

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 962. Resolution expressing the sense of the House to release rural electrification funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYS (for himself and Mr. Fuqua):

H. Res. 963. Resolution providing for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Res. 964. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for the rural electrification program for fiscal 1972 should be made available by the administration to carry out that program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. ERLÉNBOEN):

H. Res. 965. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organiza-

tion Conference in Geneva; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

384. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, relative to the Federal Government making payments to counties on the land owned by them in the same ratio that the county collects taxes on similar privately owned land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and several referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 14773. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Terri McCullough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 14774. A bill for the relief of Jack Bradshaw, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 14775. A bill for the relief of Hipolito Mangampat Resngit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14776. A bill for the relief of Luis Francisco LiDonni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 14777. A bill for the relief of Maude Cantrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

224. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, East Lansing, Mich., relative to the war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING EDWARD J. DALY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am extremely pleased to recognize the splendid achievements of a good friend and constituent, Mr. Ed Daly of Orinda, Calif., who has been named the recipient of the 1972 Outstanding Citizens Honor Award presented by the Bay Area Friends of the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center.

This award is being given Mr. Daly for his outstanding accomplishments in assisting the Bay Area community's philanthropic organizations and educational institutions.

Ed Daly is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of World Airways, Inc., of Oakland, Calif.

Despite the time-consuming nature of those positions, Ed Daly has worked tirelessly to help those who need it.

He is a member of the advisory council of the San Francisco Area Council of Boy Scouts. He is a member and past chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of Santa Clara. He is also active in such organizations as Boys' Club, American Irish Foundation, United Negro College Fund and the Bay Area Council.

One of the most impressive of Ed Daly's accomplishments was his sponsorship and guidance of FIPCO, a minority-owned and managed aircraft service firm in Oakland. While many people express their concern for the problems of providing blacks with job and business opportunities, Mr. Daly used his resources and the resources of his company to do something very real about minority underemployment.

When the World Air Center, an aircraft maintenance base owned by World Airways, was completed, Ed Daly worked with the black community to establish

FIPCO—which operates with the World Air Center as its principal customer.

FIPCO has progressed very well since its inception and an on-the-job training program is maintained at FIPCO to teach employees the skills that will permit them to qualify for technical positions at the Air Center itself.

In 1968, President Johnson appointed Ed Daly as the Oakland chairman on the National Alliance of Businessmen. This appointment has proved to be an enlightened one as Ed Daly has been reappointed to this position by President Nixon and now has the distinction of having served as a metropolitan chairman longer than any other chairman in the Nation.

The National Alliance has spearheaded a crucial program in the Oakland area called job opportunities in the business sector, or JOBS.

JOBS has been a very successful program in the Bay Area placing many who were considered unemployable into meaningful jobs. Much of the credit for JOBS' success is due Ed Daly.

Also in 1968, Mr. Daly was appointed by President Johnson to serve as one of 16 incorporators of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships. This organization has as one of its goals the construction of an average of 600,000 housing units a year for low- and moderate-income families. The program provides for community participation in the planning of new projects and will provide jobs for the people in the area of construction. As with his reappointment to the chairmanship of the National Alliance of Businessmen, Mr. Daly was also reappointed to the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships by President Nixon.

Two Presidents and thousands of people throughout the Nation know Ed Daly's contributions to his community and his country. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to honor this great man and recognize his latest achievement as recipient of the Outstanding Citizens Honor Award of 1972.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. President, those words are taken from the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic. Today, May 3, is Polish Constitution Day, and I would like to join with Polish-Americans throughout Pennsylvania and the Nation in commemorating the day, 201 years ago today, that the Polish Constitution was adopted.

Polish Constitution Day, 1972, is a special day for me because the burgeoning tide of ethnic pride in this country has given birth to two long-awaited legislative measures, both of which I am proud to sponsor. The first is S. 973, the bill to make Philadelphia's Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home a National Historic Site, which passed the Senate March 28. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko fought in the American Revolution and later returned to his native Poland to lead a revolution to secure freedom for his own people. After returning to the United States he gave the moneys awarded to him by Congress to the cause of freeing the slaves. I believe it is fitting to honor the memory of this great Polish-American patriot in this way.

The second measure that has met with success in recent months is S. 23, the Schweiker Ethnic Heritage Studies Act, which was approved by a Senate-House conference committee as a part of the Omnibus Higher Education Bill. The Ethnic Studies Act is intended to foster ethnic pride and ethnic identity throughout the Nation, and it has received considerable support from such organiza-

tions as the Polish-American Congress, and many, many others.

In addition to celebrating our accomplishments of the past year, we must also pause on Polish Constitution Day 1972 to rededicate ourselves to those courageous and freedom-loving Poles who remain in their native land. And let us always strive to live up to those principles upon which their nation was founded.

NEW PROGRAM FOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN yesterday announced an eight-point program to "guarantee the American worker's right to health and safety on the job".

The problem of occupational health and safety is one that is often shoved to the side by American public officials and industrial leaders. Every American worker has an absolute right to work in an environment that does not endanger his health and safety.

Senator MCGOVERN's proposal entitled "To End Industrial Carnage" follows. I recommend it to my colleagues for their study:

TO END INDUSTRIAL CARNAGE

It is time we did something truly effective about the disgraceful conditions under which millions of Americans labor every day of their working lives.

Working men and women in this country are constantly exposed to the risk of death, injury and disease on the job. And each year they suffer a tragic toll in lost lives, limbs, health and hope.

Industrial accidents now take some 15,000 lives a year—more than twice as many as nonkinship murders.

90,000 men and women are permanently disabled at their jobs—rendered incapable of working or supporting their families.

About 25 million are injured badly enough to be forced off work for at least one day.

And a big part of the problem—industrial diseases—is not even calculated. We have no estimates of how many workers have their lives shortened by exposure to toxic fumes, chemicals and the like; how many are gradually losing their hearing from excessive and harmful noise; how many are more susceptible to disease of all kinds because of their working environment.

But we do have some indications.

It is estimated, for example, that between ten and twenty percent of all people who have been uranium miners will die during the next twenty years from radiation exposure.

Over half the deaths of insulation workers are attributable to asbestos, and three and one-half million workers are exposed to asbestos.

Soft coal miners die from respiratory disease at a rate five times greater than the general work force.

We have established environmental standards outside the plant, to protect our air and water from pollution. Those standards are virtually important for all of society, and for the survival of our plants.

Yet few consider that when we plug the industrial chimney, we often leave deadly fumes locked up inside where the worker is. As we protect our own well-being we tend to ignore, and often worsen, the situation of

men and women inside our shops, plants, mills and mines.

And the Surgeon General has reported that new scientific knowledge "points to hitherto unsuspected cause and effect relationships between occupational exposures and many so-called chronic diseases, cancer, respiratory ailments, allergies, and heart disease."

This evidence hints at the senseless level of industrial carnage in America. It stands in sharp contradiction to descriptions of the United States as a modern and civilized society—as a society that really cares about the health, security and dignity of its people.

In this area as in others, the Nixon Administration's preeminent concern for the comfort and prosperity of big business has left the ordinary worker with few friends in high places.

With present staffing, it would take between 20 and 30 years to make just one inspection of all the worksites covered by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

The substance of citations under the Act, and often the citations themselves, are frequently kept secret to avoid embarrassment for the offending company. OSHA inspectors have abandoned the practice of incorporating the results of their tests for toxic substances in their citation reports. Working people themselves usually have to fight hard to see the inspectors' reports—to find out what the government knows about their working conditions. And citations are rarely backed up with tough enforcement—with real inducements for industry to obey the law and to provide a decent working environment.

In short, while the Occupational Safety and Health Act promised a federal guarantee of job safety, timid enforcement and favoritism have left it a tool with no teeth. And the rate of industrial death, injury and diseases continues its steady climb.

The worker is neglected after the injury as well.

There is, for example, usually an upper limit on weekly workmen's compensation payments which sets the ceiling below the theoretical two-thirds compensation for lost income. And compensation is always limited to no more than a portion of lost wages plus medical expenses.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The costs of unsafe and unhealthy working conditions are astronomical—in pain and wasted lives for workers, in compensation payments and lost time for industry, in welfare payments and depleted productivity for the nation as a whole. Decisive federal action is both justified and required.

The following steps, built around the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, would provide a dramatic improvement in the capacity of the American worker to survive and stay healthy on the job.

(1) There should be a minimum of 8,000 federal inspectors working for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and their work should be supplemented by some 4,000 industrial hygienists. Trained to deal with the so-called "invisible" health threats.

(2) As a matter of right, workers and their representatives should have full, free and fast access to the complete results of federal inspections, including hazards not included in citations.

(3) Funds should be provided for industrial safety and health training in every state for the workers themselves, so they can serve as their own inspectors. This is especially important in smaller plants and in non-union plants. Training should include methods of compiling evidence on hazardous working conditions and a full understanding of workers' rights under the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

(4) New techniques for removing job accident and health hazards should be a major priority for public research funding, with

the results available to all industries and workers.

(5) A new Occupational Standards Administration should be established to set safety standards both for working conditions and for the 6,000 to 12,000 chemicals which are in common industrial use. This agency would complete tests and set exposure standards before new substances could enter the production process.

(6) Federal health teams should concentrate on generally recognized target health areas such as silica in foundries, asbestos in glass factories and foundries, cotton dust in textile plants, carbon monoxide, and lead poison inhalation.

(7) Workmen's compensation rates for occupational injury and disease should be standardized, with the minimum set at no less than two-thirds of lost pay, plus full medical benefits.

(8) Workmen's compensation boards and the courts should be given authority to determine additional payments for non-wage losses caused by occupational trauma.

METROPOLITAN SCHOOL INTEGRATION AND THE BLACK EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD a background paper on school integration in metropolitan areas by William L. Taylor, director of the Center for National Policy Review, School of Law, the Catholic University of America.

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

The paper follows:

METROPOLITAN SCHOOL INTEGRATION AND THE BLACK EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

(By William L. Taylor)

INTRODUCTION

On January 5, 1972 Federal District Court Judge Robert R. Merhige ordered the merger of Richmond, Virginia's predominantly black school district with the predominantly white districts of two adjacent suburban counties, Henrico and Chesterfield. Several months earlier, a District Court Judge in Detroit had ordered Michigan state officials to submit by February, 1972 a plan of desegregation for the Detroit metropolitan area.

Similar cases are pending in Indianapolis, Wilmington, Delaware, Hartford and Grand Rapids.

These cases mark a new and important phase of the struggle for equal educational opportunity. If the Richmond and Detroit decisions are upheld, they will for several reasons, have a broad impact on metropolitan areas throughout the nation. First, the cases provide a school integration remedy in places where it was previously thought to be a rapidly diminishing possibility. Black students now constitute a majority of the school enrollment of many cities, particularly large ones, and their numbers are growing rapidly. The black enrollment in Richmond, for example is now about 65 percent and in Detroit is more than 60 percent. Accordingly, substantial school integration can only be accomplished in many places if the area covered by a court decision is larger than the city itself. Viewed from another perspective, Brown v. Board of Education

may become a historical anachronism unless its principles are interpreted broadly enough to encompass metropolitan relief. Since 37 percent of all black citizens live in the twenty-five largest cities of the country where racial concentrations tend to be the highest, without metropolitan relief school integration can be a reality only in smaller cities and rural areas which are rapidly being depopulated—at least until the distant day when low-income minorities can obtain homes in suburbia.

(Richmond itself provides a good example of how the constitutional rights of black children can be frustrated if new remedies are not devised. A school desegregation case had been pending in the Federal courts for ten long years during which time state and local officials had used every tactic of delay and evasion available to avoid compliance with *Brown v. Board of Education*. By the time a full desegregation plan was ordered in 1971, a mass movement of white families to suburban counties had taken place with no similar housing opportunities provided for black families. The Richmond school system was left with a 2/3 black student enrollment which was continuing to grow. Thus, unless relief was available on a metropolitan basis integration would not have been possible).

LEGAL AND FACTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

Second, the Richmond and Detroit decisions have wide implications because they rest upon legal principles and factual findings which would make them applicable throughout the country. The principles, best articulated in the Richmond case, may be summarized as follows:

(1) Public education is the responsibility of state government and the state must make it available to all on equal terms. The constitutional principle, of course, was articulated most clearly in *Brown*. It is also at the heart of recent successful challenges to state school financing systems which make expenditures a function of local property wealth. In Virginia, Judge Merhige found, the state had assumed extensive responsibility. General supervision of the public school system is vested by law in the State Board of Education which establishes the policies and duties of division superintendents, prescribes standards for certifying teachers, sets down standards of quality for school divisions, sets standards for school construction and approves local construction programs. In Detroit, Judge Roth found that the Michigan Board of Education had similar responsibilities as do State boards of education in all of the states.

(2) Political subdivisions, including school districts, are creations of the state and will be altered when necessary to meet the overriding demands of the Constitution. This principle, long established, has had its major contemporaneous application in the reapportionment cases. It has also been applied specifically to school districts in situations where courts have been able to find that the districts were clearly segregated as a matter of law. In the Richmond case, the Court said, "... the power conferred by state law on central and local officials to determine the shape of school attendance units cannot be employed, as it has been here, for the purpose and with the effect of sealing off white enclaves of a racial composition more appealing to the local electorate and obstructing the desegregation of the schools."

(3) Unlawful school segregation is established by demonstrating that school assignment policies are based upon segregated housing policies. Judge Merhige's resolution of this issue was crystal clear:

"School authorities may not constitutionally arrange an attendance zone system which serves only to reproduce in school facilities the prevalent pattern of housing segregation, be it publicly or privately enforced. To do so is only to endorse with official ap-

proval the produce of private racism." (Op. 30)

In so ruling, the Court was following the most recent line of decisions in Northern school segregation cases involving Pontiac, Michigan and Pasadena, California. As a Federal court said in a recent San Francisco case constitutional violations may be established by the "knowing pursuit of policies which cannot but produce racial separation."

In both Richmond and Detroit, these holdings were supported by massive evidence of officially sanctioned housing segregation. This included the policies of the Federal Housing Administration during the 1930's and 1940's—policies which called for the maintenance of racially and economically homogeneous neighborhoods and schools protected from "adverse influences" by "proper zoning regulations and deed restrictions" and whose persistent effect could be gauged by continuing segregation in FHA assisted sale and rental housing; the enforcement of racially restrictive covenants in the courts until *Shelley v. Kraemer*; the location of public housing only in the predominantly black sections of the inner city; the refusal of suburban jurisdictions to permit the construction of federally subsidized housing for low and moderate income families (and the predominantly white occupancy of such units were permitted); the continuing racially discriminatory practices of realtors and developers unrestrained by effective governmental action. In addition, there was evidence tying practices of housing segregation directly to segregated schools. In Richmond, for example, it was established that when new suburban subdivisions were built, new schools were frequently constructed to serve only the all-white populace of the subdivision.

In short, the core element of the Richmond and Detroit decisions was the containment of the black population within the central cities by housing discrimination in which government was heavily involved. Thus, the attendance of black children at geographically zoned segregated schools was hardly accidental or fortuitous. Efforts to integrate the schools are well within the mandate of *Brown* to end governmentally imposed segregation and can not fairly be described as imposing "artificial racial balance."

(4) There is no justification for maintaining racially separate school systems within a single metropolitan community. While the dividing lines between city and suburbs may have existed for many years, they rarely serve any useful educational purpose and are artificial in many ways. In Richmond, the city and the two suburban jurisdictions form the great bulk of what is defined in Census terms as a single interdependent metropolitan community.

A substantial proportion of suburban residents work in the city; suburban people make many of their purchases in Richmond city stores; a large volume of traffic flows back and forth daily across the borders; almost everyone in the metropolitan area is born or dies in a Richmond city hospital; many of the recreational and cultural facilities located in one jurisdiction serve people in the entire metropolitan area.

In Detroit, there is even less educational justification for defending existing boundaries, for there are some 85 separate school districts in the metropolitan area and, unlike Richmond, they vary in their school enrollments and overlap other kinds of political subdivisions.

The issue of justification for existing boundaries has arisen in still another form in Indianapolis where in a school segregation suit directed initially at the city school board, the court has asked how the maintenance of several separate school districts can be justified in a metropolitan area which has consolidated almost all other functions.

Establishing this "community of interest" between city and suburbs is important, not only because it serves to nullify the argument that district lines are inviolate, but because it underscores the fact that we are dealing with schools that are racially identifiable within a single metropolitan community (not simply racially "imbalanced").

