passive sonar has a current operational range of about 100 miles and can be used over a wide range of frequencies. In both these respects, it has some advantage over active sonar. Its greatest advantage, however, is that the submarine remains unaware of its operation, whereas active sonar transmissions can be heard by a submarine well beyond the sonar's own detection range. Against this, passive sonar has no significant ranging or locating capability. The location of a submarine with passive sonar depends upon comparing signals from a number of different sonar installations, and, even then, is relatively imprecise. Passive sonar is also dependent for its effectiveness on a high level of radiated noise from the submarines it is seeking. Quiet submarines, operating at low speeds, are indistinguishable from the normal background noise of the ocean, except at extremely short ranges.

Active sonar is not dependent for its effectiveness on noisy submarine targets and cannot be defeated by submarine quieting improvements. It also has much better ranging and locating capabilities. At the same time, active sonar has a direct range in current operations of only 10-15 miles, and as noted earlier, its use can be detected well beyond that range. This latter difficulty will continue to exist even if several promising prospects for a moderate extension of range bear fruit.

In addition, both kinds of sonar are affected by other problems. Range and accuracy can be degraded significantly by adverse sea conditions. More importantly, sonar

capability is seriously affected by the irregular temperature characteristics of the ocean. The differential refraction of sound waves at the boundaries between water layers of different temperatures creates blind spots. In particular, the sharp change of temperature at the bottom of the layer of mixed surface water, which will commonly occur at a depth of 100-700 feet, has the effect of creating a substantial sonar "shadow" immediately below that boundary within which a submarine may be virtually undetectable from the surface.

A third point to note is that these characteristics of sonar detection methods make it much tougher to locate enemy ballistic missile submarines than to protect one's sea lanes against enemy attack submarines. To be successful in its mission, the anti-shiping submarine has to seek out enemy convoys and destroy them. In order to do this, it has to come well within range of the sonar equipment saturating the area around a convoy for the purpose of protecting it. The attack submarine may also have to expose some portion of itself above the waves or proceed at high speed in order to get into a suitable attack position, actions which would facilitate its detection. By contrast, the ballistic missile submarine needs only to hide itself in the ocean depths. Such a submarine might in principle be detected from time to time leaving its port or transiting narrow waters if concentrated enemy forces are employed. Even then, evasive tactics and assistance from general purpose forces would be available to prevent continued tracking unless several attack submarines were employed for each ballistic missile submarine followed.

Finally, far more than an ability to locate and track continuously a small number of ballistic missile submarines would be needed to seriously threaten our existing sea-based force. Unless almost all submarines could be tracked continuously and destroyed simultaneously, a preemptive strike attempt would invite unacceptable retaliation from the remaining missile submarines. The counterforce by attrition scenario, in which a Soviet attack submarine force would concentrate on a handful of ballistic missile submarines at a time, silently destroying them, makes no sense at all. Any unaccounted for submarines would immediately arouse suspicions of Soviet foul play, and general purpose forces assistance could be provided to as many of our remaining submarines as we saw fit, to protect them from attack until Soviet culpability had been confirmed. There is also a high probability that any Soviet attack upon our submarines could be detected when it was made, even if conventional rather than nuclear weapons were used.

For all these reasons, our existing sea-based missile force is secure today and likely to remain so for some time. It is universally agreed that we are ahead of the Soviets in acoustic submarine detection techniques and that neither we nor the Soviets are anywhere near the verge of a breakthrough in other detection methods. The only foreseeable threat to our submarines today is concentrated Soviet deployment of advanced sonar equipment in the still limited on-target areas in which our submarines now operate. The answer to this danger, it will be argued later, is not a new submarine system, but a longer range missile system for our current submarines.

**Future Risks—ABM.** Our deterrent is not seriously threatened, either, by anti-ballistic missile systems designed to shoot down incoming missiles after they have been launched. Again the reasons are quite straightforward.

First, we have already taken steps designed to counter possible Soviet construction of a large-scale ABM system. That has been the announced purpose of the Poseidon conversion program, which, as noted earlier, will provide a ten-fold increase in the number of



independently targetable warheads which the 31 converted submarines can fire, from 496 to 4,960. Thus, even if a Soviet ABM system were 90 percent effective—a very generous assumption in itself—we would still be able to put as many warheads on target as we could before the threat of a Soviet ABM system first arose. And these remaining warheads would still be several times the number needed to achieve the level of damage long regarded as necessary for an assured destruction capability.

Even more important, it now appears likely that the Soviets will never build the large-scale ABM system which Poseidon was originally designed to counter. The prospects are good that we and the Soviets will sign by May an interim SALT agreement significantly restricting the number of ABM launchers permitted to both sides. Under these circumstances, Poseidon will provide us with even more warheads than our immediate needs require, thereby adding to the lead-time we would have available to respond to later Soviet initiatives in both the ABM and ASW fields.

**Future Risks—obsolescence by age.** Nor is there any danger that our existing force will have to be replaced soon because of advanced physical age. As noted earlier, our present submarines were all deployed in the seven-year period between 1960 and 1967. They were expected then to have the same 25-30 year life as other large naval vessels, and there has been no evidence uncovered since to challenge that original projection.

In fact, what new evidence there is directly supports that projection. For one thing, some of our older attack submarines, first deployed in the 1940's, have themselves attained a 25-30 year age. In addition, no signs of unexpected wear have yet been detected on the oldest Polaris submarines now entering the second decade of their lives.

Finally, there are good reasons why ballistic missile submarines should have even longer lives than attack submarines and other naval ships. The nature of their mission is such that rigorous demands are seldom made upon them. Instead, they are driven quietly at slow speeds, and at relatively shallow depths. They have also been subject to extensive refit operations between each patrol and rigorous overhauls every five or six years to ensure that they remain in peak operating condition. Their crews are extensively trained and qualified and must meet the highest standards of any group in the Navy. The record of high Polaris reliability is well known.

Accordingly, we have every reason to believe that our existing submarines will attain the 25-30 year life predicted when they were first deployed. To the extent age is a factor, replacements will eventually be needed in the 1985-1990 time frame, but not until that time.

**Administration Comments.** The Administration, however, does not really base its case for ULMS on the existence of new ASW or ABM threats or on the age of existing submarines.

It makes no reference at all to an ABM threat, recognizing no doubt that even the threat used to justify Poseidon has never come to pass.

It does talk about ASW, but its comments are deservedly guarded. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., did note in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, that "the Soviets have expressed interest (emphasis added) in developing a strategic ASW force that can effectively locate, identify, and destroy our Polaris force." And Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, pointed out in his testimony to the Committee that "the Soviets are believed (emphasis added) to be working on a number of new ASW developments which could significantly improve their anti-submarine warfare capa-

bility." These are unusually weak statements for a threat analysis. And they are undercut further by Dr. Foster's direct admission to the Committee that "we cannot identify today any developments that indicate a Soviet threat to our sea-based missile deterrent."

Nor is the Administration arguing that our present submarines are on the verge of wearing out. It notes that they are getting older and that they will eventually have to be replaced. But nowhere is this eventual replacement need directly tied to the 1978 deployment date implicit in the accelerated ULMS development program.

In short, the Administration turns elsewhere to find its rationale for a major acceleration of ULMS.

### III. The official rationale for ULMS: Soviet submarine expansion

Secretary of Defense Laird was quite candid about the main reason for an accelerated ULMS program in his recent posture statement to the Congress. Acceleration was required, he argued, not because of any inherent deficiencies in our existing sea-based forces, but in response to Soviet expansion of their own forces:

"The continuing Soviet strategic offensive force buildup, with its long term implications, convinced us that we need to undertake a major new strategic initiative. This step must signal to the Soviets and our allies that we have the will and the resources to maintain sufficient strategic forces in the face of a growing Soviet threat. It would be diplomatically and politically unacceptable for the U.S. to allow the Soviets to achieve a large numerical superiority in both land-based and sea-based strategic missiles . . . I have carefully reviewed all alternatives for new strategic initiatives and have decided that acceleration of the ULMS program is the most appropriate alternative, since the at sea portion of our sea-based strategic forces has the best long term prospect for high pre-launch survivability."

Laird noted in his posture statement that the Soviets have been expanding their own ballistic missile submarine fleet so rapidly that they may soon have more such submarines and more sea-based missiles than we do. He pointed out that they have already deployed 25 Yankee class submarines—rough equivalents to our own Polaris—and that another 17 are now under construction. By the end of calendar year 1973, he argued, the Soviets could have 42 Yankee submarines at sea, compared to a United States fleet of 41 ballistic missile submarines. And since Soviet submarines, like ours, carry sixteen missiles each, the Soviets would then lead, too, in numbers of sea-based missiles deployed, 672-656.

The purpose of ULMS acceleration was therefore two-fold; to dissuade the Soviets from continuing their buildup and to match it in the event it proceeded. Our purpose is to examine in detail the wisdom of this rationale.

**The Concept of Parity is Important.** We have no quarrel with the suggestion that the size of Soviet forces is a matter of legitimate concern to the United States. In fact, we noted earlier our belief that a stable nuclear deterrence requires that neither side gain the ability to inflict considerably greater urban/industrial damage on the other. The reason is that the level of retaliatory damage needed to achieve deterrence is an inherently subjective judgment, which can best be given objective status through shared perceptions on both sides.

It is no doubt true that we and the Soviets already have more than enough weaponry to virtually obliterate each other. But as long as influential policy makers on both sides believe that additional buildups can produce military and diplomatic advantages, it would not be conducive to a stable mutual deter-

rence if one side were to let go unchallenged a major buildup by the other. A stable mutual deterrence—and an arms accord looking to parity at reduced force levels—will not be achieved until the goal of superiority has been firmly rejected by both sides.

**Parity, However, Can be a Two-edged Sword.** While mutual acceptance of parity is essential if the arms race is to be controlled, parity is also a difficult concept to define, and too zealous a pursuit of all its indicia could easily fuel the arms race.

It is clear, for example, that not one factor, but many factors jointly, determine the ability of one country's strategic forces to inflict damage on another country. Considering only sea-based forces for a moment, numbers of submarines and missiles are important, but so are many other factors—missile range and accuracy, numbers and size of warheads, submarine survivability, the status of ABM defenses, and geographical considerations.

Absolute parity in all these regards cannot possibly be achieved. Even close approximations are made difficult by such factors as different historical starting points, lack of knowledge about each other's intentions, and the momentum of programs once begun.

Accordingly, there is grave danger that action taken in one country to maintain parity will be perceived elsewhere as evidence of other motives, and that the action taken in response will be similarly misperceived. Too zealous a pursuit of parity, in other words, can easily trigger a long series of actions and reactions which serve only to fuel the arms race.

The Administration and its spokesmen have recognized this danger, and they have sought to defuse it with their words. First, they have defined parity in terms of general damage level equivalence, not in terms of other narrower indicia. They have also stated that only a Soviet capability to cause "considerably greater urban/industrial destruction than the United States could inflict on the Soviets" is a reasonable grounds for concern.

We accept this formulation. We agree with the words of President Nixon in his recent foreign policy message to the Congress: "The capabilities of both the U.S. and USSR have reached a point where our programs need not be driven by fear of minor quantitative imbalances." Whether these precepts have been reasonably applied in the decision to accelerate ULMS development is the question to which we now turn.

**The U.S.-Soviet Sea-based Balance.** We believe that these precepts cannot be used to justify the Administration's accelerated ULMS program. In our view, ULMS acceleration seems "driven" by precisely that "fear of minor quantitative imbalances" which the Administration has rejected as a suitable basis for United States strategic defense policy.

To begin with, the present balance in land-based systems is not unfavorable to the United States. The Soviet lead in numbers of land-based missiles deployed—1,520 to 1,054 according to Secretary Laird's recent posture statement—is greatly offset by our own lead in numbers of strategic bombers—565 to 140 according to the same source. In addition, the United States has a significant lead at the present time in numbers of independently targetable land-based warheads due to the Minuteman III MIRV program and development of the SRAM missile for our bomber force. The Soviets, as Secretary Laird has noted, have not yet even tested a MIRV warhead, and they have no air-to-surface missiles with the capabilities of SRAM. Accordingly, an unfavorable balance in land-based systems cannot reasonably be cited to justify undue concern about the status of the sea-based balance.

As far as sea-based forces are concerned, it is true that the Soviets 18 months from now

may have one more modern ballistic missile submarine with 16 more missiles deployed than we do. But this very "minor quantitative imbalance" will be more than offset by continued United States advantages of other kinds.

One such advantage will be the huge United States lead in independently targetable warhead numbers, an outgrowth of the Poseidon program. Since each Poseidon submarine will carry 160 independently targetable warheads, compared to 16 on each Yankee class submarine, it will take only five Poseidon submarines to more than match in warheads the total Yankee fleet. Yet we will have approximately 20 Poseidon submarines deployed 18 months from now at the end of 1973, together with about an equal number of unconverted Polaris submarines.

For a number of reasons, our submarines will also be significantly more secure than their Soviet counterparts from ASW techniques. First, our submarines themselves are of better quality they have better sonar and more sophisticated navigational equipment and, above all, are significantly quieter. Second, the already longer range of our submarines' missiles—about 2,880 miles for the Polaris A-3 and Poseidon, compared to about 1,760 miles for the current Soviet Sawfly missile—will enable them to hide within range of their targets in a broader expanse of ocean area. In addition, geographical considerations will remain unfavorable to Soviet submarines; when leaving port, they will have to transit for much longer distances through narrow waters in which ASW equipment can be concentrated. Finally, they will be faced with the superior ASW techniques which the United States has developed and deployed.

It seems clear, then, that nothing will occur in the next 18 months to give the Soviet Union the capability to inflict "considerably greater" damage on the United States than it could inflict in return. Whatever net advantage there may be will continue to lie with the United States.

As far as longer term developments are concerned, two things should be said.

First, it is impossible to predict what additional improvements in their sea-based forces the Soviets may undertake or what success they will enjoy in their endeavors. They may seek to deploy considerably more than 42 ballistic missile submarines, or they may stop at or near that number. They may or may not seek to put in their submarines longer range missiles with independently targetable warheads to match the Poseidon program. The Administration has noted that the Soviets have been testing a new submarine-launched ballistic missile—the SS-NX-8—with an estimated range roughly equivalent to that of Poseidon. But the Administration, quite deservedly, has made no claims as to the capabilities of or Soviet hopes for that missile. To date no MIRV or MRV tests have been conducted with that missile, and doubts must remain both as to its compatibility with existing Soviet submarines and its long-range potential as a Poseidon equivalent. Finally, the Soviets may attempt to supplement their Yankee fleet with submarines of a newer class, but there is as yet no evidence that they plan to do so.

Second, an accelerated ULMS program is clearly not required to protect long-term United States interests against this vague Soviet threat, as the examination of a worst-case analysis—which no-one has even suggested to date—will show. Even if Soviet submarine construction continues, even if a successful MIRV test of the SS-NX-8 is conducted tomorrow, and even if action is then taken to put the SS-NX-8 in all Soviet ballistic missile submarines as a Poseidon equivalent, the United States lead in sea-based warheads will remain secure until 1980 at the very least.

We already plan to have 5,120 warheads at

sea by the end of 1976 when the Poseidon program is completed. The Soviets might be able to match this figure by 1980, but only if they proceeded more quickly than we did from the first successful test of their new missile to its deployment or if they converted their submarines at a more rapid pace than ours. If initial deployment occurred in late-1970 and six submarines were converted each year thereafter, it would not be until 1980 that the Soviets would have on station more than our 31 converted submarines. In the meantime, we could prolong our warhead lead simply by converting to a new missile system the 10 oldest Polaris boats not now programmed for Poseidon.

Under these circumstances, there is little danger of a serious tilt in the sea-based balance of strategic forces if we wait to see whether anything like this worse case scenario materializes. If we do wait, we will be able to monitor all new Soviet ship construction 18-30 months before deployment. We will also be able to monitor any tests of MIRV technology on the SS-NX-8. And even if we moved forward two years from now on the accelerated ULMS timetable presently proposed, we could still look to ULMS deployment as early as 1980. It should not be forgotten in considering our option, that what the present Administration program entails is a three-year step-up in the earliest ULMS deployment previously considered, from 1978 to 1981. We could wait a good while yet and still beat the old timetable.

*The Bargaining Chip Implications for ULMS.* It is far from clear that an accelerated ULMS program at this time would have the effect the Administration hopes. The Soviets to date have shown little interest in the negotiation at SALT of sea-based force limitations. An accelerated ULMS program might facilitate such negotiations, but it much more likely would not.

The history of the SALT talks to date shows that both sides have proceeded cautiously, protecting their national interest and avoiding any steps that might lock them into even a short-term disadvantage. The Soviets have continued a numerical buildup in both their land-based and sea-based missile forces, and the United States has moved forward with its Safeguard ABM system and the introduction of MIRVed warheads to its existing missile force. If the Soviets perceived an accelerated ULMS proposal as a threat to their own chances of attaining parity with the United States in sea-based forces, it is unlikely that they would respond by foregoing programs already planned.

And an accelerated ULMS program might well be perceived as such a threat by the Soviets. Look at the situation for a moment from a possible Soviet perspective. The Soviets have been responding in recent years to a series of earlier United States initiatives. They are fast pulling even with the United States in numbers of submarines and missiles deployed, yet they are still far behind in other areas—in numbers of warheads, in submarine quietness, in missile range, etc. The ULMS initiative at this juncture could have several implications.

First, it could pose a threat over the longer term to the Soviets' almost acquired parity in numbers of submarines and missiles. It is doubtful, however, that this would be the Soviets' main concern, since this threat could be easily offset by a continuation of their present buildup or eliminated altogether by agreeing to the kind of numerical limitations on submarines and missiles which have been discussed at SALT.

But an accelerated ULMS program would pose more than a simple numerical threat to the Soviet Union. If pursued, it could lead to greater United States advantages than now exist in other areas. Some of our submarines, for example, would have more missiles and warheads each then could ever be placed in the Soviets' Yankee class sub-

marines. And these advantages would be gained if the program were pursued now at a time when the Soviets had not yet demonstrated through successful MIRV tests an ability to match existing United States capabilities.

These Soviet concerns would not necessarily be eliminated by the negotiation of numerical limitations on submarine and sea-based missile forces, since these limitations would not by themselves preclude the accelerated development of ULMS. Unless arrangements to the contrary were made, an accelerated ULMS program could easily proceed under the context of these limitations, as a replacement rather than a supplement to the existing Poseidon force.

The Administration has been less than candid as to its own intentions in this regard. On the one hand, it has justified accelerated ULMS development as a needed signal to the Soviets of United States concern over the Soviet submarine buildup, thus implying that ULMS is somehow bargainable. On the other hand, it has stressed the fact that ULMS will eventually be needed anyhow, thus implying that little change in the present timetable might follow from progress at SALT.

Under these circumstances, the Soviets might reasonably look askance at United States calls for numerical limitations at SALT. They might well question the wisdom of agreeing to restraint in the one area where they can begin to match the United States, while simultaneously allowing the United States to proceed in other areas where it already enjoyed advantages.

We are deeply concerned by the likelihood of this development. In our view, an accelerated ULMS program is not required at this time to protect our national interest. And if pursued, we believe it would be as likely to stimulate as to curb the arms race.

*A Sensible Position on ULMS for SALT.* We believe that a responsible United States bargaining position on ULMS must meet three objectives. First, it must clearly protect the security interests of the United States in the event negotiations fail.

Second, it must be reasonably calculated to assure the Soviet Union that its own security objectives can be attained through successful negotiations. And third, it must be designed to provide sufficient time for fruitful negotiations to take place. These objectives would be met, in our view, if the following steps are taken.