In Richmond, of course, there was much more proof than that already summarized. The case had dragged through the courts for ten years while the city schools were becoming predominantly black; accordingly, metropolitan relief could be viewed simply as a question of effective remedy under *Brown* to dismantle the dual system. The state of Virginia had intervened massively to preserve segregation, freely transferring children across district lines and busing them long distances. (Until 1968, the State of Virginia maintained regional schools for black children, often busing them hundreds of miles or keeping them in dormitories except on weekends). Yet Judge Merhige apparently did not regard these factors as essential to his decision:

"When a school board . . . operating in any area where segregated housing patterns prevail and are continuing, builds its facilities and arranges its zones so that school attendance is governed by housing segregation, it is operating in violation of the Constitution . . . These conclusions apply in a case where no history of past intentional segregation was relied on in order to establish an affirmative duty to desegregate. In a situation such as the instant one, when officially mandated segregation was enforced by numerous other means, the legal principles are all the more demanding." (Op. 36-37)

In sum, the crucial elements of the Richmond and Detroit decisions were State responsibility for public education, the containment of black people in the central city by policies of housing discrimination, and the lack of justification for maintaining separate districts in a single metropolitan community where such districting resulted in segregated schools.

Contrary to the charges of some critics, the decisions are not based upon a patronizing view that it is necessary for black children to sit next to whites in order to learn. Rather the courts are saying that so long as black children are locked in the inner city and denied access to schools outside the ghetto, they are being deprived of equal educational opportunity. It is racial discrimination that puts blacks in segregated schools in Richmond, Detroit and other big cities, just as in the rural areas of the South, and that discrimination is the evil that must be cured.

REMEDY

In Richmond, the Court had ordered into effect a plan prepared by the city school board which will consolidate the three districts into one district of 104,000 students governed by a single school board and district superintendent. While the ruling has fueled the furor over busing, several key aspects of the decision and of other allied cases are frequently overlooked:

Logistically, metropolitan plans may be less difficult to implement than desegregation plans for a single district.

In Richmond, for example, the desegregation plan adopted by the Court would divide the metropolitan area into six subdistricts. The maximum time for any trip would be 45 minutes in five of the six subdistricts and one hour in the sixth (a rural area of Chesterfield County where long distance busing is already common). Very few children would actually travel the maximum time—times which are well within limits set by the Virginia State Department of Education twenty-five years ago. The number of children to be transported would increase by no more than 10,000 from 68,000 to 78,000. And the require-

ments of busing about equally by black and white children.

In Hartford, where another metro case has survived a motion to dismiss and is awaiting trial, all schools with minority group enrollments of 90 to 100 percent are in the North End of the city where no predominantly white schools are situated. Integrating the minority students in the North End with white students in the South End would necessitate busing students through Hartford's large commercial and industrial center. It would be simpler logistically to integrate the North End of Hartford with the adjacent suburban community where schools are within walking distance for many students. Thus, in Hartford, the pairing of nearby schools would be available as a technique for metropolitan integration, while only busing would be feasible for intracity desegregation.

Obviously in larger cities, planning for metropolitan integration may be more complex, but the logistics may be no more difficult. In Detroit, for example, preliminary planning by the State Board suggests that substantial racial and economic integration can be accomplished between the city suburbs and a group of adjacent suburbs without an increase in transportation costs or in the number of children to be transported.

Remedies can be made flexible enough to achieve the desired educational result. Total consolidation is only one option. Others include partial merger, redistricting or even the assignment of children across existing boundaries. The only prerequisite would be that the remedy accomplish integration.

Metropolitan plans offer the prospect of stable integration.

In the Richmond metropolitan area, where there is a minority population proportionately as large as any area in the nation, the consolidated school system would have an enrollment of 66 percent white and 34 percent black. Under the Richmond Board's plan, all schools would have an enrollment ranging from 18 to 40 percent black.

Such an arrangement should enhance prospects for stability. "White flight" is variously regarded as being predicated upon racism or upon a judgment that schools consisting of a majority of advantaged children offer the greatest educational benefits. In either case, the dangers of rapid resegregation would be decreased where the obligation to desegregate is system wide and the racial and economic class composition of each school is within a defined range. For most families there would be an incentive to remain living where they are in an effort to make integration work instead of moving to more distant areas.

Metropolitan plans offer educational advantages beyond those of integration.

As expert witnesses in the Richmond and Detroit cases testified, a metropolitan approach in many places will provide economies of scale that will make possible spending on new facilities and services which now are too costly for smaller districts. These include the development of special schools and programs to serve the gifted and handicapped, improved facilities for teacher training, and the wider use of television and computers as instructional tools. (In some places, New York for example, the state now provides special incentives to suburban districts—but not to cities—to cooperate among themselves in providing such services. It seems reprehensible as well as probably unconstitutional, for a state to hold out incentives for consolidation and cooperation only in a manner that results in entrenching racial separation).

Metropolitan plans do not decrease and may even enhance the accountability of schools to parents and the opportunities for community participation.

Under the plan adopted in Richmond, the new consolidated district of 104,000 students

is to be divided into six subareas consisting of 9,000–20,000 students in each. A nine member central board is to be established consisting of four members from Richmond, three from Henrico and two from Chesterfield. While the plan is not specific in apportioning responsibility between the central authority and the subdivisions, there is no reason why each subdivision cannot be delegated broad authority to determine the kind of educational program that best meets the needs of children in the area. This might well include the hiring of faculty and administrative personnel and decisions about curriculum and allocation of budget. Thus, there is no basis for the suggestion that metropolitan school integration plans necessarily entail a loss of "local control."

Judge Merhige's order also seeks to protect the black community against various forms of discrimination that have often accompanied the desegregation process. The order contains detailed provisions prohibiting discrimination in the retention, reassignment and hiring of faculty or staff.* It also requires the development of plans for "in-service training of staff, creation of biracial committees, employment of black counselors in all schools, and plans for biracial extracurricular activities."

None of this brooks the fact that black children, who will be a minority in each of the six subdivisions, frequently encounter difficult problems when they enter desegregated schools. But the battle to win respect for one's heritage and fair treatment from teachers, administrators, and fellow students is a new phase of the desegregation struggle. The fact that it is difficult does not present a compelling argument for abandoning the effort. The struggle to win equality of status in desegregated schools should be viewed as an integral part of the effort to win equality of status in a biracial society. It is at least doubtful that students who are shielded from any inter-racial contact in the name of avoiding mistreatment will be well prepared for the struggle of equal status they will face in the larger society.

Further there is little evidence to suggest that school systems are more accountable or black parents more influential in predominantly black districts than in integrated systems. To the contrary, it is likely that community participation of minority and low income parents in school affairs will increase—not decrease—under metropolitan integration arrangements. Parents in Evanston, Rochester, Boston whose children have moved from racially isolated to integrated schools have reported feelings of greater participation and influence in their children's education in the new situation than in the old.

POLITICAL FACTORS

One concern that has been raised about metropolitan school litigation is the possibility that it may be the precursor of general metropolitan government. And general metropolitan government, it is said, may result in a dilution of minority political power, particularly in areas where blacks have attained a voting majority in the central city.

*Although the interests of black teachers are often threatened by desegregation, it is heartening to see that many continue to support it. Recently for example, the Baltimore Teachers Union issued a statement encouraging consideration of a metropolitan approach in Baltimore. Godfrey Moore, the black executive director of the BTU, said "instead of fighting the [Richmond] decision, people should be getting ready to implement a program that would run smoothly. We do not believe all poor kids should be together. We know that integration is a part of learning and kids do learn better where kids are integrated."

and have elected (or are about to elect) their own candidates to municipal office.

But there is no necessary link between metropolitan school integration and metropolitan government. This was well illustrated in Richmond where, during the pendency of the school suit, another group of black plaintiffs sued to de-annex a predominantly white portion of Chesterfield county that had been merged with the City of Richmond. Their claim was that the purpose of the annexation was to prevent black citizens from becoming a voting majority in Richmond. Judge Merhige—the same judge who later ordered metropolitan school relief—upheld plaintiffs' contention that the annexation was racially motivated and required some form of redress. It is clear then that equal educational opportunity in a metropolitan area is an issue quite separate from political representation in the same area. One may urge the former without committing oneself either in legal or policy terms to a position on the latter.

At the same time, the move toward metropolitan school integration may result in a significant realignment of political forces. In Richmond, the city school board, long a defendant, was a principal moving party in the request for metropolitan relief. In Detroit, a group of white city residents initially raised the metropolitan issue.

Whether these parties are truly convinced of the need for school integration may vary from situation to situation. But they do assert that whatever social burdens are involved in integrating the schools should be borne equally by the generally more affluent citizens of suburbia and by the white and black working people of the cities.

There is merit to this view, and the fact that it is being asserted in the courts indicates that the potential political support for metropolitan solutions is not limited to black people. It also suggests that despite all of the controversy the Richmond and Detroit decisions have aroused, a metropolitan approach may help to defuse the current conflict between blacks and whites in the inner city.

CONCLUSION

It is far too early yet to offer a prediction on the outcome of metropolitan school integration suits.

Given the current hysteria over busing and the sparsity of courageous political leadership, it is possible that the effort may be thwarted by action in the Congress. The Senate, for example, has already passed legislation which would stay the implementation of any order involving inter-district integration until all appeals have been exhausted. And any direct restraints placed upon busing as a tool for integration would obviously frustrate the possibility for metropolitan integration.

A more sophisticated—yet hardly less dangerous—approach would be for public officials to embrace the equalization of school financing as an alternative to integration. Ever since the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Serrano v. Priest*, there has been a surge of interest in litigation and legislation to apply its principle that financing of schools should not vary with the property wealth of local districts. While there is a need to deal with fiscal inequity, it must be recognized that there are limits to what such reforms can accomplish:

(1) It is being discovered that in some states there is no positive correlation between the property wealth of an area and the wealth of families who reside there. New York City is an example of a city with a good tax base and many poor families. There, poor and minority children would be hurt—not helped—by an application of the *Serrano* principle of redistributing property wealth for school financing purposes:

(2) The *Serrano* decision is pointed at equalizing the property tax base, not toward a

system of financing based on educational need (which is what poor children really require), or even toward a system of equal expenditures.

(3) Even in the best of circumstances there is no persuasive evidence that differences in expenditures except on a major scale produce significant differences in educational results. It is problematical at best that increases in funding alone will bring about the higher quality teaching that poor children so desperately need.

(4) While the Serrano principle removes the additional costs involved for a community in educating new students and thus strips away the rationale that affluent suburbs employ in refusing to provide shelter for poor and minority families, it is hardly assured that suburban barriers to the poor and minorities will now be removed.

In short, while fiscal reform may be needed it is clearly not a panacea for educational ills that are traceable in large part to discrimination and racial isolation. And care must be taken that it does not become the modern day version of the "separate but equal" theory of Plessy v. Ferguson.

In contrast, should Congress decide to adopt a constructive stance of support for the courts there is much it could do to assure the success of a metropolitan approach. Much of the current concern about integration arises from widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of public education. If people become convinced that integration was one part of a broader effort to improve the quality of public education for all children some of the opposition to it would abate. New facilities, such as education parks, located in areas accessible both to suburban and city residents might temper the cross-busing controversy. Federal assistance to programs of individualized instructions could help to convince parents that the learning problems of their children will not be neglected in an integrated system.

This may be too helpful a view at a time when public officials, including the President of the United States, are manipulating the integration issue for narrow political gain. But major progress in school integration has been achieved in the South even in the face of massive resistance, and a new brand of leadership, best exemplified by Governor Askew of Florida, is emerging which encourages people to face their problems and solve them rather than to retreat to racism. It just may be that in the long run, the realpolitik of Richard Nixon's Washington will prove to be more illusory than the dream of Martin Luther King.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I must confess in joining my colleagues today in tribute to the late J. Edgar Hoover that I am at a loss to match words to the occasion and the man. His 48-year record as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is a monument to J. Edgar Hoover that can neither be embellished nor sullied. Courage, honesty, loyalty, patriotism, devotion to duty—all these words fit J. Edgar Hoover, yet not even in total do they do the man justice. I stand in awe, as do we all, Mr. Speaker, of the magnitude of the man. Yet, this does not say it for

those of us who were fortunate enough to be his friends. For over a quarter of a century Director Hoover and his associates would come before the Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I am chairman, for the annual appropriation for the FBI. I am sure the other members of my subcommittee will join me in saying that no one, no agency, no member of Government ever made a better presentation than Director Hoover did annually. Over the years I got to know Director Hoover very well and indeed we became close friends. He was, despite his unrelenting battle against crime and those who would destroy the American way of life, a truly warm kindly man. He had at times an almost puckish sense of humor coupled with a deep respect for his fellowman. John Edgar Hoover's life was the FBI. It will stand as his monument and every American looking at it will know what a loss his death was to our country. Some will also have the cherished memory of a great human being.

COAST GUARD VESSELS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska State Legislature recently sent me a copy of a resolution passed by that body relating to the permanent assignment of additional Coast Guard patrol vessels in Alaska. This is an area of particular concern to Alaskans as our fisheries are increasingly being taken over by foreign fishing fleets, and unless increased protection of these fisheries is forthcoming, the economic impact on Alaska will be quite devastating.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of this important resolution:

ALASKA SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 66

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas traditional American and especially Alaska fisheries are increasingly being taken over by sophisticated foreign fishing fleets; and

Whereas currently there are neither adequate numbers of Coast Guard personnel nor any modern Coast Guard ships stationed in Alaska equipped with the latest electronic gear that have the maneuverability necessary to adequately and continuously patrol Alaska's some 31,383 statute miles of tidal shoreline; and

Whereas the Coast Guard does have ships with the capacity to improve greatly its surveillance activities in Alaska waters, as is evidenced by the temporary assignment of the "Mellon", a class of vessel uniquely designed for more adequate protection of our fisheries; and

Whereas the "Mellon" has been assigned to temporary duty in Alaska waters, but will shortly be forced to return to its home base; and

Whereas, unless more adequate equipment and personnel are assigned on a permanent basis to duty in Alaska, the detrimental economic impact will be felt not only in

maritime states, but eventually throughout the nation; and

Whereas, unless increased protection of the traditional Alaska fisheries is immediately forthcoming, the economic impact on Alaska will be particularly devastating;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that it commends the U.S. Coast Guard for its foresight in designing ships of the secretary class and in particular for assigning a secretary-class ship to temporary duty in Alaska waters; and be it

Further resolved that the U.S. Coast Guard is urgently requested to assign one or more ships of the "Mellon" class to duty in Alaska on a permanent basis, the only means by which our fisheries may receive increased protection from foreign encroachment.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary, Department of Transportation; Admiral Chester R. Bender, Commandant, United States Coast Guard; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

OPIUM WARRIORS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, WCBS-TV in New York City has long been noted for one of the Nation's most aggressive editorial policies. That policy has most often greatly enlightened the public at large.

To state the obvious, I have not always agreed with certain judgments rendered by WCBS-TV, but I believe deeply in the right of radio and television to air forcibly their views—free, ideally and hopefully, from the threat of Government coercion. Freedom is best judged when it is least judged.

The problem of hard drug usage among American servicemen has greatly bothered me. It remains but one of the more awful manifestations of the war in Vietnam. Our failure as a nation to deal with this problem, except in the most piecemeal fashion, is scandalous beyond compare. Some of us are trying desperately to do something about those who come home from Southeast Asia hard drug users. Recently Sue Cott of WCBS-TV looked at this problem and I think what she had to say about it merits our attention:

WCBS-TV EDITORIAL—THE OPIUM WARRIORS

The use of hard drugs by G.I.'s in Vietnam made the headlines several months ago. In response, President Nixon sent a message to Congress declaring "war on heroin" and he affirmed the right of all drug-addicted servicemen to be rehabilitated. After a while, military sources said the rate of heroin use was declining; and the public's initial shock and dismay gave way to complacency.

But just because the furor had died down, don't think the problem has gone away. Far from it. For despite the establishment of two drug treatment centers in Vietnam and a thirty-day period in a drug-free environment for all servicemen found to be addicted, thousands of veterans with drug problems are being discharged.

The New York City addiction services agency estimates that right now there are at least 10,000 drug-abusing veterans in the city in need of treatment.

In theory, at least, the Veterans Administration hospitals should be handling the problem. But according to the Addiction Services Agency, the three V.A. hospitals in New York City are currently treating only 417 drug-abusing veterans.

The reason for this is that V.A.'s are hamstrung by inadequate staff and facilities. And further, many drug-users are ineligible for V.A. hospitals because they have been less than honorably discharged.