First, we should proceed now with development of a new long-range missile system. Such development work would provide ample evidence to the Soviets of our determination to protect our sea-based nuclear deterrent.

Second, the President should make clear the willingness of the United States to forego during fiscal year 1973 any major increase in expenditures for the development or production of a new submarine system, in return only for Soviet agreement to serious negotiations at SALT on the subject of sea-based force limitations. It is our belief that the President should be able to obtain such a commitment from the Soviets during his Moscow trip in May, at which time an interim SALT agreement—restricting ABMs and land-based missiles only—is widely expected to be signed.

Third, the United States should make clear that its continued restraint during subsequent negotiations will be directly dependent on the restraint exercised by the Soviets themselves. In our opinion, such restraint will be shown if both sides forego major additional ballistic missile submarine construction activities and confine their efforts to improvements in the capabilities of their existing submarine fleets. If such restraint is exercised—and there are no developments threatening the survivability of existing sea-based forces—there should be



ample time for negotiations to proceed without simultaneous submarine buildups on either side.

Such an approach, we feel, would fully protect all our interests at SALT. We should not allow Soviet expenditure of \$100 million on a 42nd ballistic missile submarine to propel us into a \$30 billion investment on ULMS and the world into a new sea based arms race.

#### IV. Additional reasons for going slow on ULMS

An accelerated ULMS program is not required to protect our interests while the SALT talks continue and indeed could jeopardize those talks. But there are other reasons, too, why we should proceed slowly with ULMS at this time.

*The Proposed Accelerated Program is Inconsistent with Sound Procurement Policy.* Recent aircraft programs such as the C-5A and the F-14 have shown the dangers involved in overly ambitious development and production schedules. There are differences, to be sure, between aircraft and submarine development programs. Prototype submarines are not developed and tested first, after which they are turned out in large quantities on an assembly line basis. Instead, each submarine is very much a unique creation, and each is earmarked for production. There are several respects, however, in which the same kind of program management considerations which apply to aircraft programs apply to submarines as well.

First, many submarine subsystems are subject to the typical development-production cycle normally associated with aircraft programs. The missile subsystems are an obvious case in point, and the same considerations apply to navigational equipment, launch systems, and flight control systems as well. An accelerated schedule for ULMS would increase the risk of otherwise avoidable concurrency in the development and production of these subsystems.

Second, an accelerated schedule for ULMS would also necessitate illogical phasing between work on these subsystems and work on the submarine itself. To cite just one example, work on the submarine is now programmed to proceed so rapidly that we will be locked into specific size constraints for the second generation ULMS 2 missile before the first generation ULMS 1 missile has even flown for the first time.

Perhaps most important, any compressed development schedule means that more work has to be done in a shorter period of time. This increases the danger of mistakes being made and makes corrective action more difficult without disrupting the overall program timetable. Accordingly, a choice has to be made at the outset between running these risks or eliminating certain programmed work from the project. Often an attempt is made to retain all design objectives for awhile, but some later drop by the wayside. Such could be the fate, for example, of several improvements now counted on to reduce ULMS' detectability.

The history of overly ambitious development programs has a clear lesson to tell. Almost invariably such programs lead to higher than anticipated modification costs before new systems are debugged. They also lead to schedule slippages, such that a program's accelerated features evaporate before its completion.

There is no reason to believe that ULMS would not be subject to similar pitfalls if pursued on an accelerated schedule. The major distinction to be expected is that our mistakes would cost us more because of the overall magnitude of the program. Since there is no need to accelerate work on ULMS, it makes no sense to run this risk.

*More Time is Needed to Review the Merits of Alternative ULMS Designs.* Even if developments at SALT are such that we feel com-

pelled to move ahead with a new submarine construction program one year from now, there is much to be gained by having that much additional time to review the merits of alternative submarine designs. While alternatives have been explored ever since the inception of the ULMS program in 1969, no final decisions were made by the Navy until ULMS acceleration was ordered in January, and many important details are still being worked out. Accordingly, neither the Defense Department nor the Congress have had much opportunity to exercise design review. Such review, however, may be very badly needed.

It seems clear, for example, that the Navy is designing ULMS to have a top speed several knots faster than our existing Polaris submarines. The case for a higher speed has not been made, and any attempt to attain it is certain to have some adverse side effects.

The Navy will no doubt argue that increased speed is necessary, since increased speed will always make it easier to break contact with trailing Soviet attack submarines, many of which are already faster than our Polaris submarines. This argument, however, deserves further examination.

It should be noted, first, that speed is much more central to the mission of an attack submarine than it is to the mission of a ballistic missile submarine. The primary objective of the latter is to avoid detection in the first place, not to break trail after detection has occurred. Accordingly, we have always placed more emphasis in our ballistic missile submarine programs on quietness than we have on speed. Soviet Yankee class submarines, by contrast, have been faster but much noisier than Polaris (especially when driven at their faster speeds) and considerably more easy to detect. Only in our attack submarine programs has speed to date been made a key objective. Since the purpose of attack submarines is to seek out enemy shipping and destroy it, there is arguably some need to give them speeds as fast as most surface ships. Many experts have argued, however, that our attack submarines themselves should rely more on stealth and less on speed.

It should also be remembered that there are simple technical reasons why it will always be possible to build attack submarines faster than any ballistic missile submarines afloat. In a gross sense, the most important difference between the two kinds of submarines lies in the fact that the ballistic missile submarine has a middle section, which the attack submarine lacks, in which its missiles are stored. The presence of this missile section increases submarine size and in turn imposes an obvious restraint on speeds which could otherwise be achieved. In fact, even if ULMS is given the increased speed which the Navy seeks, it will still be substantially slower than existing and projected Soviet attack submarines.

Accordingly, the Navy should logically be required to demonstrate two things to justify its increased speed requirement. First, it should be required to show that the marginal reduction in the still remaining speed advantage of Soviet attack submarines has a clear-cut military significance. And second, it should be required to show that the original advantage could not be regained in a new Soviet attack submarine program. The first point has not yet been demonstrated, and the second cannot be shown.

The merits of increased speed would be a much less important issue if increased speed could be obtained without adverse side effects. Unfortunately, the speed now sought will necessitate a much larger submarine than would otherwise be required.

Several factors have had a major influence on the size of alternative ULMS designs, but the two most important have been the proposed length of the missiles to be carried and the proposed size of the new submarine's

nuclear propulsion system. (Both factors have an obvious effect on the needed hull diameter, since both have to fit inside, and the hull diameter in turn drives the overall size of the vessel at a rate proportionate to the size of the hull radius squared). Missile range is the main determinant of missile length, and the speed desired determines power plant size.

A submarine slightly larger in hull diameter than our current Polaris submarines would be required simply to accommodate the 6,000 mile range ULMS 2 missile. The increased size required would be much less, however, if this were its main determinant, a point attested to in part by Navy plans to incorporate the 4,500 mile range ULMS 1 missile in our existing submarines. In fact, the size of an ULMS submarine which could carry 20 to 24 missiles of 6,000 miles range would probably be 13,000 to 14,000 tons, compared to 8,000 tons for the largest of our current submarines. The Navy's present speed objective, however, and the size of the power plant needed to attain it have now pushed the size of the proposed ULMS design into the 17,000 to 18,000 ton range, more than twice the size of current submarines.

Several consequences would follow from any attempt to build a submarine that size.

One such consequence would be a notable increase in a whole range of program costs—propulsion costs, submarine construction costs, operating costs, and costs of new port facilities. According to some informed sources, the net effect could be at least 20 percent higher 10-year systems costs than those which might be incurred in building a new submarine with more and larger missiles, but no faster speed, than our present submarines.

A second consequence would be increased time per ship and slower construction rates. These factors—and the high costs per ship—could have an obvious impact on our ability to match the pace of new Soviet submarine construction.

Finally, such a larger submarine would be more susceptible than a smaller one to some ASW techniques. Active sonar equipment, for example, is more effective the larger the target, and the same may be true for new non-acoustic detection techniques, which we and presumably the Soviets are now trying to develop. High costs could further compound the ASW risks by limiting the total size of our fleet.

For all these reasons, a hard look at the Navy's present speed objective seems very much in order. Other design objectives, too, should be very carefully checked. A 6,000 mile range ULMS 2 missile would offer definite advantages over the 4,500 mile ULMS 1, but their precise significance should be pinned down. As noted earlier, very dramatic cost savings might be achieved if both speed and missile range could be scaled down. A design review might show that any new submarine construction we undertake in the near future should be based on a design much more similar than the present ULMS to the design of our present fleet. But unless we go slow with ULMS this year, we may find ourselves wholly committed to the existing design before a review can be made.

*The Funding Implications.* For all these reasons, we believe that the ULMS program should not be accelerated at the present time. Approximately \$650 million of this year's request for \$977 million (including the fiscal year 1972 supplemental) is earmarked for work on the new submarine itself and its non-missile subsystems. We believe that \$600 million of this amount should be disallowed and that fiscal year 1973 funding for non-missile-related work should be held at the \$50 million level. Such actions would provide for a slight increase from the roughly \$40 million available for non-missile-related work in fiscal year 1972 ULMS fund-

ing. This amount should be more than adequate to continue Navy design studies and preliminary development work.

In allocating these funds to specific uses, the Navy, in our view, should be guided by two objectives. First, it should seek to reduce to the greatest extent possible the risk of cost growth and schedule slippage which would be inherent in a decision to greatly accelerate the pace of ULMS development in fiscal year 1974. Second, it should minimize the extent possible the risk of premature commitment to a particular ULMS design. Major development expenditures on a new propulsion plant, especially, should be avoided at this time.

**V. The modernization and replacement problem: The role of a long-range missile**

Even if negotiations proceed well at SALT and no new submarine construction is needed to match a continued Soviet submarine buildup, it will still be necessary to modernize and eventually replace our present sea-based missile force.

The Navy will no doubt seek to meet this need by pushing for development of a new ULMS submarine system as fast as the Defense Department and the Congress will allow.

Admittedly, a new submarine system would offer more in the way of prestige than continued improvements in our present fleet. It cannot be justified, however, in terms of the advanced physical age of that fleet. As noted earlier, none of our current ballistic missile submarines will reach 25-30 years of age until 1985-1990 time period. Moreover, we believe that a new submarine system would not offer significantly greater operational capabilities than those which could be obtained for some time to come by appropriate modifications to our present fleet.

**ULMS Would Have Advantages.** There is no doubt that a new submarine system such as ULMS could be superior in several ways to our present sea-based missile force.

First, the new submarine could be significantly more survivable than our present Polaris submarines. It could be designed for quieter operation, and it could be given a new long-range missile system which would greatly expand the ocean area in which it could hide while remaining in range of its targets. These two steps would greatly complicate the ASW problem facing the Soviets. They would reduce detectability by acoustic sensors and make much more difficult the concentrated deployment of such sensors in all submarine operating areas.

Second, the new submarine could present a tougher ABM problem for the Soviet Union. Its missiles could be given new maneuvering re-entry which (MARVs) designed to dodge Soviet defensive missiles. In addition, its longer range missiles would enable it to provide deterrent coverage over the entire defense perimeter of the Soviet Union. By contrast, our present submarines are much more limited in the geographical areas from which they can obtain effective target coverage.

Finally, the new submarine could provide better on-station availability. Due to the limited range missiles in our current submarines, a significant portion of their time at sea must be spent in transit to their patrol areas, and they must depend heavily on overseas basing. The on-station availability of a new submarine could be enhanced, moreover, not only by its longer range missiles but also by the lower maintenance times which its modular construction and integrated systems design would permit.

That a new submarine system could provide significant improvements in the capabilities of our current fleet is not disputed. But it is not enough for the Navy to cite these possible improvements as reasons for building ULMS. The Navy must show also that the same improvements cannot be ob-

tained through modifications to the existing fleet. And this the Navy has not yet done.

**The Fleet Modernization Alternative.** Many of the improvements just referred to are dependent not on the construction of a new submarine, but on the capabilities which new long-range missiles themselves would provide. In fact, new long-range missiles would provide improvements in each of the areas mentioned. They would increase submarine survivability, compound the problems of ABM defense, and increase submarine time on-station. This fact has been well attested to in testimony of Defense Department spokesmen to Congress earlier this year. Dr. Foster noted as much in speaking to the Senate Armed Services Committee about the capabilities of the Navy's proposed ULMS 1 missile:

"When our current SSBNs are armed with this more capable missile, the ocean area from which they can launch their missiles will be significantly increased, with no sacrifice in payload. This enlargement of an area in which the Soviets must expand their strategic ASW efforts degrades the effectiveness of any ASW of the kind they now appear to engage in. Consequently, we expect that, with this new missile, the current submarine missile system will remain invulnerable. Moreover, the longer range ULMS-1 missile will offer the option of CONUS basing with minimum sacrifice in deterrent posture."

Modifications of our present submarines themselves could also proceed concurrent with work on a new long-range missile system. We have been making such improvements ever since these submarines were introduced. As Admiral Zumwalt noted in his recent testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee:

"Concurrent submarine improvements have included reduction of detectable noise levels, better passive and active sonars, and improved navigational equipment. This orderly, upgrading process has paid off and the logic for it remains valid today."

We wholeheartedly agree. As far as detectable noise is concerned, our current submarines are already 5-10 decibels (db's) quieter than when they were introduced, and there is no reason why a gradual quieting program should not continue to be successful. It is true that the natural circulation reactor now programmed for ULMS cannot be incorporated in our current submarines, but similar noise reduction could be obtained by incorporating equipment such as the variable speed pumps and multi-vein impellers which the Navy is now developing.

It should also be possible to reduce maintenance requirements affecting the on-station availability of our current submarines. The Navy is now installing in those submarines new long-life reactor cores. While older cores have had to be replaced every 5-6 years—thus setting a clear outside limit on the time between submarine overhauls—the new cores will have a 10 year service life. The Navy is now investigating several promising ways to extend the time between overhauls to take advantage of these long-life cores. Our current submarines are now on station 55-60 percent of the time. With long-range missiles aboard and increased time between overhauls, they should be able to come much closer to the 65-70 percent on-station availability rate which a new ULMS submarine realistically might provide.

Modifications to our existing sea-based missile force should be able, then, to provide almost the same improved capabilities as brand new submarines would provide. Under these circumstances, we believe that money spent for new submarine replacements would be money wasted at the present time.

**The Unpredictable Nature of the Future ASW Threat.** Money spent now might be money wasted for another reason as well.

While our current submarines are secure today from Soviet ASW techniques—and while they could be made more so by an appropriate modernization program—we know very little about the long-term nature of the ASW threat.

We do know that a submarine moving through the ocean environment leaves various indicators of its presence. Sound is only one of these indicators. The presence of a mass of metal, such as a submarine, distorts the earth's magnetic field. The temperature of a submarine, especially a nuclear submarine with its hot nuclear reactor discharge, differs from the temperature of the surrounding water. And the passage of a submarine through water creates hydrodynamic pressure.

Until now, only acoustic techniques have been of major utility in submarine detection. But other signals are also there. What is needed is new technology to dig them out and process them. What form this technology will take—and what steps will be required to counter it—is not known at the present time.

There is a danger, therefore, that any new submarines we build today could be rendered obsolete in much the same way and at much the same time as the submarines we now have. It is quite possible that we could invest \$30 billion in the ULMS program over the next 10-15 years, expecting it to protect us until the year 2,000, only to find that it might be rendered obsolete by 1990 and that a new submarine development program was needed in the early 1980's to offset this possibility, almost as soon as ULMS was sent to sea.

**A Well-Phased Replacement Program.** This does not mean that we should simply sit back, wait for a new ASW threat to develop, and then counter it when it does. We have no guarantee that it will burst upon us in a dramatic breakthrough or that such a breakthrough, if it occurs, will coincide with the physical obsolescence of our current submarines.

We should be able, however, to devise a well-phased modernization and replacement program which will minimize potentially wasteful expenditures yet keep us equipped at all times with a highly secure sea-based deterrent. We believe that the following course of action would provide us with such a program.

First, Congress should approve the Navy's request for approximately \$330 million in fiscal year 1973 ULMS 1 missile development funds. Development of the ULMS 1 missile—together with other modifications to our current submarines on which the Navy is working—will significantly enhance the survivability of our present fleet against all foreseeable threats. If development of this new missile proceeds at the presently projected rate, it should be available for initial deployment by 1976. In the absence of any major change in the ASW threat, it should remain an integral part of our sea-based deterrent well into the 1990s.

Second, the Navy should accord high priority to its current "SSBN Defense" program. This program, the funding for which is projected to increase from \$12.2 to \$20.4 million in fiscal year 1973, is designed to identify and develop suitable counters to new ASW techniques which could jeopardize our Polaris fleet. The knowledge gained from this program should be used to make future reductions in the detectability of that fleet. It should also be used as a source of ideas for new submarine designs.

Third, the Navy timetable for a new submarine construction program should be determined both by changes in the ASW threat and the eventual need to replace our current submarines. Such a program should be undertaken in sufficient time to meet any changes in the ASW threat which have been identified and which cannot be countered by



modifications to our Polaris fleet. Unless such threat changes that have identified, it should not be necessary to move beyond the study and design phase of the ULMS program until fiscal year 1976 or later. That starting date would provide ample time for the gradual development of a new submarine system. Even if development time were stretched from the roughly six years implicit in the Administration's present timetable to as much as 10 years, the first new submarine would still be available for deployment in 1985, at which time the oldest of our current submarines would be 25 years of age. It would then be possible—with a construction rate as low as two or three submarines per year thereafter—to replace all our current submarines inside their projected 30 year lives.

We believe that this timetable, either the development or production phases of which could be speeded up if the threat required, makes much more sense than the commitment now of vast sums to a new submarine system of unknown long-term value.

**ASW Talks at SALT.** The most pressing need at SALT right now is the negotiation of restrictions on ABM systems and the size of strategic offensive forces. These issues themselves have caused difficulties enough, and a continued failure to resolve them—coupled with a continued Soviet submarine buildup—could force as much sooner than would otherwise be desirable into a new submarine construction program.

As soon as possible, however, the issue of restrictions on strategic ASW operations should be placed high on the SALT agenda. Our sea-based missile submarines are secure today, and it should be possible to keep them so well into the future. At the same time, the possibility of a new ASW breakthrough—one which cannot be countered by any new submarine design—cannot be dismissed out of hand. The occurrence of such a breakthrough, coupled with the already increasing vulnerability of all land-based systems, would dramatically undermine the present stability of the nuclear balance.

We recognize that restrictions on ASW research itself may not be feasible, since there may be no way that compliance could be verified. Neither we nor the Soviets have much choice, therefore, but to pursue strategic ASW research—with the purpose of ensuring the survivability of our own sea-based deterrent, but with the danger that the knowledge gained could be used for counter-force purposes.

It should not be impossible, however, to work out verifiable restrictions on the actual deployment of new ASW systems or even on the use of such systems when deployed. A numerical limitation on attack submarine force levels and the establishment of trailing norms are two promising possibilities.

The long-range prospects for a stable mutual deterrence may well depend on the continued survivability of sea-based deterrent forces. Accordingly, much more attention should be directed in the future to this ASW problem.

## THE CARDS ARE ON THE TABLE IN CHINA

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, during President Nixon's visit to Peking and the weeks which have followed we have heard a great deal about Communist China. While little has been said about the fact that the Chinese people live under a tyrannical regime which does not per-

mit them to leave the country, and does not permit them the slightest degree of religious, intellectual, or cultural freedom, a great deal has been said about the potential business which our country might, in the future, be able to do with the Mainland.

American businessmen, we have been told, will profit greatly by having available to them a market of more than 800 million Chinese. It is unfortunate that the wishful thinking upon which such statements are made is not more often forced to confront reality.