The main burden of aiding addicted veterans is being shouldered by civilian agencies. Thirty-five hundred ex-G.I.'s are in locally funded rehabilitation programs. But these programs can't afford to continue providing services to veterans without financial help.

We think this help should come from the Federal Government and that funds should be made available to the local agencies that are currently carrying the heaviest caseloads. We also think that the role and capability of the V.A. hospitals should be expanded so that all drug-abusing veterans can have access to a full range of treatment.

We're glad that President Nixon has declared war on heroin. This is one war we'd like to see escalated.

REDUCTION OF HOME HEALTH SERVICES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, adequate health care for the aged is of prime importance. We have recently discussed the problems our elderly citizens are faced with relating to the high expense of medical assistance. Today I will address myself to a particular type of health care directed at the elderly which has helped greatly the homebound of our Nation. Home health aid offered by the San Francisco Home Health Service, oftentimes acts to prevent, postpone or reduce expensive institutional care. I feel this preventive type of medical care deserves our utmost attention.

In late March of this year I received a memorandum regarding the reduction of services from the San Francisco Home Health Service from Mr. Don Fibush. The reason for this reduction of needed health service was pure and simple—money.

I think it is outrageous that the rendering of health care to those who have worked many years in service to this country are now relegated to asking the country they helped to help them. I also feel that the use of preventive medical assistance to the elderly which could act to lower overall medical expenses, should be exhaustively looked into.

Further I feel this letter I am bringing to your attention is exemplary of many health offices serving the elderly and encountering the problems of being reimbursed by the Federal, State, and local health care programs. Because of the problems in receiving reimbursement for services rendered by the San Francisco Home Health Service, it may be necessary to terminate 25 staff personnel serving the homebound.

This termination of service will inevitably show an increase in the number of elderly people being institutionalized either in old age homes or costly hospitals. Subsequently, with the skyrocketing medical costs we have been attempting to bring into balance, an increase in the amount of government aid needed will grow proportionately.

The people who will suffer in this reduction are first and foremost the powerless elderly citizens receiving services, who are homebound. Second though, the U.S. Government will suffer because of this portrayal of leaders placing funds before the lives of those who have worked diligently for their country.

For these reasons our need to provide health service to the elderly and the possibility of preventive medicine lowering overall expenditures of medical care, I am bringing to your attention the situation of the San Francisco Home Health Service.

The text of the comment forwarded to us on behalf of Mr. Don Fibush follows:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING REDUCTIONS IN SERVICES, MARCH 13, 1972

It is necessary to reduce our services and terminate twenty-five members of our staff who provide help to the homebound. The reason for this is simple enough—money. People need the service but the programs do not pay the providers of care. The providers are forced to reduce their staff, therefore, fewer clients are served, expenditures are decreased and fewer needs are said to exist. We ask that you tell your elected representatives how you feel about this development.

What brings this situation about? We know that the number of individuals who need our help and our services increase and the number of aged in San Francisco continues to grow larger every day. Most of our homebound citizens have less real income to spend for safe housing or an adequate diet today than they did just one month ago. Appropriate medical care is less available now than three months ago.

It is ironic that at a time when all of these pressures are engulfing our homebound and senior citizens, we should also permit the continued and drastic reduction of home health services. Home health services are a group of services that will often prevent, postpone or reduce expensive institutional care. Some limited home health services are purchased for Medicare and Medi-Cal beneficiaries. Some services are purchased by Departments of Welfare and some are purchased by insurance companies, United Funds and special projects. Governmental agencies on all levels state that they pay for services to the homebound citizens. However, the regulations and the administration of these programs are producing a continued decline in these sources of reimbursement. The Federal Government (Medicare), the State Government (Medi-Cal), the City Government (Department of Social Services) seem to vie with each other to see which can be more complex. The result is a restrictive program. For example:

MEDICARE

Medicare is simply not paying agencies for covered services agencies have provided to beneficiaries in good faith. The Social Security Administration and one of its Fiscal Intermediaries (Blue Cross of Northern California) advertise that home health services are covered benefits under Medicare. Social Security has a "red, white and blue" brochure entitled "Your Medicare Handbook" stating that 100 home health visits are available fol-

lowing hospitalization under Part A of Medicare and an additional 100 home health visits are available under Part B of Medicare. Non-profit community agencies with established integrity have provided these services to appropriate patients only to have payments denied. Some of the reasons for denial are contained in the attachment.

In many cases these "denials" occur months and years after the service has been provided. In some cases the beneficiaries are not available to protest the action by the fiscal intermediary. The result is that home health agencies are left "holding the bill"—having already paid the staff who kept the person out of expensive institutional care.

You will recall that of the Medicare and Medicaid dollars (\$12.7 billion for 1970), 67% went for the fees of physicians, hospital charges and drugs. Nursing homes received 32%. Less than one-third of the remaining one per cent was spent for home health services during 1970. Nearly all of this three tenths of one per cent of the Medicare/Medicaid dollar was used to pay for nurses, physical therapists and other health professionals employed by certified home health agencies. The amount used to pay for Home Health Aides—the persons who keep patients out of expensive institutions—was microscopic.

Some say Medicare was "not to be a panacea" or "was not meant to cover everything". Through bitter experience, we can say we know it doesn't "cover everything" and we have great difficulty determining why Medicare fails to reimburse licensed agencies for appropriate and necessary services.

Incidentally, Blue Cross of Northern California is taking money away from agencies for services given in 1966 and 1967 even though the Medicare audits have been completed and the accounts finalized.

If we want home health services covered under Medicare as a benefit, we will have to demand changes from our representatives and administrators. One might assume that the Social Security Administration does not want home health benefits available to people to help keep them out of expensive institutions.

Medi-Cal

In 1968, the San Francisco Home Health Service provided an array of home health services to 80 Medi-Cal patients including 20,257 hours of home health aide services, or less than 22 hours of home health aide services per patient per month. The average number of visits per patient per month was less than nine. In January of 1972, we billed Medi-Cal for zero (0) hours of home health aide services. What changed? The number of people and their needs increased—they did not go away—they are still moving from one unsafe "tenderloin" hotel to another, often paying the rent and not eating. This population—the old, the ill, the homebound—have not fled to the suburbs or checked into mental hospitals. What changed was not the needs of people but what Medi-Cal would pay for.

During 1971, Medi-Cal instituted a complex and cumbersome array of devices to correct abuses—some proved and others alleged. The result has been a plan to eliminate home health services as a program. Community home health agencies serving Medi-Cal patients decreased to two in the Bay Area

* Medicare will not purchase some necessary health equipment. For example, a toilet seat (commode) costs \$84.00 (new). Medicare will not purchase this piece of equipment for home health agencies or allow a home health agency to be reimbursed for a purchase/loan arrangement. However, in a two-year period, Medicare has paid over \$400.00 to Abbey Rents for the rentals of these little, but necessary, pieces of equipment. If it were not so serious it would be funny!

by December, 1971. Some alleged abuses (often referred to as "overutilization") do not continue since there is no utilization because there is no payment source.

In short, to quote one agency executive: "The Medi-Cal cuts were not designed to reduce abuses but to abuse providers and cut, trim and squeeze the number of Medi-Cal patients."

Incidentally, the audits for the period 1966-1970 are still not complete. Capricious and arbitrary adjustments continue—retroactively! Our files are full of unsuccessful attempts to solve our problems. The correspondence and memoranda describe, in poignant detail, the vicious cycle in which voluntary agencies find themselves. We turn to you for help.

SOME OF THE REASONS USED BY FISCAL INTERMEDIARIES FOR DENYING MEDICARE PAYMENTS

"Skill is exhausted"—Skilled nursing was ordered by the physician but a "clerk" determines that skill is "exhausted".

"The care was custodial"—This implies that the patient needed to be in the "custody" of an expensive institution, yet, someone receiving part-time and intermittent services can hardly be considered in "custody". In the past few years, it has been documented repeatedly that more than one-half of the patients in nursing homes do not need 24-hour care.

"The care was for too long a duration"—Honest providers rarely exceed the 100 visit limits and have not exceeded these limits since organized care at home was started except in rare but justifiable circumstances.

"The care is beyond the generally accepted practice in the community"—This standard of "generally accepted practice" has never—and we repeat, never—been identified or communicated. If such a standard were available, we would greatly increase our patient load, not decrease it.

"The patient was not 'actively treated'"—Treatment of the aged and homebound is often less "active" than treatment for "acute" medical problems. In any case "active treatment" has never been defined.

"The potential for rehabilitation has been exhausted"—The statute states that one of the purposes of the home health service benefit is to prevent or postpone institutionalization. The statute recognizes the very logical and real limitations of the "target group"—those over 65—for they never get younger, their medical conditions are usually acute exacerbations of or secondary to chronic illnesses and the conditions nearly always get more complicated.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS ON SMALL BUSINESS REMOVED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with others in announcing that 5 million small businesses with less than 60 employees will be exempted from wage and price controls.

The Select Committee on Small Business, which I am honored to serve as chairman, has recommended this exemption. In times of national economic difficulty, the small businessman is usually hit first, hardest, and longest.

Donald Rumsfeld, Director of the Cost

of Living Council, in announcing the Council's action, indicated that competition will exert pay and price controls on small business. While there was some difference of opinion on the 60-employee figure for those firms which would be removed from control, the Pay Panel did not disagree with the economics of the move, although they had reservations as to its timing.

Further study should be continued to determine whether employee size or other measures should be used in determining the exemption of small businesses from the wage and price controls.

Because of the great interest of the American people and my colleagues in this matter, I place in the RECORD herewith an article which appeared in the Washington Post on May 2 last on this subject.

The article follows:

FIVE MILLION SMALL FIRMS DECONTROLLED

(By James L. Rowe, Jr.)

The Government yesterday lifted wage and price controls from 5 million small businesses despite the objections of the Price Commission.

Donald Rumsfeld, director of the Cost of Living Council, announced at a press conference that all controls would be removed from firms with fewer than 60 employees. He said the exemption would affect about 5 million firms and 19 million employees.

Rumsfeld told reporters that the 5 million firms account for 28 percent of the nation's sales (\$500 billion) and the 19 million employees constitute about 26 percent of the nation's payroll employees.

He said it "appears to us that competition will exert pay and price control on these small businesses." Rumsfeld called the move a "refinement" of the controls mechanism and insisted that it did not indicate a step toward total decontrol of the economy. "It is not Phase III" he said.

Price Commission Chairman C. Jackson Grayson Jr. told a reporter the commission had recommended that the administration "hold off" any more exemptions from controls until more evidence of the success of the Phase II program was in.

Last January the Cost of Living Council exempted all retailers (about 1.5 million firms) with annual sales of less than \$100,000 and in March lifted wage controls on all workers making less than \$1.90 an hour.

Rumsfeld said yesterday's move would enable wage and price controllers to concentrate on large companies and unions which the administration believes are the major sources of inflationary pressure.

As a result of the exemptions, Rumsfeld said the Internal Revenue Service, the enforcement arm of Phase II, would be able to assign an additional 900 agents to direct enforcement of controls regulations.

According to Rumsfeld, nearly two-thirds of the 3,000 IRS stabilization agents had been assigned to dealing with requests for exceptions, alleged violations and general inquiries—nearly half of which concerned smaller economic units.

Rumsfeld also announced that the staffs of both the Pay Board and Price Commission would be beefed up. Pay Board staff will be increased from 137 to 174, while Price Commission staff would grow to 595 from 445.

The decontrol plan was submitted last March to both the Price Commission and the Pay Board for their comments. While the pay and price panels advise on coverage, the Cost of Living Council decides what segments of the economy are subject to regulation.

The Pay Board generally concurred with yesterday's action though there was a wide

range of opinion on payroll size. Business members opted for 20 employees, public members for 50, while labor members voted to exempt all firms with fewer than 100 employees.

Price Control Chairman Grayson said the seven-member price panel did not disagree with the economics of the move, but "did not concur that this was the right time" to lift controls from a large portion of the economy. He said the commission would discuss the matter at a meeting today.

Rumsfeld said the controls program has been making progress against inflation, though the goals "clearly have not been reached." The President's target is to reduce the rate of inflation to less than 3 percent by the end of 1972. Rumsfeld told newsmen he did not think the new exemptions would have an adverse impact on inflation.

Yesterday's move did not lift controls on firms in either the construction industry or the health services field—two of the major sources of inflation over the last five years.

Instead, CLC tightened controls on these two industries. In the medical field, all firms with annual sales of more than \$10 million are now classified as Tier I companies (which means they need prior approval from the Price Commission to raise prices).

Construction companies with annual sales over 750 million are now in Tier I. Generally, Tier I companies include only those with annual sales exceeding \$100 million.

The council action exempted from controls all local government units with 60 or fewer employees, representing 67,500 small businesses (83 percent of the total) and 378,000 employees (7 percent).

The statement said the action should not be construed as a step toward decontrol because:

"Voluntary restraint is expected from small units and their employees . . ."

Large companies "within an industry tend to exert some price discipline over small companies," just as large wage settlements set the tone for smaller pacts.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, called the latest move "exactly the right kind of action." He has long advocated removing controls on all but big business and big unions.

Labor's reaction thus far has been critical. Harry Brinkman, president of the National Small Business Association, said the "arbitrary approach" to exemptions (based solely on the number of employees) will "aid in destroying the objectives of the stabilization program."

Harry Bridges, president of the West Coast longshoremen's union, called for a nationwide general strike against the President's wage control program.

AFL-CIO President George Meany, a strong critic of the controls programs, is expected to give his views on the latest move at a press conference today.

AN IMPORTANT STEP BY LABOR AND INDUSTRY IN WICHITA, KANS.

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a significant agreement between labor and management which occurred in Wichita, Kans., last month. At that time the most extensive agreement in the Nation to influence price

stabilization in the important construction industry was reached.

A 1-year moratorium on wage increases, initiated by local union members, has been agreed to by six of the basic building crafts that negotiate with members of the Associated General Contractors of Wichita.

This agreement to delay taking wage increases already authorized for the 1972 year, which averages approximately \$1 per hour, is an unselfish and sincere action by the unions involved, their leaders and their individual members. It will contribute to the continuing growth and economic stability of the Wichita area which is now recovering from a period of high unemployment.

It also will mean a savings to local taxpayers on major construction projects, as well as to other buyers of construction in the area.

Mr. Speaker, this voluntary act of restraint by these six building crafts unions in Wichita is deserving of national attention and the highest commendation. I have brought it to the attention of the President and those responsible for the economic stabilization program.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include statements made at a news conference in Wichita at which this agreement was announced:

REMARKS BY MR. ED KANDT

(Business Agent, Carpenters' Local 201)

Basically, three reasons led to this decision by: Bricklayers Local No. 2; Carpenters Local No. 201, No. 2179, No. 2278 and No. 2383; Cement Masons Local No. 199; Ironworkers Local No. 606; Laborers Local No. 94; and Teamsters Local No. 795.

First, this moratorium will facilitate substantial savings to the public and private buyers of construction in our area, which, in turn, will stimulate additional building and thereby create more construction jobs.

Second, it is our belief that price stabilization of construction costs will encourage new industry to locate in Wichita.

Third, Wichita is our home and we want to do everything possible to enhance its continued growth and development.

Very briefly, these are the highlights which brought about this decision.

The crafts involved work on a daily basis with the Associated General Contractors of Wichita, and at this time I'd like to introduce the Association's President, Mr. Alanson Foreman.

REMARKS BY ALANSON FOREMAN

(President, the Associated General Contractors of Wichita)

On behalf of The Associated General Contractors of Wichita it is my pleasure to express our appreciation to organized labor for this significant effort to hold down the costs of construction in the Wichita Area.

This effort has already effected savings for our local taxpayers in the construction of a new school and we estimate that, during the year the wage moratorium is in effect, buyers of construction in our area will realize savings of approximately four million dollars!

This is further evidence of the longstanding record of good relations that exist in our area's construction industry between labor and management. As a result of this relationship, Wichitans can take great pride in the fact that our city does not have a history of labor disputes, strikes or slowdowns in local construction.

We believe that these unions, their leaders, and their individual members have earned, and most assuredly deserve, the gratitude of all citizens of the Wichita Area.

Representing the members of the Associated General Contractors of Wichita, I am pleased to publicly thank all of the individuals who were courageous enough to voluntarily make this personal sacrifice for the benefit of our community.

The Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce also has a keen interest in all factors affecting the economy and growth of the Wichita Area. How the decision announced today will assist efforts directed toward total community development, will be discussed by Chamber President John M. Bell.