Such a confrontation with reality recently took place at the 43d annual conference of Copley Newspapers in Borrego Springs, Calif., which was addressed by Lt. Gen. V. H. Krulak, USMC, retired.

General Krulak noted that:

The Maoists declare that their world trade is healthy and growing; that they are competitive. The fact is, Red Chinese world trade is small; perhaps three billion legitimate dollars—in and out—per year. That is no more than Taiwan, a little land of only 14 million people.

The future, according to General Krulak, will see little improvement in the Chinese world trade posture. The reason, he argues, is that—

They have no agricultural surplus to sell. They have no oil surplus to sell. They have no precious mineral surpluses to sell. Their manufactured products are not competitive, and it will take a massive and costly industrialization to make them so. In Hong Kong there are Red Chinese bicycles, electric cookers, radios and electric fans on sale—all of inferior quality and relatively high price.

Products produced in China for international consumption before the Communist takeover, such as wool carpets, are still produced, but the prices are no longer competitive. A Tientsin rug, for example, cost \$1 per square foot in 1947 and now costs \$6 a foot. The same carpet of at least equal quality in Taiwan, made to your own design, costs \$4.25 a foot.

General Krulak, taking issue with our official government pronouncements which deny any Communist Chinese involvement in the flow of narcotics, states that—

The Chinese Reds do want hard money—and opium is probably China's greatest export staple. They are doing everything they can to improve and expand opium culture, and it is estimated that they earn almost a billion clandestine dollars a year from their dope sales.

In his speech, General Krulak discusses the "terror, oppression, regimentation, restriction, surveillance, and harsh punishment" which has been visited upon the people of China by the Communist regime of Mao Tse-tung.

Criticizing those who urge American aid, assistance, and business dealings with the Peking regime, General Krulak concludes by stating that—

We do not need the People's Republic of China. They do need us. Consequently, our guidance in dealing with the Peking leaders might well be found in an old Chinese dialog coming from the Tang Dynasty, about 800 A.D.:

If one injures me, hates me, vilifies me and suddenly smiles on me, what should I do?

Bear with him, endure him, avoid him. And, after a few years, just look at him.

I wish to share General Krulak's speech, presented February 14, 1972, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD.

The speech follows:

"THE CARDS ARE ON THE TABLE IN CHINA"

(An Address by Lt. Gen. V. H. Krulak, USMC, retired, at the 43rd Annual Conference of the Copley Newspapers, Borrego Springs, Calif., Feb. 14, 1972)

No man who lays claim to any humility at all should express views about China in absolute terms. Everything there is relative and the more one learns the more qualified his attitudes and conclusions are likely to be.

In any case, having devoted a good bit of my life's energy to the study of these people, I still find my own views little more than a synthesis of the opinions of others whom I respect.

And that is really the basis for my story. Actually, China today is not one story. It is four stories. There is little complex about any one of them. It is only when we seek to bring them all into a single discussion that the matter becomes complicated.

The first story is the one we are now hearing so widely. It is the propaganda account of what the Chinese people are supposed to be doing—their controlled experiment in Marxism. It is a rosy story, and we see and hear it on the television and in slick paper products everywhere.

It is really the story of how the Maoists want things to be some day; the way they want us to believe it is now.

It is the story of the cheering happy communes, the busy smiling workers, the roaring factories, the fertile fields, the lavish markets.

It is the story of advances in science, of handsome laboratories and hospitals, the story of dramatic attention to the arts.

It is the story of great Chinese military prowess, of modernization of their military establishment of growing nuclear strength.

While there has unquestionably been progress in China, this is still little more than the idealized story of Mao-think and how the teachings of Mao Tse-tung are enough to bring peace, plenty and tranquility to the lives of 800 million people—and ultimately to the world.

I need not talk at length to this story because it is already being hammered into our minds with drum-fire resonance by the Communist propagandists, by sincere idealists here in the United States, by ignorant or misguided apologists around the world, and by thoroughly honest reporters who report what they are permitted to see but who simply are not allowed to see—or have not yet had time to see—the total picture or even a large part of it.

In any case, it is by no means the true story of China. It is a Hollywood false front set of Maoism as the Maoists and their partisans everywhere would have us see it. Its exaggerations and over-generalizations are very great.

So let us leave the telling of this story to them, discounting what they say accordingly.

Actually, despite the propaganda picture, Maoism has affected profoundly the lives of a relatively few Chinese, maybe 30 or 40 million. It has affected slightly the lives of a larger group—perhaps 200 million—and it has affected the vast remainder—five hundred million or so—almost not at all. So, it will be far more profitable for us to talk to the second story, the reality of the total China in the here and now—all of China, not the propaganda China, but China like it really is.

Maoism's claims are actually far greater than its attainments.

Let us first look at a few of the visible chasms that stand between the four or five

varieties of Utopia that Mao has designed and tried to inflict on a helpless people since 1949, and China as it is.

First, the reality of the Chinese populace. There are 800 million human beings in China and in the next 30 years the number is expected to triple!

What will they all eat?

Right now Peking claims the country is growing about 200 million tons of cereal a year. There is some doubt as to this figure, but we do know that they supplement it by importing between 6 and 8 million tons from abroad.

Still it adds up to just a bare subsistence level for the country at large, and less than that for many. In the big cities of China today—Shanghai, Canton, Hankow, Peking—it costs half of what a man earns just to buy food. Rice and meat—the backbone of the diet—are rationed.

There seems little chance that China's agricultural productivity will equal its population growth in the visible future. The Maoists have given the problem tremendous emphasis, spending their precious foreign exchange on as much as 8 million tons of costly fertilizer in a single year and exploiting the new high yield rice strains to the maximum.

They have put on two powerful birth control campaigns, touting all varieties of drugs and devices. They have made very meager progress. There seems little hope, without a dramatic and unexpected increase in the acceptability of birth control, that the specter of famine can be avoided in China. And if the people are hungry they are not likely to be content.

Turn to the reality of world trade. The Maoists declare that their world trade is healthy and growing; that they are competitive. The fact is, Red Chinese world trade is small; perhaps three billion legitimate dollars—in and out—per year. That is no more than Taiwan, a little land of only 14 million people.

Furthermore, there is little likelihood that the future will see any significant improvement in the Chinese world trade posture. They have no agricultural surplus to sell. They have no oil surplus to sell. They have no precious mineral surpluses to sell. Their manufactured products are not competitive, and it will take a massive and costly industrialization to make them so. In Hong Kong there are Red Chinese bicycles, electric cookers, radios and electric fans on sale—all of inferior quality and relatively high price. The things Chinese that were good a generation ago—things such as wool carpets and lacquer work—are still good. They just cost too much. For instance, a Tientsin rug which in 1947 cost \$1.00 per square foot now costs \$6.00 a foot, and you can buy the same carpet of at least equal quality in Taiwan made to your own design for \$4.25 a foot.

The Chinese Reds do want hard money, though, and will go to great lengths to get it. Ibex meat from Manchuria is for sale to the world at \$6.00 a pound, bear paw at \$12.00 a pound, and opium is probably China's greatest export staple. They are doing everything they can to improve and expand opium culture, and it is estimated that they earn almost a billion clandestine dollars a year from their dope sales.

But you are not going to make a solid economy out of bear paws and opium and, in this regard, two simple statistics tell the story. The Chinese gross national product is growing at the rate of 1% per year, while their population is growing at the rate of 2½% per year. Unless their productivity increases dramatically the unfavorable projection is obvious. Certainly, they are not likely to be either a major or a profitable trading partner for us.

At the beginning I commented that Maoism and its sloganeering has affected very greatly only a small fraction of the people, say some 30 to 40 million, or ½ of 1%.

These are the people in the communes, the collectives and some residents of the big cities. It has indeed affected them deeply and perhaps permanently. These are the men and women who for one reason or another, have bought the pitch. They are the promising subsidized students, the administrative hierarchy, some of the military leadership, some of the industrial commissars.

Then there is a much larger group whom these leaders influence; maybe another two hundred million. Some will say that these people also are Maoists in a very real sense of the word, that the Marxist vaccination has taken on them, too.

I believe this would be a wrong conclusion;—there is no assurance that the vaccination has been effective on them—or even on the smaller, hard-core group.

Ask yourself how you would feel. In 1949—over and over again—Mao promised freedom of thought, freedom of speech, of publication, assembly, association, correspondence, person, domicile, religious belief, procession and demonstration. This was real Utopia, and Mao declared that he would bring it to everyone.

It were better that he had not promised, because absolutely none of it materialized. In the place of these freedoms there has been terror, oppression, regimentation, restriction, surveillance and harsh punishment; and the people at large cannot have forgotten the promises.

In 1949 Mao took large quantities of land from landlords and gave it to the peasants. In 1955 and 1956 he took it back from the same peasants to make collectives—and then made them work on the collectives against their will. You may imagine their disappointment. Better for Mao not to have given them the land in the first place.

These conditions are reflected in the fact that after the Cultural Revolution—as recently as three years ago—there was absolutely uncontrolled dissidence and defection among the rank and file in the factories and communes. The Marxist inoculation had had fully twenty years to work, but it still wasn't working.

In the cities workers deserted their posts of production, there were widespread industrial strikes, transportation was disrupted and supply of public utilities was paralyzed.

But the flaunting of the Communists went beyond the cities. In rural areas peasants who secretly hated the commune idea set about dividing up the communal property among themselves. In desperation, Mao had to turn to the Army—whose strength he already feared—for help in getting the factories going and the crops planted. It took some serious head knocking by hand-picked military units everywhere—stationed in state offices, on the railroads, in factories and in the fields.

Nor am I suggesting that just a few soldiers were sufficient to pull China out of anarchy after the Cultural Revolution. Actually, it took 80% of the whole Red Army! 80% of the Army—split up a battalion per county, a regiment per large factory, a company per mine and small factory—all together 2½ million men to get the workers back in harness—but not before thousands were killed and thousands more imprisoned.