REMARKS BY JOHN M. BELL

(President of the Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce)

Savings in construction costs will be a very important factor in the continued growth of the Wichita Area through expansion of local business and industry and in the unified program to secure new industry.

Certainly, this agreement will help stabilize construction costs and will place Wichita firms in a more competitive position in bidding on construction projects in a larger geographical area. Hopefully, it will motivate local companies to accelerate their construction plans and should stimulate additional construction throughout our area.

This combined effort by labor will also be a tremendous boost to joint industrial development efforts by the City, Sedgwick County and the Chamber by enhancing our competitiveness in attracting new industry and by further evidencing the continuing cooperation between labor and management in Wichita.

We are very pleased with today's news and we join in congratulating the six basic crafts involved in the construction industry, their leaders and their individual members, on their wage moratorium!

1972 MEMBERS OF ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF WICHITA, INC.

Coonrod & Walz Construction Co. Inc.
Dondlinger & Sons Construction Co. Inc.
Dopps Construction Co. Inc.
Martin K. Eby Construction Co. Inc.
Hahner, Foreman & Harness.
E. W. Johnson Construction Co. Inc.
Law Construction Co. Inc.
McBride & Dehmer Construction, Inc.
W. C. Mierau Construction Company.
Milt Pollit Co. Inc.
Simpson & Son, Inc.
Snodgrass & Sons Construction Co. Inc.

UNION REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SIX BASIC CRAFTS

Brickmasons Local No. 2
Carpenters Locals No. 201, 2383, 2179, 2278
Cement Masons Local No. 199
Ironworkers Local No. 606
Laborers Local No. 94
Teamsters Local No. 795
Marvin Morrison, Business Agent
Eddie Kandt, Business Agent
Calvin Berry, Business Agent
Bill January, Business Agent
Joe Howard, Business Agent
Sam Smith, Business Agent

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, on this date 181 years ago the people of Poland adopted a constitution which peacefully transformed their government from a monarchy to a democracy and in so doing set an example for freedom-loving

men and women, of courageous commitment to human rights and individual freedom. The Polish people's indomitable spirit and their dedication to freedom allowed them to create in 1791, just 2 years after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, a historic document which abolished class distinction, established absolute religious toleration, and declared the equality of all citizens under law. It is with the deepest respect and admiration that I join today with citizens across the Nation in paying tribute to the gallant Polish people and their heritage of heroic dedication to freedom.

Across the country the Polish American Congress, a national organization with chapters in all major cities, will commemorate the 181st anniversary of this historic event on Sunday, May 7, 1972. In Maryland the anniversary will be marked by our distinguished Polish community at Baltimore's Polish Home Hall where ceremonies underscoring the meaning and importance of this occasion will take place.

A brave people long recognized for their chivalry and compassion, the Polish people have for generations struggled for liberty, a struggle which led them to carry on their national banner the motto "For Our Liberty and Yours." But theirs is a tragic history. Despite the fact that it was Poland which stopped Genghis Khan's invasion of Europe in 1250, despite the heroism of Poland's King Jan Sobieski and his 40,000 Polish troops who turned back at Vienna on September 13, 1683, Turkey's invasion of Europe despite the great courage and skill of men like Thaddeus Kosciuszko in the 1790's, Jan Paderewski in the 1920's, and the brave sons of Poland who fought with the Allies in World War II, Poland has time and again been attacked and occupied by aggressive neighbors. But the spirit of this great people has never died—neither in Poland nor in the lands where Poland's sons and daughters began life anew.

Mr. Speaker just as the Polish people courageously sought their own freedom in 1791, so they have contributed to this Nation's struggle to create a free society since the earliest days of our colonial beginning. In 1608, almost 12 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, Polish artisans arrived in Virginia's Jamestown, and by the fall of that year had built America's first glass factory. A year later two of these Polish colonists saved the life of the colony's leader, Capt. John Smith. But it was in 1619 that these sons and daughters of Poland demonstrated their unquenchable love of freedom. Responsible for the colony's glass and soap factories, they refused to work until they were accorded the same voting privileges enjoyed by the English settlers. Since their services were essential to the well-being of the colony, these first Polish-Americans quickly won their rights, and in so doing, to use the words of a scholar on the era, established themselves "among the first champions of American political freedom."

America was to benefit again and again from the commitment to freedom of its citizens of Polish descent. During the American Revolution Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Count Casimir Pulaski,

rallied to the banner of our new-born country as it struggled for its independence. With the exception of Lafayette, Kosciuszko was the only foreigner ever admitted to the American Order of the Cincinnati, an honorary society of Revolutionary War officers. Jefferson wrote of Kosciuszko:

He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known.

After America's war he returned to Poland, and there was a courageous leader in the movement which created the Constitution of 1791 and later in the heroic but unsuccessful effort to withstand the foreign invasions which followed.

Count Pulaski arrived in America in July 1777 and shortly thereafter he was commissioned a brigadier general by the Continental Congress. During the spring and summer of 1778, General Pulaski came to our city of Baltimore to recruit and organize an independent corps of cavalry and infantry. Pulaski's Legion from Baltimore and neighboring areas served with distinction in South Carolina and Georgia and Pulaski himself gave his life for the cause of American freedom when he was shot and mortally wounded during the siege of Savannah.

From these early examples of the contribution Polish Americans have made to our land and to the cause of freedom throughout the world, there are thousands more which can be found in each generation which followed. Today Americans of Polish descent number well over 10 million and their contribution to the strength and vitality of this Nation is beyond measurement. The list of distinguished Polish Americans grows with each generation and marks the ranks of every profession and walk of life. In government Polish Americans have distinguished themselves as Senators and Congressmen, Cabinet officers, Governors, and mayors, jurists, and in countless other positions in Federal, State, and local governments. Polish Americans have contributed significantly to American industry and strengthened American labor. They have added their many talents to our intellectual, artistic, and social life. And, above all, they have always championed our Nation's freedom and honor.

In joining with Polish Americans throughout our land in commemorating that proud triumph in 1791 when Poland immortalized her people's love of freedom in a democratic constitution, let us recall the great contributions Americans of Polish descent have made to our Nation. Let us recall that our national heritage is rich with the gifts of the Polish people, and let us hope that we will all see again a free Poland, fulfilling its heritage and its destiny.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Members of this body de-

part briefly from their customary activities to commemorate the 181st anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland. That country's fundamental law took effect May 3, 1791, but 2 years after our own Government began functioning under the Constitution of the United States.

We are all familiar with the events of 1787, when the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia and drew up the charter which, along with the Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments, has been the guide for our Federal Government ever since. We are well acquainted with the roles played by such outstanding men as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton. Unfortunately, most Americans know all too little about the history of Poland. This anniversary is a most appropriate time for a brief recital of one of the great chapters in that history and a tribute to the memories of some of its patriots.

While the Thirteen Colonies were fighting together in a revolution that culminated in victory and collaborating in the framing of a new constitution that made American union permanent, Poland was being robbed of its territory by powerful and greedy neighbors, its new Constitution being but a temporary obstacle to the obliteration of its existence as an independent nation. It had been deprived of about a third of its territory and about half of its population in 1772, when Austria, Russia, and Prussia engineered the first partition. The second partition, by Russia and Prussia, took place in 1793, and the third partition, by all three partners in crime, occurred in 1795 and meant the extinction of Poland as a free nation except for the years between the two World Wars.

Between the first and final partitions, Poland enjoyed a brief interlude of constitutional government, the new Constitution being the product of the Four Years Diet of 1788-92. Stanislaus Malachowski, Hugo Kollontay, and Ignacy Potocki led the movement that resulted in the new charter.

Under the new Constitution, Poland, which had been an elective kingdom, became a hereditary monarchy. Executive power was conferred upon the sovereign and a council of state, with legislative power being entrusted to a bicameral diet. Earlier diets had been reduced to impotency by the liberum veto, which the new charter abolished.

Other reforms included parliamentary representation, full administrative and judicial autonomy for the towns, absolute religious toleration, the ending of class distinctions, and the mitigation of serfdom. The townspeople became eligible to landownership and access to state and ecclesiastical offices, privileges which had previously been reserved to the gentry.

The years that followed the establishment of constitutional government did not parallel the situation that prevailed in the United States. While America became the greatest nation on earth, Poland, as I have already mentioned, disappeared completely from the family of independent nations until the two decades that followed World War I. The fourth partition of Poland, by Adolf Hit-

ler and Josef Stalin, was one of the earliest episodes of the second world conflagration. The National Socialists were eventually defeated, but the Communists remain firmly in possession of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, Poland's soil has been taken from her, Poland's freedom has been destroyed, and Poland's people have been enslaved, but the spirit of Poland is eternal. That spirit, which helped Nicolaus Copernicus, Marie Curie, Ignace Paderewski, and numerous other great Poles to accomplish great things for the benefit of all mankind, will someday inspire the Polish people to unchain themselves from Communist imperialism and regain the constitutional freedoms of which they have been deprived for all too many years. May God speed the day of deliverance for Poland and its people.

THE GLOBE—AT THE 100-YEAR MARK

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe, a newspaper which serves my congressional district is completing its first century "as an institution rooted in New England, whose pages have mirrored the life of its region and have both influenced and reflected its condition through these hundred years."

During the Boston Globe's first 100 years, it has chronicled the extraordinary changes in our national life which has brought our country to greatness, and it has done so in a way that has earned it the reputation of one of America's most distinguished journalistic enterprises.

Through all but the first year of its century, the Boston Globe has been owned and managed by the members of one family. Three generations of Taylors have published the Boston Globe; the fourth generation of the family is now represented by the paper's general manager. President John I. Taylor, W. Davis Taylor, and W. O. Taylor II carry forward the tradition of aggressive journalistic excellence begun by their pioneering forebear, Charles H. Taylor, who, at the age of 27, began bringing back the fledgling Boston Globe from the brink of insolvency, by creating a new newspaper on the broadest possible readership and advertising base, one eagerly read by women and children and newcomers to American shores.

After the first floundering half-dozen years, just four editors, two Taylors, then two Winships, have spanned the whole epoch. One man, James Morgan, was, in effect, editorial director and adviser to three successive publishers, serving the Boston Globe from 1884 to 1955. Two of his editorial writers, Lucien Price and James Powers, were colleagues through more than 40 years.

Such continuity is unmatched in American journalism. It largely accounts for the character of the paper and its place as a community institution. One Man, A. A. Fowle, was managing editor

for 42 years. One man, William D. Sullivan, was city editor for 37 years. One man, Harry Poor, as night editor, presided over the organization of the morning paper for more than a third of a century. One man, Francis X. "Doc" Rooney, decisively influenced its typographical appearance, as composing room superintendent, for more than 50 years. Such Globe bylines as those of M. E. Hennessy, Frank A. Sibley, A. J. Philpott, James O'Leary, and Willard DeLue became household names in the region. Andrew Dazzi ran "classified" from the days when he opened all the "want ad" envelopes himself, to his retirement at the end of 1969 from a department that handles 17 million lines a year. The Boston Globe has benefited markedly from such redoubtable length of service by gifted and energetic men.

The innovations achieved by Charles H. Taylor brought about one of the great success stories in American journalism. The Boston Globe assumed a leading position in New England, a position which it held throughout the half-century of the founder's personal management. His sons, who joined the Boston Globe right out of college, carried on that tradition as the paper struggled for survival against war restrictions, depression, and fierce competition.

The Globe was built on Charles Taylor's intuitive understanding of his reader's interests. It has always had in rare degree a personality of its own. Its "Uncle Dudley" editorials, famous for 75 years, reflected this; and their liberal spirit inspired sermons in countless New England pulpits. The wit and whimsy of its "Editorial Points" and "Weather Ears," its household recipes, and its remarkable club of women letter-writers in "Confidential Chat" have made it welcome in many New England households, down through the years.

James Morgan's character and wisdom infused the spirit of the Boston Globe staff through two generations, and his judgment guided Globe policy. In his steps, Laurence Winship combined instincts for human relations and for the human side of the news. Their strategic roles in editorial direction covered three-fourths of the Boston Globe's century.

They had the confidence of the publishers and the affection of the staff. In the last 15 years, Davis Taylor has opened the paper to a strong sense of civic responsibility, which editor Thomas Winship has applied with fresh vitality and enthusiasm in developing an exceptionally resourceful and youthful staff.

The Boston Globe observed its centennial by publishing an anniversary edition on March 5. A Sunday was chosen for this edition, so that it might reach the largest possible number of readers, although March 4, 1872, was the date of the Globe's first edition.

In the anniversary edition was a 64-page rotogravure section called "Treasures of Massachusetts," presenting in full color the painting, furniture, sculpture, buildings, maritime and historic shrines that together form the Commonwealth's cultural heritage. In preparing the section, the Boston Globe had the willing cooperation of museums, libraries,

and other institutions throughout Massachusetts. The section was printed on heavy stock so that it could serve as a lasting guide to the places where everything shown in it may be seen or visited.

Louis M. Lyons, a former Globe man and former curator of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard, wrote a history of the Boston Globe entitled "Newspaper Story—One Hundred Years of the Boston Globe," a 482-page volume published by the Belknap Press of Harvard University. A serial of 21 installments was condensed from the book and ran one each day, starting March 5.

Sports editor Jerry Nason wrote an eight-chapter account of Globe sports over the century, and this ran daily in the sports section, March 12 to March 19. With it were pictures showing great moments in sports in those years.

At the last Globe Book Fair, visitors showed great interest in reprints of early Globe front pages. Therefore, for the centennial, the Globe prepared a 118-page booklet called "Famous Front Pages From the Boston Globe, 1872-1972." The cover simulated a mat used in curving pages for modern circular presses. This one reproduced the mat used on the Globe's front page the day that man first walked on the moon. In addition to reproducing 100 front pages, the booklet contains, from various years, a selection of firsts from the Globe—the first story ever sent by telephone, the first full-page advertisement in the Nation—and its Pulitzer Prize award "for meritorious public service."

An unexpectedly heavy snowfall occurred on March 5. In most places, people were still digging out early in the afternoon. Yet the sale of the Globe's anniversary issue was the greatest in Globe history—665,000—80,000 above the usual Sunday circulation. Thousands of letters from readers have expressed their thanks for the anniversary edition and their best wishes to the Globe for the future.

Mr. Louis M. Lyons in his book, "Newspaper Story—One Hundred Years of the Boston Globe" stated:

In perspective—this account of one newspaper has been written in years of crisis challenging historic concepts of journalism, as of all institutions. Its chief problem has been to find perspective for these latest years of change. Instant history loses in perspective what it may claim of contemporaneity:

The Globe has been well in advance of all but a very few newspapers in recognizing and adapting to the dynamics of its times. The dilemma of the editor over "participatory journalism" is suggestive of the issues and problems of the newspaper, both internally and as a civic voice, that will pose questions of the future, both in communications and throughout a society in transition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial of the Boston Globe which expresses the Globe principle.

THE GLOBE—AT THE 100-YEAR MARK

The Globe was born in the same year as the American postal card and the unbreakable billiard ball. They, in their time, were accomplishments. So was the book people were then about to read Jules Verne's "Around the World in Eighty Days."

In 1872 people had no phones, electric

lights, stereos, automobiles, movies or television. All of these brought change. Yet it was nothing compared with what is now happening.

Living today has become so complex and terrifying. Great problems of environment and overpopulation search desperately for answers.

The Globe, which battled through the last century, will continue to dedicate itself to finding these answers, and to building a New England, an America and a world community where people can live together in peace and plenty.

In this effort, the fine people in all departments who put out The Globe will keep doing their best to stay abreast of the new times and new problems.

Their aim will be, as the late Globe editor James Morgan wrote a quarter-century ago, "to conduct in season and out, an unending campaign of education in the enduring principles which underlie the political, economic and social questions of the day."

Vital to all this is a free press, more necessary now than ever before. Newspapers will remain free only if the people insist they remain free—and if the press does an ever better job of informing them, defining the issue, interpreting the changing customs, defending the poor and the young and the weak in this increasingly complicated society.

The Globe in its second century, as a strongly independent paper bound to no political party, aims to do just that.

And this newspaper renews its determination to help the people of this distinguished city and all of New England enjoy better, more exciting daily lives.

CRITICAL SHORTAGE—COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, commercial fertilizers will be in short supply this year, and barring some change in the administration's policies, the matter will grow steadily worse with time.

I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Edwin Wheeler, president of the Fertilizer Institute, 1015 18th Street, NW., Washington, D.C., to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz detailing the situation.

I commend this letter to my colleagues in the House, so they may be aware of this growing crisis:

APRIL 6, 1972.

Hon. EARL BUTZ,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Per the discussion at the Agricultural Chemical Manufacturing Seminar on April 4, I thought it would be helpful to put in writing the dilemma as it pertains to fertilizer supplies and the problems created by the flat of the Price Commission.

American fertilizer industry sources—be it producer, retailer, fertilizer broker—report either an extreme tightness in supply or, in individual cases, nonavailability of the following materials:

Diammonium Phosphate (DAP)
Concentrated Superphosphate (Triple Super)

Phosphoric Acid (Phos. Acid)

There will be a snug supply of urea and ammonium sulphate, but not approaching

the crisis—as it may truthfully be called—situation in the three phosphates enumerated above.

We have three situations which contribute to this dilemma.

First, great overproduction and great financial losses in the mid-1960's, culminating in the year 1969 in a loss of nearly \$200 million on \$2+ billion in sales, compelled managerial decisions to shut down the less economic older plants. Stringent proposed or promulgated environmental controls also dictated which plants should be set aside and closed. We, therefore, estimate that, as of July 1, 1971, there were, conservatively, 600,000 tons of phosphoric production shut down, compared with eighteen months prior, i.e., January 1, 1970.

Second, as of June 30, 1971, (traditional end of our fertilizer year), it was clear that 1971 had seen a domestic increase in demand for these products rise about 4%. Hence, the cotton and the corn usage had risen faster than for other fertilizers in the face of a dip in production. Export demand was good, but not "red hot."

Farmers and retailers put a heavy demand for these products on the producer all through October, November and December, 1971.

Third, contemporaneous with this was the devaluation of the dollar, and Phase II price controls began to have an effect—a far-reaching effect. The real effect of these two events is illustrated by DAP in export trade. For comparative purposes, let us examine a three-year period. It is the most dramatic illustration of what occurred:

DIAMMONIUM PHOSPHATE, EXPORT

[In thousand short tons]

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
November.....	79.4	46.1	86.3
December.....	39.7	137.0	183.3
January.....	53.9	122.3	160.0
February.....	88.0	81.8	212.0
Total.....	261.0	387.2	641.6

Note: 1969-70 versus 1971-72 exports were nearly triple in the last most current period and not quite double over just a year ago.

Simplifying:

1971-72 DAP

	Production	Export	Available for domestic
November.....	344	86.3	257.7
December.....	400	183.3	216.7
January.....	320	160.0	160.0
February.....	337	412.0	125.0
Total.....	1,401	641.6	759.4

¹ Excluding imports.

Thus, nearly 46% of total DAP production was going into export during this four-month period. With the Price Commission delays and subsequent inconsistent rulings, the material naturally moved into the unregulated foreign market and away from our domestic customers. Even now, foreign buyers are willing to pay nearly any price to get the material—at least 20% above U.S. ceiling on these short supply materials.

While not as dramatic, exports and domestic use are up on Triple Super, and the heavy manufacture of both have made Phosphoric Acid well nigh impossible to buy.

With the Price Commission and the Cost of Living Council oblivious to soaring world prices, economics—sound economics—would dictate these materials moving into the foreign market. Export prices commendably are exempt from price control. Cost increases—no profit theories, with no recognition of demand on a global basis for a commodity, have contributed significantly to a domestic shortage.

Our best estimate today is a shortage of 10%-15% on these phosphates. We hedge on a firm figure until we begin heavy movement of fertilizer in the Corn Belt country in this coming six weeks. Weather and crop planting decisions will determine what finally happens. Based on the already heavy movement in the South now, running 7%-10% higher than a year ago, a 10% over-all shortage would be a conservative figure.

We do know of companies now allocating material on the basis of 85% of last year's sales. Thus, in these instances, the customer is going to be short 15% plus any growth. 1973 sees no relief in sight in so far as additional production is concerned. Certainly, phosphate imports will not fill the gap.

What about 1973, 1974, and beyond? With the unbelievable Price Commission rules on profits, no one of sound mind wants to make the investment in plant engineering, design and construction. First, the industry has lost huge sums of money, e.g., Exhibit I and Ia. Gulf Oil, Continental Oil, Mobil Oil, all have withdrawn from the business for this reason. Thus, to make any improvement in profit, one must examine the regulations and rulings of the Commission. They are in two groups:

For example, the Commission has held that where a division or subsidiary of a profitable company has been losing money, it is only permitted to raise its prices (of the subsidiary or division) so that it (subsidiary or division) will break even. One could not conceive of the parent corporation's making additional investments of either money or personnel in such a division or subsidiary.

As a second example, where an entire company has been losing money in its base period, it may increase prices to where it will make a maximum of 3% on sales and no single item shall be increased more than 8%. The short phosphatic materials, based on international awards (tenders) are up in price 20% over a year ago.

In the second group, to further confuse the issue, the Term Limit Pricing orders on fertilizer have been from allowing 15% (one at 25%!) increase down to 4.5%. Thus, some major multi-line companies got 15% price increases, and the money losers got 8%. This triple ruling on commodities such as fertilizers is wreaking havoc in the orderly marketing of fertilizers, even ignoring the export situation above referred to.

It is almost silly to be regulating an industry as depicted in Exhibit I or Exhibit II. Exhibit II shows the farmer paying less and less for plant nutrients, and this is in the face of skyrocketing transportation costs which are included in the data. Exhibit III shows fertilizer costs compared with cost-of-living costs and, again, it convincingly demonstrates our industry has, in no wise, contributed to inflation.

RECOMMENDATION

What, then, must be done to assure an adequate supply of all fertilizer material, looking to 1973 and beyond?

1. De-regulation of price and profit for the fertilizer industry would be the simplest.

A. Potash is in great abundance. (Mines in Canada are operating at 45% capacity. Price floor is set by the Provincial Government.) There would be no increase in price because of the above, as production could be quickly accelerated.

B. Nitrogen. Ample supply is on hand. Depending on availability of natural gas, this should be true in 1973. Soon (1974-1975), additional capacity will be needed. Without profit, this will not be accomplished.

C. Phosphate. Plenty of raw material available. Manufacturing capacity apparently needed now or in the near future. Again, no construction under present rules on profits.

ALTERNATIVE

2. Base period profit of 6 out of the last 10 years. This would be a more normal period in the industry. It would permit the companies to have a ratio of net to sales of 11.3% (Exhibit I) if there was no limit of 8% per any one item and the rule was applicable to the independent company, division or subsidiary, regardless of a parent company's profit margin. As another possibility, a 6-out-of-10-year return on investment test: Per Exhibit I, this would equate to 10%.

SUMMARY

The American farmer and, ultimately, the American consumer is going to soon feel the effect of a shortage of certain fertilizer materials. Demand at home and abroad for these life-sustaining materials must be recognized and immediate consideration be given to permit all segments of the industry to earn sufficient profits that will attract capital to ensure adequate production of fertilizers.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN WHEELER.

EXHIBIT I.—THE FERTILIZER INSTITUTE, FINANCIAL SURVEY

[In percent]

DOLLAR WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR ALL COMPANIES—18-38 PARTICIPANTS

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Net sales.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Cost of goods sold.....	76.4	75.8	76.2	75.6	76.1	76.6	77.8	79.3	85.9	89.6	83.3
Gross margin.....	23.6	24.2	23.8	24.4	23.9	23.4	22.2	20.7	14.1	10.4	16.7
S.G. & A. expense (total).....	11.7	12.2	12.7	12.7	13.1	13.0	13.7	15.8	17.4	18.9	18.9
Pretax margin.....	11.9	12.0	11.1	11.7	10.8	10.4	8.5	4.9	(3.3)	(8.5)	(2.2)

SIMPLE AVERAGES OF DATA REPORTED—6-16 PARTICIPANTS

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Return on equity.....	18.3	14.7	13.0	7.3	7.9	18.8	17.5	14.2	(1.7)	(7.5)	(1.4)
Equity to sales.....	1.22	1.00	0.99	1.12	0.83	0.82	1.04	1.09	1.17	1.59	1.33
Long-term debt (thousands).....	8,748	8,955	11,452	15,851	15,138	18,414	25,853	30,487	37,651	35,972	33,614
Profit as percent of shareholders' equity.....	20.8	17.8	15.5	9.8	10.7	21.9	17.4	11.0	(4.0)	(10.5)	(0.3)

TOTAL DOLLAR (THOUSANDS) REPORTED BY ALL COMPANIES—18-38 PARTICIPANTS

Net sales.....	595,058	725,486	825,423	961,372	1,176,942	1,431,569	1,707,113	1,760,660	1,828,712	1,866,675	2,032,035
Cost of goods sold.....	454,368	549,913	629,073	726,987	895,442	1,096,581	1,327,212	1,396,619	1,570,361	1,671,843	1,692,764
Gross margin.....	140,690	175,583	196,350	234,385	281,500	334,988	379,901	364,041	258,351	194,831	339,271
S.G. & A. expense (total).....	69,541	88,311	104,593	122,060	153,745	185,515	234,350	277,247	319,520	354,090	384,685
Pretax margin.....	71,149	87,262	91,757	112,325	127,755	149,473	145,551	86,794	(61,169)	(159,259)	(45,414)

6-16 PARTICIPANTS

Long-term debt.....	52,486	71,640	91,616	126,806	151,386	239,377	361,944	396,326	527,116	539,578	537,827
---------------------	--------	--------	--------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

DOLLAR AVERAGES DERIVED FROM PERCENTAGES REPORTED—6-16 PARTICIPANTS

Equity.....	63,940	57,389	63,723	73,836	71,285	72,280	84,010	93,662	94,494	74,317	74,411
Shareholders' equity.....	57,756	44,188	51,795	53,562	54,642	51,617	55,630	60,045	53,953	57,902	57,319

TOTAL DOLLARS (THOUSANDS) DERIVED FROM REPORTED PERCENTAGES—6-16 PARTICIPANTS

Equity.....	383,638	459,111	509,784	590,686	712,850	939,639	1,176,135	1,217,603	1,322,909	1,114,755	1,190,580
Shareholders' equity.....	288,782	343,305	414,361	428,492	546,417	671,027	778,823	780,589	755,339	868,532	859,791

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT,
MARCH 1972

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the March 1972 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

Month	Full-time employees in permanent positions	Change from previous month	Temporary part-time, etc.	Change from previous month	Total employment	Change from previous month
July 1971.....	2,521,703	+1,391	381,448	+18,755	2,903,151	+20,146
August.....	2,524,098	+2,395	366,062	-15,386	2,890,160	-12,991
September.....	2,527,518	+3,420	317,021	-49,041	2,844,539	-45,621
October.....	2,529,832	+2,314	303,236	-13,785	2,833,068	-11,471
November.....	2,528,233	-1,599	300,256	-2,980	2,828,489	-4,579
December.....	2,525,858	-2,375	300,662	+406	2,826,520	-1,969
January 1972.....	2,552,081	+26,223	272,945	-27,717	2,825,026	-1,494
February.....	2,550,984	-1,097	277,284	+4,339	2,828,268	+3,242
March.....	2,539,790	-11,194	286,441	-9,157	2,826,231	-2,037

Administration orders announced last August were directed at reductions in the category of full-time permanent employment. In the 7 months since, full-time permanent employment has been reduced by approximately 14,300, mainly in the Defense Department. This would indicate further reduction of about 8,300 to reach the level of 2,531,500 projected for June 30, 1972.

Of the 14,300 reduction in full-time permanent employment since last August, 13,400

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MARCH 1972

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of March was 2,866,368 as compared with 2,868,122 in the preceding month of February. This was a net decrease of 1,754.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of March totaled 2,826,231. This was a net decrease of 2,037 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of February. Employment by months in fiscal 1972 follows:

was reported by the Defense Department. The civilian agencies reported a net decrease of about 900 (exclusive of approximately 30,000 reclassified Postal Service employees)—reflecting decreases mainly in GSA, Agriculture, Transportation, NASA and Interior, partially offset by increases in Treasury, Veterans and EPA.

Changes in total employment in January in Civilian Agencies of the Executive Branch

as compared with civilian employment in Military Agencies were as follows:

	March	February	Change
Civilian agencies.....	1,705,959	1,703,448	+2,511
Military agencies.....	1,120,272	1,124,820	-4,548
Total, civilian employment.....	2,826,231	2,828,268	-2,037

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increases in March were Interior with 608 and Justice with 529.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by Navy with 2,361 and Air Force with 1,728.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in March was 2,643,202, an increase of 484 as compared with February. Total employment outside the United States in March was 183,029, a decrease of 2,521 as compared with February.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in March totaled 31,853, an increase of 247 as compared with the preceding month of February. Employment in the Judicial Branch in March totaled 8,284, an increase of 36 as compared with February.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the Joint Committee report, on personnel employed fulltime in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during March 1972, showing comparisons with June 1970, June 1971, and the budget estimates for June 1972:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	March 1972	Estimated, June 30, 1972 ¹	Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	March 1972	Estimated, June 30, 1972 ¹
Agriculture.....	82,912	84,252	83,156	83,000	Environmental Protection Agency ²		5,959	7,892	8,000
Commerce.....	25,427	28,435	27,820	28,500	General Services Administration.....	36,400	38,076	35,797	39,400
Defense:					National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	31,223	29,478	28,112	27,500
Civil functions.....	30,297	30,063	30,093	30,600	Panama Canal.....	14,635	13,967	13,856	14,200
Military functions.....	1,129,642	1,062,741	1,048,796	1,011,000	Selective Service System.....	6,665	5,569	5,814	6,200
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	102,297	104,283	106,034	102,000	Small Business Administration.....	4,015	4,004	4,022	4,000
Housing and Urban Development.....	14,661	16,030	15,775	15,200	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	12,657	13,612	13,762	14,000
Interior.....	59,349	57,570	56,721	56,900	U.S. Information Agency.....	9,989	9,773	9,491	9,400
Justice.....	38,013	42,662	43,455	45,100	U.S. Postal Service.....	565,618	564,782	593,494	613,400
Labor.....	10,217	11,352	11,974	11,800	Veterans Administration.....	148,497	158,635	161,294	162,700
State.....	23,618	23,398	22,775	22,700	All other agencies.....	29,807	31,333	32,384	34,300
Agency for International Development.....	14,485	13,477	12,856	12,400	Contingencies.....				2,000
Transportation.....	63,879	68,482	67,320	66,400					
Treasury.....	86,020	90,135	95,109	98,500					
Atomic Energy Commission.....	7,033	6,920	6,813	6,700					
Civil Service Commission.....	5,214	5,324	5,175	5,600					
					Total.....	2,552,571	2,520,312	2,539,790	2,531,500

¹ Source: As projected in 1973 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

² Established as of Dec. 2, 1970, by transfer of functions and personnel from Interior, HEW, Agriculture, Federal Radiation Council and Atomic Energy Commission.

³ Includes approximately 39,000 postal employees subject to reclassification by June 30, 1972.

under a labor-management agreement. Such reclassification was reported to the committee in January 1972.

⁴ March figure excludes 2,947 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 2,950 in February (see table 3, p. 11).

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR BLACK AMERICANS: ISSUES IN ACHIEVING MORE THAN JUST EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to insert in the RECORD the excellent statement on Higher Education for Black Americans presented at the recent National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks by the distinguished president of the Institute for Services to Education, Elias Blake, Jr. I urge my colleagues to read this carefully prepared analysis of the status of black Americans in higher education.

The statement follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR BLACK AMERICANS: ISSUES IN ACHIEVING MORE THAN JUST EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

(By Elias Blake, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

The paper will do the following things:
Develop a factual profile on the status of Black Americans in higher education, undergraduate through graduate and professional schools.

Analyze the conflicting data on exactly how many blacks are being educated beyond high school. This is crucial to projecting the magnitude of what still needs to be done.

Project some divisive issues which must not be allowed to divert Black Americans from coalescing their need for "Unity without Uniformity" in achieving equity not just equality of opportunity in higher education.

Indicate needs, financial and programmatic, at "crisis points" for achieving equity not just equality of opportunity: (1) college admission and survival after high school; (2) college completion and movement into graduate and professional training.

Indicate financial and programmatic needs at "crisis points" for achieving equity not just equality of opportunity. Some crisis points are: (1) getting into college with restrictive admissions; (2) survival in college after admission; (3) college completion and support for graduate and professional training.

No attempt was made to do detailed justifications of a particular point of view. It tries to go through the things we must all attack if equity in higher education is to be achieved.