All of this is just by way of saying that Mao-think is not now—and never has been—acclaimed by the great mass of the people who are really China.

They do not like it and miss no chance to make their views known. They are Chinese, they have 40 centuries of stubborn individualism behind them; a culture that was visible two millennia before Christ.

And realistically, we must recognize that the Communist structure has never extended its official party representation below the hsien (county) level. Local officials—township, village, hamlet and farm—come from the people themselves. When you real-

ize that fully 80% of the people live on the farms, it is easy to understand by assertion that much of the real China is still governed directly by people of its own choice.

And to answer those who would say that the examples I have given you are three years old—or more—let me offer a sobering addition.

100,000 refugees escaped the mainland last year and found their way into Hong Kong alone. When to this number are added those who escape to other places, like Kinmen or Matsu, those who try to escape and fail, those who want to escape and do not try, the smiling faces on the propaganda poster lose some of their freshness. Furthermore, the rate of defection appears to be growing and, to make it all more sobering, the escapees are now largely young people—not older men who have seen freedom, but youth who simply reject Maoism. Many are ex-Red Guards who fear retaliation from some of the same people who encouraged them to riot four years ago.

Some will tell you that all of this story is old, that Mao, having used the Army as a weapon against his own people, now has set affairs in perspective again and that he has reestablished civilian primacy over the military.

Not so. Today almost half of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party are military men—not because the Communist leadership wants it that way, but because they haven't the power to make it any other way. Of the governing Politburo, over half the members are military. We simply cannot evade it; three years ago Mao and Maoism became, in a very large degree, hostages to the soldiers.

But civilian-military turmoil is not the whole story. We have to look at the total structure to get a feel for the relative stability of the regime we are dealing with.

And this brings us to story number three—what is really going on in the higher echelons of government?

What do the recent purges mean? We could call this story "Fun and Games at the Top" or "Button, Button, Who has the Mao Button Today?"

To see it all, it is necessary to understand that a total study of a Communist society has to embrace three things: the party, the government, and the military.

First, a look at the party organization. Back in 1968, Mao purged the highly respected Party Vice-Chairman, Liu Hsiao-chi, and replaced him with Lin Piao.

Lin Piao was Mao's favorite. Mao even had it written into a draft Party Constitution in 1969 that Lin Piao would be his heir.

But that was three years ago. Now, like Liu Hsiao-chi, Lin Piao is gone, too—disappeared; possibly in one of three aircraft shot down by the Chinese themselves last September. It is claimed that his erasure came about because he was a hard-liner where Japan and the United States are concerned, that he wanted nothing to do with those two non-Communist states. But whatever the reason, Lin Piao, the erstwhile fair-haired boy, is gone. Far more significantly, nobody has been either elected or appointed to fill his top party job. It is vacant!

A look at the Politburo Standing Committee before and then after the recent purging sessions discloses that seven out of the ten members of that body have been eliminated.

Next, there is the government itself. In 1968, Mao got rid of the President of the country, Liu Hsiao-chi, and hasn't bothered to replace him, either. In this regard it is not reassuring to reflect that next week President Nixon will be unable to shake hands with his titular counterpart—the President of the People's Republic of China—because the office is vacant!

Finally, there is the military. Here Lin Piao was the Defense Minister. But, as I



have said, he has been purged, and no replacement has been designated for him.

The chiefs of the Army, Navy and Air Force have also been purged—all of them, and many of their deputies, too. Of the 2,000-odd Chinese "Principal Military Personalities" (a euphemism for generals and admirals) fully 200 have stopped showing up for ceremonies and official functions during the past five months. They, obviously, are out, too.

All these things hardly add up to the trappings of stability, yet they are pure reality.

The fact is, what we see is turmoil at the top. But, what does all the turmoil mean? With humility, this is the way I would analyze it.

There are three factions within the Chinese leadership. They have deep and basic disagreements. They have been at each others' throats ever since the Cultural Revolution of 1968, and what we are seeing is another major test of strength.

The first faction includes the pure Marxist theoreticians, led by Mao Tse-tung. They are the ideological radicals; the political hardliners. They want nothing to do with the rest of the world, declaring it to be composed of equal parts of "imperialists" (meaning us), "revisionists" (meaning the Russians) and "reactionaries" (meaning Japan and the rest of the world community that does not agree with them). The pure Maoists believe that if they stay with their Marxist principles, gradually communize and collectivize all of the Chinese people and harness all of the vast energies of China they, one day, will rule the world. They are inflexible and quite unrealistic. Their heartless Marxist experiments have brought misery and turmoil to China for 25 years.

The second faction is the bureaucrats, led by Chou En-lai. They respect Mao as the father and high priest of their cult. They share fully in the record of Maoist brutalities, but have become disenchanted with the idealism and theories of Maoism. They see them as impractical.

They now favor a period of opportunism—international wheeling and dealing to buttress China's economic, military and industrial weaknesses while the communization process proceeds. This is the group that has favored intercourse with the United States; not because they like us or trust us, but because they want to use us.

Finally, there is the third faction, largely military, led until recently by Lin Biao, the now deposed Defense Minister. This group, commanding the loyalty of much of the Army, holds the physical power and knows it. They are by no means united among themselves. They disagree on Marxist theory, and they are not of one mind as to where the greatest threats to their country lie.

Some are willing to see a move toward the U.S. Some strongly prefer accommodation with the Soviet Union. Some prefer neither. All of them are interested in the devotion of more resources to the military strength they see as a prerequisite to survival.

They are worried about their shortage of fissionable material. They see their small stock of nuclear weapons—maybe 100 A-bombs and four or five H-bombs—as pitifully inadequate, and they are restive at the slowness of their nuclear program. In any event, they are far less politicians than soldiers, and none of them have any compunction against throwing their lot in with either of the other contesting factions if, in the end, it will result in a militarily more powerful land, because they believe that China will not survive, much less conquer the world, unless she has a great military establishment.

There has been a knock-down struggle between Mao's theoreticians and Chou En-lai's bureaucrats during the past year.

The military group fought it out inter-

nally as to which of the other two factions they would back. Lin Biao himself, who was apparently opposed to dealing with the U.S., was finally voted down, and Chou En-lai's group ended up with the support of most of the generals.

Once the military-bureaucrat coalition, tenuous though it is, crystallized, there were purges of those in each group who were not willing to go along with the Chou En-lai line—the hundreds of generals I spoke of; Lin Biao, himself.

At this point, we may draw a prophetic historical parallel.

In 1934 Hitler, the opportunist, made an alliance of convenience with the generals, keeping Hindenburg on as a figurehead and proceeding to purge all who opposed him.

Today, in China, Chou En-lai, the opportunist, has also made an alliance with the generals, while Mao Tse-tung and his dialectic are kept out front as a figurehead; and the purges are under way.

We were revolted by Hitler's conduct, and I can see no reason why the brutal Chinese behavior should generate any lesser emotions.

The climatic phase of our third story became visible last year as the Chinese decision to smile on the outer world was implemented. We saw the Chinese maneuvers that led to membership in the U.N. There was the establishment of diplomatic relations with various nations, the Ping-Pong diplomacy with us, and now the visit of the President of the United States.

That is the third story—the battle at the top. It is a transitory triumph of militarists and pragmatists over Marxist theoreticians and it flows logically into the final story—why did they do what they did?

What really is motivating the Chou En-lai group and their military allies?

The answer is fear, and a very specific fear at that. They have an almost paranoid terror of the Soviet Union, of its strength, its aspirations to leadership of the Communist world, its plans concerning economic domination of Asia, its hatred of China and its aggressive intentions regarding China's borders.

They are apprehensive of the Japanese, too, but in a far lesser degree.

And that is it. They fear the United States of America not at all—not in any sense. To the contrary, Chou En-lai and his cohorts see in us a tool which they can use as a counterpoise against the Russians and the Japanese. And that is the basis for the current program of smiles in our direction. They want a relationship with us that will present Russia with serious military apprehensions. They want to get us out of the Far East and simplify their own security problems, in order that they can turn their attention to Russia. They want, most of all, our help in industrializing their country.

They have abundant manpower, they have some resources, but, to be a world power, they needed a complete system of heavy industry and they need mountains of agricultural machinery. We are their only hope. They have nothing to trade to Japan or Germany for heavy machinery. The Russians will not sell it to them. But Uncle Sam,—good old Uncle Sam—may just do it on credit.

One of the senior diplomats in the Japanese Foreign Service put it to me this way, "You Americans are China's weapon. They believe, if you will build up their heavy industry, they will be able to bludgeon all of Asia with it and protect themselves against Russia. Then, with their new industrial power and their slave labor, they are confident they will be able to take care of us—and you, too—in time."

These are the four converging stories;—the propaganda myth of China like the Maoists tell it, the truth of China as it really is, the death struggle at the top in Peking, and the setting in which it is all played,

China's contest with Russia for world Communist leadership, with us as their synthetic ally.

All put together, the combined story promises little good for the United States of America because real friendship with us does not fit anywhere in the pattern of the current Chinese leadership. This group hates us; aspires to use us and ultimately to enslave us; and it doesn't hesitate to say so. It is their Party policy and their daily preaching.

Chou En-lai has taken pains in his public utterances to stress this point. He has said, "The peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America can destroy the United States piece by piece, some striking at its head, others at its feet."

On January 24th, a play opened in one of the government playhouses in Shanghai. Its final curtain closes on a group of young Chinese shooting arrows into Uncle Sam. And the last words on the stage are, "kill, kill, kill."

Nothing would be worse, it seems to me, than for the United States to do anything to dignify Chinese leadership who openly declare themselves our sworn enemies.

Were I asked, I would propose our best and most promising course to be an absolutely hard line with Chou En-lai.

He is not the Duke of Norfolk. He is a charlatan, a brigand and a cut-throat who got where he is literally over the bloody bodies of his contemporaries. He will understand straight and strong words—and no others; words like these:

"Leave your neighbors alone. Stop your imperialist aggression in Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Burma and the Philippines.