The paper attempts to avoid moving into areas which dealt with what would be done in specific educational programs. If the issues outlined can be joined and effectively worked on, greater equity will be forthcoming. A more philosophical stance was felt to be inappropriate as a starting point for a national group.

PART I.—PROFILE OF BLACK AMERICANS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In the fall of 1970, various estimates projected from 400 to 500,000 blacks were enrolled in institutions of higher education. 970,000 should have been enrolled at that point and 1,070,000 should be enrolled by 1972. Without the most drastic attacks on current methods of college recruiting, admission, and available financial support, the 600 to 700,000 deficit will occur. By 1982, 1.8 million should be enrolled in college.

There are no reliable estimates of how many black youth are graduating from any level of higher education, whether two year colleges, four year colleges and universities, or graduate and professional schools. The

only hard data are from the 100 black colleges in the South. Using the fact that the black colleges will produce about 25,000 graduates in June, 1972 and this probably represents at least 60 percent of the national total, that would mean about 41,700 graduates of all kinds: baccalaureate, graduate, and professional.

From 1960 to 1968, the gap increased between the percentage of blacks and the percentage of whites who have finished four years of college in the 25 to 34 year old age group.

[In percent]

	1960	1968
White.....	11.7	15.7
Black.....	4.3	6.3
Difference.....	7.4	9.4

According to estimates by Michael Flax,* the gap will be no smaller in 1976 than in 1968, and by 1987, blacks would just reach the 1968 level of college educated white people in the 25 to 34 age group! The serious problem this presents for equity in income levels and participation in the professional, technical, and managerial segments of the society can not be overestimated.

About 3 percent of the enrollment in graduate and professional schools is black, though some higher percentages have been reported for the 1971 entering classes in law and medicine. (These are as high as 8 to 9 percent of the most recent entering classes.)

For the first time in a hundred years, a majority of blacks in college may be enrolled outside of the predominantly black colleges in the South. If this is in effect true, it occurred in the last four to five years indicating how recent is the involvement of blacks in any numbers in predominantly white institutions of higher education. (The "Quality" of the non-black college enrollment will be discussed shortly.)

How is the enrollment distributed? The following data are for fall 1970.

	Number	Percent
Total enrollment.....	379,138	-----
Predominantly black colleges (South).....	170,000	44
Predominantly white colleges.....	204,138	56
1st 2 years of college.....	264,000	74
Last 2 years of college.....	93,000	26
Graduate and professional.....	22,000	-----

* Office of Civil Rights Ethnic Survey of Higher Education Institutions. I prefer to use the more conservative data from OCR rather than the 482,000 figure of the Census Bureau, since no knowledgeable observers can find the rapid expansion of enrollment in the last 7 years—234,000 in 1964 to 482,000 in 1970, physically present across the country.

Black college students come from families with less money than the general college going population. The following data are for students from families with more than \$10,000 income.

All students—64% are from families above \$10,000;

Black Students—17% are from families above \$10,000;

In Black Colleges—7% are from families above \$10,000.

A special note is appropriate about the educational clientele of the Southern Black Colleges in the region where 53 percent of the black population still resides. The median income of entering freshmen is \$3,900 as compared to a median income for black families in the South of \$5,226. About half of their students come from small and semi-rural towns reflecting the fact that in the 1970 census 44 percent of the Southern black

* Michael Flax, "Blacks and Whites: An Experiment in Racial Indicators," Urban Institute, 1971.

population lived in non-metropolitan areas. This is a caveat on some very important institutions which still have a heavy role to play and a large part of it is outside of the cities.

Over two-thirds of all black students in college could not remain there without continued and substantial financial aid. About 75 percent of their financial aid comes through the institutions they attend and from federal sources.

Though black families produce about 20 percent of the average students' expenses, it is a substantial sacrifice representing as much as 10 to 20 percent of their money income in already over extended family budgets. Presently, there are no real alternatives to major increases in federal support for black college students.

Conflicts in Estimates of College Enrollment: Is "Progress" Really Progress?

In 1968, the Census Bureau reported 434,000 blacks ages 16 to 34 in college; this represented an 80 percent increase over 234,000 reported in 1964. The previous highest estimate was about 300,000. Since that time, the three main sources of racial data have remained in substantial conflict. They are: (1) the Census Bureau, (2) the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) HEW, and (3) the American Council on Education (ACE). For example, in fall 1970, the OCR reported 356,836 black undergraduates, while the Census Bureau reported 484,000, while the ACE estimates were somewhere in between. This 125,000 gap has remained consistent for three years now.

Another highly related issue is what proportion is in Southern predominantly black colleges. It is widely quoted that now only 34 percent of the blacks in higher education are enrolled there. This writer, along with the ACE, Office of Research, John Edgerton, who wrote "State Universities and Black Americans," all view the census data as inflated. It is a way to suggest a diminishing role for the colleges which have supported black aspirations for over a hundred years. It is also associated with highly restrictive programs in the private sector that will benefit only a smaller number of these institutions which still produce a majority of the black graduates.

The drift of all this would be to kill off the historic black colleges, thereby making all higher education of black youth dependent on predominantly white institutions in which the problems of control and influence are enormous.

Enrollment after all is only a sign of what may be possible not what is happening to Black Americans in higher education. The quality is important. We must be alert to some seriously deceptive factors in the enrollment data. Quality factors are the following:

1. How many are enrolled full-time?
2. How many are in degree credit programs?
3. How many are in two year versus four year colleges?

Productivity factors are the following:

1. How many are graduating and in what fields and are those the needed areas?
2. How many in the two year colleges are in baccalaureate transfer programs versus terminal programs out of which few college credits can be carried towards a B.A. degree?
3. How many are going on into graduate and professional areas such as, law, medicine, engineering, advanced science, research, and technology?

Despite all the publicity on increases, no studies of any comprehensive nature exist with solid answers to these questions. All kinds of head counts are taken but almost as in a conspiracy nothing else is known (except for some studies in individual colleges and some estimates). Most estimates agree that about 75 percent of the blacks are in the first two years of college. It is difficult to get a breakdown on what proportion are in

two year versus four year colleges. Nationally, 26 percent of all students are in community colleges. More than that proportion of blacks is generally assumed to be in two year colleges. Though some community colleges, particularly those under black leadership, are being responsive to black students, there are still major characteristics of community colleges in general which must be scrutinized carefully.

The Question of What Kind of First Two Years: Dead End or a Chance to Make It?

Most community colleges enroll degree-credit and non-degree credit students. A major question is whether too many black youth are being directed into such terminal programs when the need is for programs giving the option for transfer to a four year college. A look at some data from the Los Angeles Community College district shows that the more blacks and Chicanos are in college, the more the enrollment is in non-degree credit work. Despite problems in determining the actual size of the colleges and their number of blacks enrolled, the basic finding is accurate that a lot of non-degree credit work is going on and most heavily in the places where blacks are concentrated. Another factor is that male degree credit enrollment is from half to two-thirds part-time in the majority minority schools while two-thirds of the degree credit male enrollment is full-time in the community colleges with 88 to 94 percent white enrollment in Los Angeles.

It could well be that a substantial portion of the so-called increased enrollment could be part-time students, in non-degree credit work with substantial financial problems and married with families. It is essential that opportunity be available to these black people, but they need to be almost superhuman to survive all the obstacles and gain college degrees or their vocational goals. Steps must be taken to create the same pattern seen in the predominantly white colleges in Los Angeles. A major proportion of the so-called black enrollment is being programmed for failure or as the menial labor of the Technological Society of the year 2000.

By comparison, 87 percent of the enrollment in the black colleges is full-time baccalaureate degree credit enrollment and 95 percent of the enrollment is in four year degree granting four year colleges and universities. These facts are never mentioned as arguments ensue about what enrollment is where.

Unless we ask the quality and productivity questions, the keepers of the "social progress" data may well be directing our attention away from the real issues.

Greater pressure then must be brought in all regions of the country to produce some reliable indices of what is actually happening to black enrollees. State level efforts in this regard are important. The task is more manageable and more consistent pressures can be brought at the state level to produce data. Once the data are available, then the pressure shifts to performance of institutions in graduating competent blacks.

TABLE I.—A COMPARISON OF THE PROPORTION OF MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT AND THE PROPORTION OF NONDEGREE CREDIT ENROLLMENT IN LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

	Percent minority est. ¹	Percent black	Percent others	Percent nondegree enrollment
L.A. Tech cc. (15,500) ²	70	34	36	57.5
L.A. City cc. (18,000)	54	28	26	39.9
East L.A. cc. (14,000)	53	6	47	38.0
Southwest cc. (3,000)	96	92	4	33.1
Pasadena cc. (16,000)	6	1	5	31.0

	Percent minority est. ¹	Percent black	Percent others	Percent nondegree enrollment
L.A. Harbor cc. (8,500)	30	11	19	24.0
L.A. Valley cc. (18,000)	12	3	9	20.9

¹ The minority percentage was taken from the Office of Civil Rights Ethnic Survey 1970. The total enrollment was taken from Fall Enrollment in Higher Education 1970: Institutional Data NCES, Office of Education. The total minority enrollment is possibly inflated because the total size of the colleges was more accurate in the Office of Education report than in the Office of Civil Rights Survey. The problem then is that the numbers reported here are greater than those in the OCR Survey. This points up the problem of accuracy in enrollment data. For example, OCR reports 1,936 blacks, 2,049 other minorities out of a total enrollment of 5,694 at L.A. Trade Tech. The Office of Education reports a total enrollment of 6,550 in degree credit enrollment alone. At O.E., L.A. City Community College reports 10,842 in degree credit enrollment as compared to a total enrollment of 7,507 in the OCR Survey.

² Total enrollment degree and nondegree credit enrollment. ³ Estimated minority enrollment based on OCR reports that there is a 70 percent minority enrollment at L.A. Tech. The other percentages in the column follow the same pattern. If the O.E. enrollment data are not accurate, then the numbers will be inaccurate. From conversations with educators, the O.E. enrollment data are more accurate. Yet that does not answer the questions about whether more blacks are enrolled because the total numbers in enrollment are larger. For example, 1,936 blacks could be all that there are at L.A. Trade Tech, and no more are included in the 900 additional students beyond the 6,550 reported to OCR. All this adds up to some very fuzzy data on how many blacks are actually in college.

A more subtle question about what is happening to blacks deals with the psychological and emotional pressures of the predominantly white campus (particularly on the larger state universities or where a small proportion of blacks are on a smaller campus). Those black youth who are not already well formed as to their personal identity, can be very much confused by their educational experiences. Thus we lose their effectiveness for some years after graduation while they recover from the emotional battleground of their educational experience. It is also becoming apparent that some of the new black professionals on these campuses are also under similar pressures and not able to be of much help to the students.

Some of these pressures deal with the role of a black person in a white institution and how much time and effort should be put into dealing with the personalized and institutionalized racism of students, faculty, administrators, and staff personnel (guards, cafeteria people, student union, staff, etc.). The incidents often tend to be in enough volume to make up a full-time effort for a student in reacting to each and every instance of racism. Though one is deeply involved with blacks in Afro-American unions or other group activities, a substantial amount of ambivalence exists as to whether one is following the right actions. There is also the business of being "on" all the time in acting in a way so as not to allow whites to continue to do racist things.

DIVISIVE GAMES BEING PLAYED IN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY FORMULATION

The Numbers Game: Whose Got the Black Students So Who Gets the Money?

Major segments of the blacks in higher education institutions can easily be put at each others throats because of the numbers game. It is fairly clear that the Congress can be influenced to put money into programs that help students in financial need. Though the definitions of need include essentially middle class families in the new legislation poorer students still result in more federal aid to students coming into a school. A part of both of the new higher education bills includes some general support based on how many poorer students a school enrolls. General support is free money to be used as a school sees fit. A proportion of this free money is based on how many students one has on financial aid.

Black students are clearly the lowest income segment of students in higher education. Thus if you can prove you have lots of them, lots of money can come in your direction. Not only that, but foundation grants and research grants also can be pursued to do research on the "disadvantaged".

Three major segments all have black professionals who have been put on the firing line in getting money for black students. These three groups should beware the use of the numbers game to force one group of blacks to be influential in killing off the educational efforts of another group.

These three groups are:

1. Blacks (teachers-administrators) in community colleges including black presidents of predominantly or heavily black community colleges mainly in the 20 largest cities.

2. Blacks in predominantly white four year colleges and universities flowing mainly from black student pressures and the rise of Afro-American and Urban Studies programs.

3. Blacks in the historically predominantly black colleges in the South where 53 percent of the black population still resides.

Each group has been forced to scramble for scarce resources and has been encouraged to believe, based on the contradictory enrollment data that each is the dominant force in the field. So far no unifying force has developed to put a stop to these developing trends and turn the attention of all three to the fact that all of them should combine their efforts cooperatively.

The predominantly black colleges in the South are under greatest pressure in this three way divisive game. This is encouraged by the racism which says anything predominantly black is automatically second rate and the second rateness is the fault of those who run the black institution. Too often one hears criticisms from those in the community colleges and predominantly white institutions echoing these ideas. In such phrases as "are they really black schools?" "Are they really being relevant?" "Are not they going to soon die off?" In regards to the last question, no they will not die, but they can be killed lest the national black community becomes more vigilant.

Blacks should be aware these schools are still the only institutions run by black men which are accredited for awarding degrees. Black presidents outside the South so far have been in community colleges with one or two exceptions, even in heavily black cities such as New York, Chicago, and Detroit. If these institutions are hooked into the national black college community, they can represent (as they always have) a most dependable means to maintaining momentum in achieving equity.

The numbers game should be in terms of dollars, hundreds of millions more than are currently available for educating black youth.

The Ideology Game: What Comes First, Ideological Clarity or Technical Skills?

Clearly there are disagreements within the national black community about education for what. The highest priority must be given to rethinking what our educational efforts are all about. We must prepare black youth for dealing forcefully with their status in America without confusion and ambivalence. What kind of person we are producing in terms of knowing who he is, is as important as the technical know how.* Clearly both will have to develop simultaneously along a variety of paths. Black educators must be doing it now while they pursue philosophical clarity. The unifying force should be pro-

* These issues have been dealt with at more length in another paper, "Future Leadership Roles for Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities in American Higher Education", *Daedalus*, Summer, 1971. My own "ideology" is set forth here.

ductivity, that is getting black youth into college, keeping them there, and getting them out with competence and capabilities. Some of them to be sure will turn away from the pressing needs of the black community, but most will not. The new awareness forces itself too deeply into the consciousness of our youth. An anecdote makes the point. A young couple engaged to be married on a college campus went to get an engagement ring. They could not buy one that had not been made in South Africa. They did not get the ring. Though this was a black campus, its programs have no strong ideological focus, yet the training of two such young people will benefit black people everywhere in the world.

If black educators are making concrete productive efforts, that is producing larger numbers, then their dialogue of disagreement, if such be the case, should not intrude on their productivity. Our wrath should be directed at those whose approaches to technical competence, whether in art, music, or science and technology, are not productive or whose approach to ideology results in their most vicious attacks falling on other blacks with whom they disagree.

If another person is not "black enough" for you, check out his program of education for black youth. If he is being productive, then do not try to stop him because he "is not together". Stand outside his door and recruit his trained manpower to your cause.

There can be Unity in Productivity with diversity in paths to productivity. If the pool is large enough, we will get enough trained people to serve the ends of any point on the ideological spectrum. Without the writers, engineers, doctors, lawyers, computer experts, city planners increasing five fold, no manpower will exist to make any of the dreams of the black community for its own development come true. The last thing we need is a black educational community that is composed of a few strong leaders and legions of followers. Strength comes when the bonds of unity cannot be destroyed by the diversity they encompass. Minds must be strong and forceful behind whatever the skills. Strong minds are not produced by uniformity of thought.

PART II

The goal of the following section is more than just opportunity. It is educational parity. Opportunity is not enough if a 17 year old's training is crippled by inadequate preparation in inadequate educational institutions. Parity is a number of graduates and professionally trained personnel equal to the proportion of black people in America. Parity is essential by the end of this decade. The effects of the institutional racism of the past must not blight the fair chances of black youth as they clamor for their fair share of the trained manpower which will be running America in the year 2000. If programs of opportunity do not produce parity, they will have been a cruel hoax contributing to frustration that is heightened by raising expectations.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING FOR EQUITY NOT OPPORTUNITY

This crisis points (see attached chart) where educational programming is vital for bright but educationally cheated minority youth fall: (1) from high school graduation through the first two years of college, and (2) from college graduation through the first year of graduate and professional work. The poor quality of elementary and secondary education available to most minority students puts them at a distinct disadvantage in higher education and necessitates additional counseling and instruction. No signs of improvement are seen in elementary and secondary education and with the increasing concentrations of black people in our central cities, North and South, adequate support for improvement become more difficult. Educational programming at the indicated levels is a must if black youth are to achieve educa-

tional equity. Without it, student aid will be less effective.

The admissions crisis point: getting into the systems

The equity argument moves toward an open enrollment system for public higher education at all levels until equity is functional.

Open enrollment means no traditional added on criteria such as a specific test score, a specific academic average beyond a passing one, a specific rank in class, e.g., the upper third. If one completes high school with a C average, he is eligible for admission to any public college, not just a community college. If a community college is completed, one is eligible for admission to a four year college. If one graduates from a four year college with a C+ average, he is eligible for law, medical, dental school, or graduate school so long as he has the appropriate undergraduate major.

Functional equity means that the proportion of blacks in a state ought to be enrolled and graduating in higher education. In those metropolitan areas where they are concentrated, they should be enrolled in higher education in proportion to their share of the population. If, however, blacks are throughout a state system in the appropriate numbers, that would compensate for a smaller proportion in college in a metropolitan area. Graduating proportions is the key factor not just how many are enrolled, but how many are at all levels. What this would mean as a goal is illustrated below based on the 1970 Census (not reproduced in the RECORD).

	Percent black	Blacks as percent of the public school population
Newark	54.0	72.2
New Jersey statewide	10.7	15.4
New York City	21.2	34.5
New York statewide	10.6	15.5
Chicago	32.7	54.8
Illinois statewide	12.8	18.2
Atlanta	51.3	68.7
Georgia statewide	25.9	33.2
New Orleans	45.0	69.5
Louisiana statewide	29.8	40.4
Birmingham	42.0	54.6
Alabama statewide	26.2	34.3

In Newark, 54 percent of those enrolled and graduating from all levels of higher education should be black including doctors, lawyers, Ph. D's, etc. If the percentage is less in Newark than in the state as a whole, 10.7 at all levels should be involved. These are conservative estimates because the public school population in the state is a higher proportion than the population and that proportion should be used for the state as a whole.

My choice would be the public school population as a performance standard for functional equity. The fastest rise in enrollment curves should result from pressures to achieve that level of equity. In Chicago then, 54.8 percent of the enrollment at Chicago State, Prairie State, and the University of Illinois at Chicago should be black as well as in the community colleges. If that is not the case, then 18 percent of the statewide higher education population ought to be black. If these proportions are achieved by 1975, then by 1979, 18.2 percent of the University of Illinois Medical School in Chicago ought to be black. In fact, admissions to graduate and professional schools should be 18 percent by 1974 since these schools pull from the national population as well as the state.

East state and metropolitan black community should determine what equity means for them and begin to pursue those goals. Without open enrollment, however, nothing like the increases required can be achieved.

Undergraduate Crisis Point: Revolving Door or Maintenance of Progress

The first two years of college are critical. Most drop-outs occur in that period. A majority of students who return for their third year of college graduate. Two factors are of paramount importance: (1) money for student expenses, and (2) an educational program to hold in rather than push out students.

Financial aid programs should extend into the summer before a student comes to college or his aid package should allow charges to be made for preparations to come to college, such as, clothing, possible travel, and so on. There would be no fees for tests since they would be given only after admission and for diagnosis only.

The aid program should:

1. Free a student from any work requirements for at least his first year of college. Ideally all work should come in the last two years after two successful years of Achievement.

2. All colleges should give the maximum grant support possible in the first two years; reducing overall indebtedness where loans are used and giving the student a maximum chance to do his school work.

3. New kinds of packages are needed for older students in metropolitan centers. For example, veterans should be able to get additional money from other programs, such as, educational opportunity grants and loans. Students over 21 should have a program created with a base of \$4,000 a year in a tax exempt stipend for full-time attendance. Colleges such as Federal City College in Washington, D.C., reveal an enormous backlog of older students. These backlogs are a result of the kinds of deficits cited earlier where less than half of those who ought to be enrolled are enrolled.

Educational Programming: From Institutional Racism to Institutional Support for Equity

Historically, except for the black colleges, all levels of the higher education structure excluded black people. The elementary and secondary schools crippled the education of black youth and then colleges and universities excluded them for being "unprepared." This vicious circle of institutionalized racism must be broken all along the line. Increasing college entrants is not enough without increasing college graduates. Increasing college graduates is not enough without increasing Ph. D's, lawyers, architects, urban planners, engineers, doctors, dentists, and other health professionals. Predominantly black colleges will expand their role and enrollment in achieving the goal of equity, but they cannot do it alone. Higher education in America must follow the black college model, taking young people as they come and doing what is necessary to give them the skills necessary to become leaders of tomorrow. Educational programming with adequate support will achieve the goal.

1. Colleges must redesign their freshmen year programs for all students so that they will be responsive to the needs of black students in larger numbers. Remedial non-credit programs must be rejected because they represent the first revolution of the revolving door. Through remedial programs the regular faculty avoids its need to retrain itself in better teaching and use of more accurate content in the social sciences and humanities. All colleges generally designed their freshmen year as a revolving door even before blacks had arrived. Continuation of the approach will have predictable results.

2. Colleges should receive a cost of education allowance for each black student who would not qualify except via open enrollment. The express purpose of these funds is to support the redesign and retraining of faculty as well as putting in whatever extra counseling services are needed. For each stu-

dent who does not survive, however, the college should have to produce a refund of a portion of the allowance. Where a large proportion of the black students are not surviving, a college must show how it intends to remedy the situation as a basis for continued support or not receive the funds.

3. Particular pressure should be put on institutions to redo their approach to science and mathematics instruction. Too few black youth are majoring in these fields. A major effort should be mounted to have the National Science Foundation make better college level instruction in beginning science courses a national priority. Its new program, Research Applied to National Needs (RANN) is being designed and carried forward with the same cast of characters that left black people out of the rapid development of scientific personnel in the last 20 years.

The outlay of state and federal funds for grants for student aid should project 300,000 low-income black students at a minimum of \$2,000 a student for 600 million dollars. This grant pool will approach one billion dollars a year if America is serious about educational equity for Black Americans.

In addition, the college work study program should be expanded to 300 million a year in order to pay a better hourly wage for part-time work in the last two years of college and to produce summer work for black students in smaller towns where there is little work available.

The cost of educational allowances for the same 300,000 start-up pool would cost 150 million at \$500 a student. Again, this is a start-up figure that by 1978 would be at the level of 550 million a year.

These figures are put forward as benchmarks against which you can judge the adequacy of the efforts being projected.

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL LEVEL CRISIS POINT

National post-baccalaureate programs are needed, directed toward recruiting and interesting larger numbers of blacks to pursue graduate and professional training. Too many black youth of considerable ability do not even consider going beyond the B.A. degree. They feel a sense of obligation to help others in their families as well as to avoid further indebtedness by going forward into law, medicine, or a Ph.D. What is possible can be determined from looking at the pool of talent coming out of the black colleges this June and in June of 1973. If just the top 20 percent of approximately 21,000 B.A. degrees in the black colleges went into graduate and professional school, that is 4,200 applicants, and if about 2,600 came from other schools, that is an annual pool of 6,800 to 7,000. If one made a special effort to pick up 10 percent of the places nationally in law, medicine, and dentistry, one would need only 5,218 applicants.

There were in 1970: 11,394 first year Doctors—1,140 for 10% black; 4,639 for first year Dentists—464 for 10% black; 36,136 first year Lawyers—3,614 for 10% black.

An immediate national effort would then yield real results in these fields as well as in Ph.D. programs.

A very real crisis is facing black American equity in gaining the doctorate. The so-called oversupply of Ph.D.'s is drying up major programs for the support of doctoral study. Rather than redirecting funds toward blacks, the programs are being phased out.

The NDEA Fellowship Program is being phased out in the Office of Education. The National Science Foundation gave the last new awards in its graduate traineeship program in 1970. In 1973, the last awards for those already being supported will be made: 1,808 people are in the program; in 1969, 2,842 were in the program.

All institutions of higher education with predominantly black student populations should be aware that this means that very few black doctorate level applicants will be

available in the next five to ten years. The competition for the existing pool will be intensified and there will be convenient excuses for all kinds of universities and industries under pressure to hire more blacks with this level of training.

Rather than phasing out these programs, they should be maintained and focused on Black Americans. This decade represents a rare opportunity to do for blacks in graduate and professional education what has been done in developing scientific personnel for the space and defense industries.

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AS MAJOR RESEARCH SOURCES

Over an eight-year period, the National Institutes of Health spent \$40 million to support a team of scientists working on an artificial heart. These scientists have subcontracted specialized work out to universities, research institutes and companies. The group has involved physicists, chemical and electrical engineering, as well as specialists in such fields as hematology and physiology.

A great many problems of direct importance to the black community can use such a concentrated effort with long-term funding. Sickle cell research is one of those in the medical field. Some rather sophisticated economic development research is also needed to deal with options for the development of the economic resources of Black Americans beyond just a nation of wage earners.

Can nutrition and health in the ghetto be improved through additives to popular foodstuffs in carry-outs and small grocery shops? Can the chicken and barbeque places which dot the ghetto be a positive force in nutrition without changing the diet?

Teams of nutritionists, marketing experts, and legal experts should collaborate on how to produce and then popularize a new high protein soft drink aimed at young children and teen aged mothers during their pregnancies or a new kind of ice cream truck with diet enriching ice cream at subsidized lower prices.

Drugs are of such epidemic proportions that a vaccine of immunization may be needed and made compulsory annually from age 4 to age 21. So much greed is involved in the traffic that parallel approaches are needed. Who knows if such a thing is possible?

The NIH heart development model can be applied to predominantly black colleges or independent research groups made up of black professionals associated with a university. The grant making machinery already exists. The problem is forcing a break with continuing to support those institutions, they have developed over the last 25 years. Agencies which make grants for such purposes should be identified and pursued for multi-million dollar efforts over a decade. *It seems important to put such efforts in a historically black college or university. Institutionalization for long term benefits of black people seems more likely there than in the more recent and less certain situations on the predominantly white campuses.*

THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE BLACK PUBLIC COLLEGE IN THE SOUTH

Black public colleges enroll about two-thirds of the 170,000 students enrolled in predominantly black colleges. Without them, the pattern of building equity for blacks would be almost impossible. For example, in Tennessee without the public college, only 5.6 percent of the enrollment would be black in the State as opposed to 11 percent with the black public colleges. At least 21 percent of the enrollment in the State should be black. If there was equity, the University of Tennessee System should have 8,000 blacks enrolled out of 40,000 students. These would be in addition to the black students enrolled at Tennessee State University.

The problem is that some attention is being turned to the "desegregation" of the pre-

dominantly black campuses. This attention ignores the fact that, if white students are recruited to the currently predominantly black campuses, they cannot be at the expense of fewer blacks attending these schools. Enrollment should be expanded so that, if some whites are recruited, they do not further diminish the underrepresentation of blacks in the public higher education system.

These campuses cannot legally remain all black or exclude whites. Neither of these things is true now. In fact, almost uniformly, the predominantly black campuses have more white faculty than the predominantly white campuses have black faculty. Because of strong racial attitudes in the white community, it is more difficult to get white students.

Eventually, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will require a plan for desegregation of the public higher education system in each state. It is imperative that the black community in each state have an impact on that planning process. Just as the white community protects its interests in public school desegregation, so must the black community protect its interests with these black colleges and universities. The plan should be acceptable to the black citizens and they should not accept the easy assumption that mergers of two schools in the same city is the appropriate action to take. These plans can meet the legal requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1969 in a variety of ways. Certainly since the interests of the black community are a paramount goal of these plans, it should force access through its elected officials if appropriate to the planning process. In some states the primary higher education boards are still all white or has only one black on them in states where 25 to 50 percent of the school population is black.

The main questions are not the racial composition of each campus, but rather:

1. Do blacks have equity to enrollment and graduation in the state system in proportion to their share of the population?
2. Do blacks have equity of representation on the decision-making boards which run the system?
3. Is there a plan for expanding the size of the public higher education system to accommodate underrepresented blacks?
4. Is there a plan for making up for decades of unequal support to the public colleges in a state? Recent figures are deceptive, one must go back beyond the equal formulas of the last five to seven years to discover the inequities.

Without a great deal of vigilance, the largest pool of black enrollment in the country could be "desegregated" out of a continued fair share of its places. Also educational programs built up over years by blacks could be turned over to whites who probably could not run them very well.

Some Summary Questions

The paper to this point has consciously stayed away from pressing a particular point of view or making forceful recommendations. It is important, however, that some issues be highlighted and they can be accepted, rejected, or ignored. These issues and the way they are stated can become focal points for discussion and policy formulations.

Undergraduate Financial Aid Patterns. What is the direction for reform or new programs? What specific actions need to be projected for this summer and fall that would be helpful to more students entering or remaining in school?

Graduate and Professional School Aid Patterns. Can a counter effort be made on the phasing out of major programs for gaining the doctorate before they are shut down?

The future status of the predominantly black colleges can very well be influenced for the better. Can an effort to give them special status as regional or national resources be developed? The special status

would justify special direct federal funding. Can they be viewed as a potential network expanding to an enrollment of half to three quarters of a million by 1985? With support by the national black community, they are an alternative to complete dependence on predominantly white institutions for education of all our youth.

Should statewide analysis of the equity of blacks in the higher education system be undertaken and an action plan projected with time periods for achieving equity set out? Out of these specific state level actions, there could be recommendations made to legislators or state education authorities.

Should specific non-partisan issues be projected on which all presidential candidates would be asked to state a position? These would be stated as domestic tranquility, public interest issues.

Should a policy statement be put forward projecting unacceptable and unacceptable ways for institutions of higher education to respond to black students, e.g., in remedial programs which require no fundamental change in the institution and its faculty's actions or in alternate patterns of instruction involving major change.

The open enrollment and equity question. Is there substantial enough agreement on its importance to project it as a policy issue? What about graduate and professional school "open enrollment"? Should programs analogous to undergraduate entry level programs be projected in professional and graduate schools?

KENNETH WILLIAMSON RETIRES

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I advise the Members that Kenneth Williamson, deputy director of the American Hospital Association and director of its Washington office, has announced his retirement after 25 years of service with the American Hospital Association, the last 18 of which have been spent in the direction of the activities of the Washington office.

Ken Williamson, whom I know many of you count among your close associates, truly has been "Mr. Health and Hospitals" in Washington. He and I entered the Washington scene at about the same time back in the 1950's and I have always found him, as I am sure many of you have, a source of unending information on the health affairs of this Nation. I must say that he has contributed greatly to much of the health legislation which we in the Congress have enacted over recent years.

He cut his legislative teeth in the development and perfection of the Hill-Burton legislation which was enacted following World War II, and which has had such a tremendous impact on getting hospital care to all of the people of this Nation. He also played a key part in expanding this legislation to include Federal guaranteed and subsidized loans for the construction of hospital and health facilities. And when this great hospital construction program was endangered by the President's veto of H.R. 11102 in the 91st Congress—a bill which proposed to extend and expand that program—Ken

Williamson organized the hospital field to support the Congress in overriding the veto.

I could not hope to recite all of the health legislation in which Ken Williamson played a key role. However, I think of particular significance was his untiring contribution to the development and enactment of the medicare legislation. While this legislation is not without its problems clearly this could not have been accomplished without the full cooperation of hospitals of the Nation. It was not only Kenny's job to help mold the medicare legislation, but he took a great part in securing the full cooperation of our Nation's hospitals, so necessary to make the program work.

Of more recent vintage was Ken Williamson's early recognition of the serious shortage in health manpower and the fact that drastic action would be needed to catch up this shortage if the health field was to be able to make good on the philosophy accepted by the Congress and by the administration that health care is a matter of right for all our citizens.

He initiated efforts in the hospital field to ascertain the needs of institutions for training health personnel, and particularly in the area of nursing, brought to our attention the need to provide additional Federal assistance if we were to keep many of the needed training facilities in operation and to expand these facilities to provide the needed professional nurses.

Just in the last session of the Congress Ken worked closely with my health subcommittee in connection with the consideration of the National Cancer Act of 1971, and once we arrived at a firm proposal to take concerted action in this area, he organized the hospital field to fully support the committee's bill.