"Cease your active support of subversive revolution in Indo-China.

"Stop your export of Marxist violence to Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

"Stop flooding the world with raw and processed opium.

"Stop polluting the atmosphere with your nuclear tests.

"Stop your vilification of our country and all we stand for.

"When you cease all of this vicious conduct, we will consider talking about your place in the family of nations. And not one instant before."

If they want our help as much as they now indicate, these strong words will get their attention, and we just may help bring a little peace to this troubled world.

Furthermore, and of equal importance, we should be resolute and unvarying in this position, because if we are steadfast,—if we do not give in,—time will turn out to be on our side.

This should be evident already because, with all of its regimentation and suppression, 25 years of brutal Communism has been unable to engulf the great history and cultural continuity that is China.

Over a period of 4,000 years the wisdom of "Kuei Chu," literally, "the old custom,"—"behave like your Father did,"—has governed Chinese thinking. Basically, these people have changed very little and, given time, they will absorb Communism.

Indeed, when we see the changes that have occurred since the mid 1950s, it is not unreasonable to conclude that Maoism is on its way out already. I believe it will turn out to be the shortest dynasty in forty centuries of Chinese history, particularly if we do not sustain and nourish it.

Thus, haste and irresolution can be our only pitfalls. We do not need the People's Republic of China. They do need us.

Consequently, our guidance in dealing with the Peking leaders might well be found in an old Chinese dialog coming from the Tang Dynasty, about 800 A.D.

"If one injures me, hates me, vilifies me and suddenly smiles on me, what should I do?"

"Bear with him, endure him, avoid him. And, after a few years, just look at him."

WILLIAM R. HEARST

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief and publisher of the Hearst Newspapers, wrote a column which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Express on Sunday, April 2, 1972, and which resulted from a factfinding trip around the world. This column should be of interest to my colleagues. Mr. Hearst's theme, "Our Blindness to Communism," is a topic to which many fine Americans have tried to alert our citizens in a positive and constructive way. Unfortunately, we continue to fall into the same mental rut and lose our mental toughness in our natural inclination to "think well" of other people without a realistic appraisal.

Mr. Hearst states:

It is a bit disturbing to get home and realize how many Americans fail to face one of the grimmest facts there is—that communism keeps working day and night to destroy freedom wherever it exists. Our home front apathy to this very real menace, coupled with the minimizing of denials it gets from many quarters, is in sharp contrast to the grave concern expressed in every country visited by the Hearst Task Force.

Mr. Hearst has "told it like it is." It is deplorable that other portions of our news media have not seen fit to do the same. I recommend that my colleagues read and take note of what he has said. Now that Russian tanks, and other war materials, are being used against the South Vietnamese people and our troops, his article assumes even greater importance:

The article follows:

OUR BLINDNESS TO COMMUNISM

(By William Randolph Hearst Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Back from a fact-finding trip around the world, it is a bit disturbing to get home and realize how many Americans fail to face one of the grimmest facts there is—that communism keeps working day and night to destroy freedom wherever it exists.

Our home-front apathy to this very real menace, coupled with the minimizing of denials it gets from many quarters, is in sharp contrast to the grave concern expressed in every country visited by the Hearst Task Force.

Throughout the capitals of Europe, and naturally more so in the actively beleaguered Far East, communism with its insidious, tentaclelike global movements is seen clearly as the everlooming threat it most certainly is.

At the very least the Communists, whether Chinese or Russian, are invariably trouble makers for any free country to which they have access. All you have to do is read the daily newspapers to know this—unless, of course, you are wearing the pink-tinted glasses of Sen. Fulbright.

At most, if successful, communism's tenacious activities to weaken, subvert and eventually overthrow every non-Communist government will mean its domination of the whole world. That is its frank intent, proclaimed by its leaders time and again.

In the Far East this reality and what it can mean is thoroughly understood by everyone. The Chinese Red dragon is breathing fire right down the necks of the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, South Korea, Formosa and Japan, not to mention South Vietnam.

For a more detailed roundup on this, please read the important dispatch from Bangkok by Kingsbury Smith, our chief foreign writer, which appears in this page. Its final sentence reads:

"Despite the non-interference pledge in the Chinese-American communique (concluding the recent Nixon trip to China), every country in Southeast Asia continues to be beset by a Communist rebellion receiving at least moral and in most instances material support from Communist China."

Now I haven't got anywhere near the space even to summarize what the Russian Communists are up to all over the world. You name a place and there they are, spreading their influence and stirring up trouble by any and all means possible.

For a recent example, Bolivia this week ordered 119 members of the Soviet embassy staff out of the South American country—allegedly for fostering and financing a left-wing guerrilla movement.

Think back and try to remember how many times you've read about Russian "diplomats" being told by various countries to pack up and get because of their spying or other subversive activity.

The fact is that Russia's diplomatic missions to free world countries are primarily headquarters for subversions and only secondarily for what we consider normal diplomatic and trade relations. That is why their embassies are usually staffed out of all proportion to obvious need.

Bolivia, for example, has three men at its Moscow embassy. Even in kicking 119 Russians out of their embassy in La Paz, the Bolivians will be permitting six or seven to stay—double their own crew in the Soviet capital.

The previous diplomatic exchange ratio of some 125 Russians to three Bolivians admittedly is unusually high—explainable by the volatile nature of Bolivian politics and the opportunity to assist a very strong revolutionary movement. A lopsided ratio of representatives, however, is typical of the Soviets.

As of March 1, according to a State Department spokesman, our government had a total of 108 American nationals assigned to our embassy in Moscow. The Russians had 189 here—not counting the swarms at the United Nations.

As a general rule, the State Department spokesman told me, the Russians maintain roughly two to three times as many of their nationals in underdeveloped host countries as such countries do in Moscow; and as just noted, in Bolivia the ratio was 40 to one.

In view of the overwhelming evidence that communism is the avowed enemy of all freedom—and the acceptance of this fact elsewhere in the world—I repeat it is discouraging to return home and suddenly re-experience American apathy or disbelief of the reality.

In no country that I visited have I ever run into anything approaching the fuzzy thinking about communism that exists here. Perhaps it's because most of the countries either have had their freedom threatened by them or taken away entirely or at least have had to fight for the cause of freedom that they see the facts so clearly.

Heaven knows—and readers of this column should certainly know after all these years—that I have done everything I can to publicize the danger. Yet there are many people throughout our country who are either confusedly vague on the subject or who flatly argue that there is no such danger.

Among them, unfortunately, are many

teachers who are educating the next generation. Whether they are starchy-eyed or stupid or deliberately malicious in spreading their views makes little difference. They are helping lull this nation into a false sense of security.

What these people teach, in essence, is that communism represents a trend toward a future world of sweetness and light in which all men are brothers and justice prevails.

It is nothing of the sort. The most liberal and progressive form of government in this world is a government "of the people, by the people, for the people" based on free people determining the details of the political structure for themselves.

Communism does not and never will represent rule by the people. It is rule by an elite group of privileged commissars and whatever social benefits they supply their people carry a terrible price tag.

That price is freedom—freedom to move about the world at will, freedom to write criticism, freedom to speak up in protest.

I say it is just plain foolish when Americans blind their eyes to reality and even go so far as to contend that anti-communism is a "relic" of a now-defunct "cold war."

The cold and often hot war between communism and freedom will never be over so long as communism exists.

The next time somebody tells you that communism is nothing to worry about, you can be sure of one of two things.

Either he hasn't got all his marbles or he is quite far left of center politically and ideologically.

One thing is for sure, if he honestly believes that life in some Communist state is better, more humane and fairer he is certainly free to go there.

I, for one, wish he had all of his ilk would go and stay.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XI

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the Telephone Privacy Act (H.R. 14097) with 28 cosponsors.

This bill would give to individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option to require the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the names of those individuals in the phonebook who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates and organizations and opinion poll takers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individuals or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

As I noted in a statement on March 9, I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a ninth sampling of these letters into



the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,

April 3, 1972.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for introducing your bill against Telephone solicitation. I wrote General telephone several years ago with a similar suggestion.

We as paying subscribers are entitled to this consideration.

I have written Craig Hosmer suggesting his support of you in this legislation.

Again thank you for your efforts in our behalf.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

April 1, 1972.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: I read in the Cleveland Plain Dealer Editorial column of your Telephone Privacy Act and with the Editors of this newspaper fully agree with you that telephone solicitation should be controlled.

I will support this bill to its end. What do I do next?

Very truly yours,

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,

March 28, 1972.

Hon. L. ASPIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read, in the Christian Science Monitor, of your bill against telephone solicitation. I endorse it heartily. This has been an invasion of my family's personal privacy for some years.

Why exempt organizations like political parties and polls from the ban? (Debt collecting, I agree, is not in the same category.) The U.S. mails exist for a purpose; why not use them? Even non-profit organizations, I believe, get special rates?

Please carry on the good work. I am also writing my local Representative.

Sincerely,

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

March 30, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: An article in the March 28, 1972 Christian Science Monitor regarding your bill introduced to enable people "to place a 'no solicitors' sign on their telephones." Go to it!! Amen.

Since I'm a student at the University of Minnesota and vote in Nebraska, I've also written to my Representative, John McCollister to advise him of my whole-hearted support of your bill.

Sincerely,

LONG BRANCH, N.J.,

March 30, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: This is to let you know that I appreciate and support your efforts toward "soliciting by telephone" prevention. However, I feel that there should be no exemptions (non-profit, political, poll takers, etc.) because, I pay a premium rate (over the postal rates which are open to these users, and I could read and answer at my leisure) for telephone communications which must be answered at the callers whims. When they communicate with me by mail, they pay the postage. When they communicate with me by telephone, I feel a certain urgency, an obligation—if you will—to an-

swer even though I alone pay my telephone bill.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my congressmen, Sen. Case and Rep. Howard.

Thank You,

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

March 28, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
House of Representatives,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I read this morning in the Christian Science Monitor of your bill designed to allow Americans to place a no solicitors sign on their telephones. I commend you on your stand and fully support this type of legislation.

I am constantly plagued by telephone solicitations during the evening hours, and whenever I have stayed home from work during the day I have had, without exception, at least one call of this nature. The overwhelming majority of these calls comes from real estate interests, those most persistent involve the sale of recreational property in California.

In appreciation, and hoping your bill will be quickly adopted, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHULA VISTA, CALIF.,

March 28, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: After reading of your bill to eliminate undesired telephone solicitation in today's Christian Science Monitor, I wrote to Senators Cranston and Tunney and Congressman Van Deeren urging their support.

Sincerely,

GURNEE, ILL.,

March 28, 1972.

Ref: Telephone solicitation.

Hon. LES ASPIN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the March 28th edition of the Christian Science Monitor that you have introduced a bill to "place a 'no solicitors' sign . . ." on one's telephone.

This would be a most useful contribution if the bill is passed, and I sincerely hope it is.

Yours very truly,

## JOBS FOR PROGRESS—OPERATION SER

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, Jobs for Progress, Operation SER—service, employment, redevelopment—was originally created 6 years ago to provide manpower services primarily for the Spanish-surnamed minorities throughout the southwestern United States. During these 6 years, people all over that part of our country have come to recognize the valuable work being accomplished by this group.

This year SER has expanded out of the Southwest and into Chicago and Detroit, and its expects to provide man-

power services within the next 12 months to over 25,000 disadvantaged. These services include job placement, education, job training, job development, and supportive services that lead to employability and job success.

I would like to congratulate SER on the tremendous service that it is providing and I wish it continued success in dealing with the problems which face our disadvantaged minorities today.

To better acquaint my colleagues with the important work being done by Operation SER, I have included in the RECORD today a short description of the purposes and objectives of this organization as stated by one of its pamphlets:

### PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SER NATIONAL EFFORT

#### PURPOSE

The basic thrust of the SER activities is to assist the disadvantaged—to improve the quality of their lives, primarily through manpower and related programs designed to upgrade educational and vocational skills, and to open career opportunities in employment.

#### OBJECTIVES

In pursuit of its purpose, SER focuses available resources on the following objectives, which have shaped the strategies of all local programs for the coming contract year:

1. To plan and arrange manpower and related services that enable the disadvantaged—with priority to Spanish-Speaking Americans—to overcome the obstacles that have denied them employment, economic opportunity, and self-sufficiency. To address both institutional barriers, such as those related to the employer environment, and the unique needs of individual enrollees, including language and cultural characteristics. To provide, or arrange for the selective provision of, education, training, job development, and supportive services that lead to employability and job success.

2. To advance the state of the art in how to deliver effective manpower and related services to the Spanish-Speaking population through structured research, experimentation, and evaluation as well as through day-to-day operations by developing innovative bilingual and bicultural curricula, education and training materials, and teaching methods.

To disseminate the results showing "what works, what doesn't and why," and otherwise assist Federal agencies, State Employment Services, local school systems, other Spanish-Speaking manpower organizations, and other groups to better serve the Spanish-Speaking.

3. To work with employers, unions, and governmental authorities to broaden employment opportunities and eliminate discrimination and other barriers to employment and career upgrading of the Spanish-Speaking population in the private and public sectors.

4. To use advanced knowledge gained through research and experimentation to assist Federal, State and local governmental authorities in those areas of SER operations in the planning and development of programs for the Spanish-Speaking community and otherwise stimulate institutional changes and responsiveness on the part of governmental agencies.

5. To actively involve the Spanish-Speaking poor so that directly and through their representatives they can participate in the planning and administration of programs that affect their social and economic well-being.

6. Based on an outstanding record of results achieved, to stimulate investment of additional manpower resources on behalf of

the Spanish-Speaking community. Moreover, reallocate the resources provided to SER to local communities on the basis of the needs of the disadvantaged and the results that can be achieved on their behalf.

7. To foster the development of Spanish-Speaking leadership through executive exchange programs with other manpower agencies. To recruit some key staff with special executive development skills without regard to ethnic identification. To assist in executive search and recruitment activities for other public and private agencies. To carry out programs to broaden access to higher education.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT

In the Spring of 1965, job placement centers for the Spanish-Speaking were operated in Houston and Corpus Christi by the League of United Latin American Citizens. Under the banner of "Jobs for Progress", the centers were funded and staffed exclusively by Spanish-Speaking volunteers.

Based on the lessons learned, the two national organizations, LULAC and the American GI Forum, joined to form "Jobs for Progress, Inc." to "... eliminate poverty in the Southwest—with special attention to the culturally different." The large scale program to tap the manpower resources of the Spanish-Speaking community was given the name "to be" in Spanish—Operation "SER".

On June 10, 1966, Secretary of Labor Wilard Wirtz and OEO Director Sargent Shriver announced the joint funding of Operation SER's Regional Office, and on October 3, George J. Roybal was installed as SER's Executive Director with a small staff in Albuquerque, and the Skills Bank started placing people in non-traditional jobs.

By August 1968, the result of two year's work began to materialize. Convinced that it was moving in the right direction, SER forged ahead, implementing new ideas to reach the Spanish-Speaking, making Manpower programs available to them for the first time. As of January 1970, SER had in operation 23 programs.

The Regional Skills Bank had coordinated the activities of 5 State Offices and 21 local offices. Together, the combined Skills Banks had registered over 50,000 Spanish-Speaking Americans throughout the 5 Southwestern States and had placed more than 12,000 persons in non-traditional employment. The SER Research and Data Processing Department collected and tabulated valuable data utilized by SER in future Manpower programming.

The total impact of SER on the Spanish-Speaking community cannot be ascertained at this time. Manpower accomplishments can be cited, but these were not the only services effected by SER. Employment-policy changes influenced by SER are too recent to be noticeable. Yet, State operating agencies are cognizant of the fact that SER has reached thousands of disadvantaged Spanish-Speaking Americans; people formerly not serviced by any State employment or Manpower agency.

#### THE PROBLEM

The Spanish-Speaking in the nation is worse off in every respect than all other Americans. They are poorer, their housing is more crowded and more dilapidated, their

unemployment rate is higher, and their educational level is lower (two years below non-white, four below Anglo).

#### CULTURAL DIFFERENCE

Spanish-Speaking Americans are unique among peoples who make up our nation. They did not "arrive" to colonize. They were already here when our Southwestern boundaries grew around them and the Anglo migration came to overwhelm them. Conquering the frontier to establish civilization really meant conquering the Mexican to establish Anglo institutions, in which the Mexican had little say, and which had little inclination to include him.

With language, religion and customs at odds with the dominant society, the Mexican remained culturally and economically isolated in the midst of increasing prosperity. The Spanish-Speaking of today is first and foremost a committed and loyal American, but his desperate struggle to educate himself, and to find a better job, is a constant reminder of his cultural disadvantage. Attitudes rooted in the nineteenth century persist and perpetuate a dilemma which is not easily resolved, and our dynamic economic growth is only leaving the Spanish-Speaking further behind.

#### A NEW APPROACH

SER was designed by the major Spanish-Speaking organizations to break down cultural and economic barriers to full employment for the Spanish-Speaking of the nation by involving the Spanish-Speaking themselves in the effort. SER is staffed exclusively with bilingual, bicultural personnel who are not only well qualified in their respective specialties, but whose experience and motivation make them cognizant and adept at dealing with cultural difference. By developing and administering manpower programs in this manner, effective gains are already being made.

#### RCA IS PROUD TO TRADE WITH THE ENEMY

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Radio Corporation of America Global Communications, Inc. is so proud of its Communist China satellite sale that as a tax deduction it is running a full page slick Chinese signature on the sale contract.

It is unfortunate that pictures cannot be reproduced in the RECORD.

Supposedly, the new Red China RCA satellite station will provide a link for live TV broadcasts between the two countries. If the Red Chinese controlled TV is as unrepresentative of the Chinese people as is the U.S. controlled TV, there will be little gained in international understanding. RCA is proud to trade with the enemy.

The ad follows:

[From Business Week, April 8, 1972]

THESE TWO SIGNATURES OPENED THE WAY FOR REGULAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

They are on a contract signed in Peking on January 22, 1972 between RCA Global Communications, Inc. and The China National Machinery Import and Export Corporation.

It is a contract to sell The People's Republic of China their first satellite earth station.

It is going to put a fourth of the world's people in regular touch with the rest of the world by satellite for the first time ever.

The RCA earth station will provide a link for live television broadcasts between the two countries, as well as voice, teleprinter, and facsimile communications.

Only with modern electronic communications can fear and isolation gradually give way to cooperation, understanding and friendship.

In 1919, our company was formed to provide international communications for another of the world's great nations. The communication was a simple wireless telegraph. The nation was The United States of America.

#### THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 27th anniversary of the death of perhaps our country's most outstanding President. Twenty-seven years ago today Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 32d President of the United States died at Warm Springs, Ga.

I need not convince you of this man's greatness. We are all already well aware of this fact. The man who has come lovingly to be known as F. D. R. provided this country with the strong, unflinching leadership it so desperately needed at two of its lowest moments in history.

Franklin Roosevelt assumed office as President in 1932, and with boldness and initiative brought a crippled Nation to its feet. Again, when several years later the Axis Powers threatened destruction of the free world, F. D. R. firmly grasped the reins and instilled the confidence and courage which ultimately led us to final security.

On this day I would ask that we all spend a moment in quiet reflection on the loss we all endured by the death of this outstanding individual who so profoundly influenced for the better not only this country, but the entire world. Let us pay tribute to a great man—a good man.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 13, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph F. Thornington, D.D., Ph. D., pastor emeritus of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Md., and an honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, let the radiance of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Grant a special blessing to leaders of the American Republics now assembled

in Washington that they be inspired to propose measures, not only providing higher standards of living, education, and work, but also guarantees for the security of their peoples in their homes and nations, when faced with outside aggression or domestic subversion.