Ken Williamson announced his retirement at a staff meeting of the Washington Service Bureau attended by the association's present officers. Stephen M. Morris, AHA president, speaking in behalf of the officers and staff, said that:

The Association has moved ahead in these last two decades largely through the efforts and leadership of Dr. Crosby and Kenneth Williamson. While we regret Mr. Williamson's decision to retire early, we respect it, and will be calling on him frequently for his judgment and help in this crucial time in the AHA's history. Few have served the Association for so long and so well.

Many of the Association's most imaginative and innovative programs, and especially its policies in the public interest, are the direct result of Mr. Williamson's tireless efforts and drive.

Williamson first joined the association staff at its Chicago headquarters in December 1943, following several years in hospital administration and after having served as assistant director of the Blue Cross Plan in southern California, as director of the Association of Western Hospitals. Following the formative years of the association as an organization representing all of the Nation's hospitals, he left the AHA in 1950 to become executive vice president of the Health Information Foundation in New York City, but rejoined the association staff in 1954 to direct its Washington Service Bureau.

Ken Williamson originated the AHA

journal, Trustee, and organized a nationwide movement for hospital auxiliaries in behalf of AHA. He is an honorary fellow of the American College of Hospital Administrators, and a fellow of the American Public Health Association.

While I regret that Kenny has decided to retire from active day to day participation with the American Hospital Association, it is reassuring to know that he will still be contributing to the efforts of that organization from time to time on a consulting basis. He assures me that he will always be available to Members of the Congress and to the appropriate committees at any time to provide whatever assistance we require in connection with health matters.

STATEMENT OF JOHN HUTCHISON, DIRECTOR, TEXAS STATE EXTENSION SERVICE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was delivered to the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations by Mr. John Hutchison, director of the Texas State Extension Service. I am proud to count John Hutchison as one of my friends, having known him for a long time. All during this association, I have known John to be a most dedicated individual; most knowledgeable on his subject and has proven to be a good leader of this most valuable service.

The statement follows:

APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES FOR THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I am John E. Hutchison, Director of the Texas Cooperative Extension Service, Texas A&M University. Appearing with me on behalf of the state Cooperative Extension Services of the Nation is Director George S. McIntyre, Michigan Cooperative Extension Service, Michigan State University. We appreciate the privilege of presenting the budget request for the state Cooperative Extension Services.

In developing the appropriations request for the state Cooperative Extension Services for fiscal year 1973, careful consideration was given to (1) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Joint United States Department of Agriculture, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Extension Study Committee, *A People and A Spirit*; (2) national concerns identified and reported by bipartisan Presidential commissions and committees; (3) the results of a national survey of Extension directors to determine the program areas which they consider to have the highest priority based on state and national needs; and (4) suggestions submitted by the Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

The request for increases reflects priorities for those areas of greatest national concern in which the Cooperative Extension Service has demonstrated competence and recommends a level of funding which will be required to make significant contributions to-

ward the solution of problems in each area of concern.

The specific request for increased funds for fiscal year 1973 which we present today has been approved by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, the Division of Agriculture, and the Executive Committee—each a part of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. In addition, the request has been approved by all state Cooperative Extension Service directors.

The highest priority need is for funds to meet increased operating costs (primarily for salary adjustments) to maintain programs at present levels. For this purpose, \$12,000,000 is required.

The request includes increases for the following major areas of work:

[In millions]

Increased operating costs-----	\$12.0
Rural development-----	17.6
4-H and youth-----	25.0
Improving environmental quality-----	25.0
Family living program (money management, consumer education, housing, health education, family stability, et cetera)-----	10.0
Programs for low-income farmers-----	10.0
Expanded nutrition program and related programs for low-income families-----	25.0
1890 institutions-----	4.0

Total increase requested----- 128.6

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a statement of justification for the request of each of these items. In this brief summary, I would like to direct your attention to our most pressing needs.

INCREASED OPERATING COSTS

Our highest priority need is for increased operating costs, including funds for salary adjustments. We believe the Federal-State-local cooperative relationship which has been developed in support of the Cooperative Extension Service presumes increases in federal funds sufficient to provide the Federal Government's pro rata share of increased operating costs, including critically needed salary adjustments for staff members. For several years, federal appropriations for operating costs have been inadequately to provide for cooperative employees of the Federal Government's share of salary increases equal to those providing classified civil service personnel and with no increases for other operating costs. The amount requested, \$12,000,000, is required to provide an increase for Cooperative Extension employees (Federal Government's share) equal to that already provided "straight-line" federal agency personnel.

4-H

4-H is recognized as one of the most effective youth development programs ever created. Millions have profited from their 4-H experiences. Five million of the 45 million youth of 4-H age (nine to nineteen) in the United States were involved in 4-H Club programs during the past year. Growing up is difficult for today's youth. Youth are faced with many alternatives requiring them to make many decisions which are crucial to their future. The requirements for education and preparation for life and their exposure to mass media raise aspirations far in excess of those of a generation ago. Peer pressures tend to increase while family influence is tending to decline. Stresses on today's youth are reflected by the collective nature of youth rebellion, juvenile crime, drug abuse, accidental deaths, and an increasing rate of suicide. A basic need of modern youth is to find useful and viable social roles appropriate to their age. 4-H is currently providing the kinds of experience which are meeting the developmental needs of participating youth.

In 1971, approximately five million (4,954,600) youth were reached through 4-H youth programs. Of these, 35 percent are from farm families; 41 percent are from small towns and open country areas; and the remainder from large towns, central cities, and suburban areas.

In 1971, 501,530 adult, junior, and teen-age volunteer leaders assisted with the 4-H youth program. Additionally, 33,153 served as voluntary leaders in the Expanded Nutrition Youth Program in fiscal year 1971.

The above figures reflect growth in every category over the previous year.

We appreciate especially the increased funds made available for support of the Expanded Nutrition Youth Program beginning in fiscal year 1970.

The need for expanding the proven 4-H program to reach additional youth is great. The \$25 million requested would enable the Cooperative Extension Service to involve 1,000,000 additional youth in 4-H with the goal of helping them to prepare themselves for becoming happier, better adjusted, more useful and productive citizens. The increased funds would make possible the addition of new programs for urban poor youth in manual skill development, health improvement, career investigation, communication skill development, and cultural education; the employment of professional and paraprofessional staff to provide leadership for new educational programs; and the development and implementation of a 4-H service corps employing youth to lead in community development and environmental improvement projects.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Rural America lags behind the rest of the Nation in per capita income, available services, and governmental assistance. Employment opportunities are limited and pay scales are lower than for similar work in metropolitan areas. This situation prompted many of the more productive age groups to migrate to urban areas leaving a disproportionate number of youth who must be educated and senior citizens who need special care. An expanded rural development program is needed to close the gap in quality and quantity of the available services and employment opportunities so that rural areas will be attractive as a place for more citizens to live and work.

The Cooperative Extension Service can perform an important role in helping communities recognize their problems and opportunities, identify and analyze alternative solutions, mobilize resources within the community, and help them learn about and take advantage of the existing and developing programs which can provide resources and assistance in solving their problems. Cooperative Extension has demonstrated its effectiveness in rural community resource development in many areas, but it is hampered by limited resources. It has the established delivery system that can carry out the educational, motivational, and necessary referral function in any community in any county in the Nation if given the necessary resources in terms of trained personnel.

The funds requested will enable States to greatly increase the number of communities that could be assisted toward the Nation's goal of balanced growth and a rural America which provides citizens a choice of a place to live and work as they strive to achieve a fully satisfying life.

IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Decisions that affect the quality of our environment will ultimately be made by the public at large. Rational individual and group decisions and actions based upon factual information will enhance the quality of the environment and the quality of living of people in a community. Rational decisions can only be made after awareness and understanding have been brought about through public affairs education rather than being based upon fanatic expressions of opinion.

Cooperative Extension has clearly demonstrated its capability of successfully conducting mass public educational programs. It has the organizational framework which projects into every community of the Nation. Its relationship to the land-grant university provides direct access to the interdisciplinary resources related to environmental problems. It can be fully objective in presenting educational programs on issues as it has no vested interests to protect or promote.

The funds being requested would be utilized to employ additional specialists in the broad array of disciplines related to environmental problems. Such specialists are not only needed to support the Extension agents conducting "grass roots" educational programs, but also to provide continuous counsel to various public and private groups which make decisions having environmental implications. In addition, there is a need for the preparation and widespread distribution of information designed to provide unbiased public understanding of environmental issues. Information on the safe and minimal necessary use of chemical pesticides and alternative methods of control are examples of such an issue.

EXPANDING FAMILY LIVING PROGRAMS

The family is the basic unit in the social structure and is universal to man. It is within the family where values are inculcated which serve consciously or unconsciously as guides to future actions and behavioral patterns of its members. Family living programs conducted by the Cooperative Extension Services encompass money management, consumer education, housing, health education, family stability, clothing, and many other related areas. The programs are directed toward developing a family environment that is conducive to the maximum development of children, youth, and adults as family members and the productive citizens in society.

Physical, intellectual, and emotional growth and stability are contingent upon healthy individuals living in a healthy environment. Great strides have been made in the scientific and technical fields of disease prevention and health services. However, great need still exists in helping individuals recognize the importance of and how to be responsible for their own health and how to avail themselves of the health services that are or could be available. This is particularly true in rural, sparsely populated areas that have limited access to health care services.

The increased funds requested would enable state Cooperative Extension Services to hire qualified personnel required to reach thousands of families with needed information in the specific areas mentioned to support the vital role of families in our society.

PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME FARMERS

While much of the agricultural industry has prospered, many low-income farmers have been bypassed in our technological and economic development. Almost two-thirds of the farmers in the United States (63.9 percent) have gross farm sales of less than \$10,000. Approximately half of these fall well below the \$3,000 income level. Projects conducted recently have demonstrated that Extension can dramatically assist low-income farmers to significantly increase their income through the use of nonprofessional aides to teach basic skills needed to utilize existing resources. It has been demonstrated that aides are most effective when they serve as a "middle man" between the individual small farmer operator and agencies offering assistance and businesses supplying goods and services. Additional funds to expand the use of nonprofessionals can help disadvantaged farmers, including various ethnic groups such as Negroes, Latin Americans, and American Indians, materially improve their net family income situations. The funds would be primarily used to employ

nonprofessionals in areas of the country which have a high incidence of low-income farm families.

EXPANDED NUTRITION AND RELATED PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The fact that pockets of abject hunger were found to exist in many communities throughout the Nation and that widespread malnutrition existed among all socioeconomic groups of our society was among the most shocking discoveries of the decade of the sixties. The need for effective nutrition education has never been more critical for all people. This need is intensified among low-income families and those with limited education.

The employment of paraprofessional program aides who have been trained by professional home economists in the *Expanded Nutrition Program* has demonstrated remarkable success in reaching the most critically hard-to-reach poor and near-poor audiences. A trained paraprofessional program aide can fill the need at much less cost and many times greater effectiveness than can be achieved by professionals alone. One aide can be expected to reach and teach about 100 families per year. One professional home economist can supervise and train twenty program aides. As of December 21, 1971, there were over 9,000 program aides working with over 351,000 families which included 1,680,000 family members. The youth phase of the Expanded Nutrition Program has involved over 33,000 volunteer leaders working with 4-H type activities in nutrition education with nearly 600,000 participating youth.

Increased funds being requested would provide for an additional 250 professional staff and an additional 5,000 program aides which would be capable of reaching approximately 500,000 additional families annually.

FUNDS FOR UTILIZING RESOURCES FROM 1890 LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The institutions designated as additional land-grant colleges under the provisions of the 1890 Amendment of the 1862 Morrill Act have staff competencies which are relevant to the development of educational programs for certain special groups that find themselves in economic and social disadvantaged situations. These 1890 Institutions located in 16 states can make a significant contribution in helping many Americans acquire knowledge and skills necessary for them to become a part of the mainstream of society. Last year specific funds were provided for the direct involvement of the 1890 Institutions in Extension educational programs along with the 1862 Institutions. The additional amount of funds being requested is needed to further develop these programs and to insure that they reach larger numbers of people who stand to benefit from these programs.

We respectfully request approval of the above items.

OPEN THE BOOKS ON LOCKHEED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit, Mich., Free Press of Saturday, April 15, 1972, carried an excellent editorial entitled "Open the Books on Lockheed" pointing out the need for the law to be followed with regard to a General Accounting Office audit of the \$250 million Federal loan guarantee for Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

The editorial clearly sets out the reasons for compliance with Federal law with respect to this loan guarantee authorized by the Congress. It also points out the fact that the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, which is headed by Secretary of the Treasury John Connally, has thus far failed to comply with the requirements of law as set forth in an amendment which I offered to require a full GAO audit of this loan transaction.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert the text of the Detroit Free Press editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 15, 1972]

OPEN THE BOOKS ON LOCKHEED

When Congress decided to provide a \$250 million government loan guarantee for Lockheed Aircraft Corp., it did so with the greatest reluctance and misgiving.

Now Secretary of the Treasury John Connally is trying to deny the General Accounting Office, the auditing agency responsible to Congress, the right to review the handling of the Lockheed loan guarantee. Controller General Elmer Staats says that the three-member Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, which Connally heads and which administers the guarantee, is in "clear violation of the law" providing for the GAO to audit government operations.

Mr. Connally argued that "it was not the intent of Congress that the decisions of the board be reviewed by the GAO." Mr. Staats, in his turn, says it would be bad precedent for an executive agency to deny the GAO the information necessary to a thorough review of the administration of important funds.

Mr. Staats clearly has the better of the argument. Even the supporters of the loan guarantee were plagued by doubts about the wisdom of such a use of government funds. Many of them were persuaded to cooperate only with strong assurances that the measure would, in the end, cost the taxpayers of the country nothing and would preserve jobs.

That decision, so deeply suspect at the time, has not yet been vindicated. The record of Lockheed's performance on some major contracts, particularly the C5A transport plane, leaves considerable room for doubt that the national interest required direct federal action to save Lockheed.

The least that the Nixon administration can do is let its decisions on how and when to aid Lockheed be subjected to continuing review by the respected General Accounting Office. It might be more peaceful for Secretary Connally to operate without being under the watchful eye of the GAO, but it is not in the national interest.

Indeed, Congress should insist that Mr. Staats search his staff for a corps of the most eagle-eyed auditors he can find and turn them loose on the Lockheed loan. It was a dubious expedient, and it needs to be watched.

SELECTIVE AIR WARFARE BY REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing risk to pilots and flight crews caused by tightened air defense and surveillance, inclement weather, and improved missile accuracy, we may have a possible new solution in the increased

use of RPV's—remotely piloted vehicles. Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical, located in my congressional district, is a leading manufacturer of drones and remotely piloted vehicles and I hope my House colleagues will have an opportunity to review carefully the following article entitled "Selective Air Warfare by RPV," written by Jack G. Broward, the editor of the Teledyne Ryan Reporter:

SELECTIVE AIR WARFARE BY RPV

(By Jack G. Broward)

Returning from bombing strikes over North Vietnam in the closing days of 1971, Navy Commander R. G. "Mink" Ehrman was quoted by the Associated Press aboard the USS Coral Sea as saying: "Frankly, I don't know what effect our bombing had, the cloud cover was so thick."

A five-tour combat veteran in the North Vietnam air war, squadron commander Ehrman disclosed in the interview that air defenses had been "built up" significantly since his last tour.

While his remarks were casual and offered informally, they trace a pattern in air warfare today that has been reinforced by the statements of countless other combat pilots engaged in strikes over North Vietnam.

In essence, the pattern imposes severe risks to manned combat aircraft flying certain missions where weather, sophisticated air defenses and mission ranges are helping stack the odds against a safe return.

Fortunately, there is an alternative. It lies within a concept now under intense study by Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical for the Air Force Systems Command's Aeronautical Systems Division.

The study calls for assessment of technologies for RPVs (Remotely Piloted Vehicles) in areas such as materials, avionics, manufacturing techniques and propulsion. Based upon this assessment and missions defined by the Air Force, systems concepts, preliminary designs of vehicles to perform air-to-air, air-to-ground and reconnaissance-electronic warfare missions will be developed.

Definition of necessary efforts required to develop RPVs as systems will be the next step, taking into account such factors as costs, capabilities, schedules and the technical risks involved.

A major objective is the formulation of a quantitative data basis from which to assess RPVs in a truly operational situation.

Addressing the National Security Forum at Maxwell Air Force Base in May 1971, General George S. Brown, Commander of the Air Force Systems Command, stated, "Through the use of drones or Remotely Piloted Vehicles, we avoid exposing aircrews to heavily defended areas. These RPVs can be designed to be light, relatively inexpensive, and far more maneuverable than human tolerances would permit if a pilot were aboard. Remotely 'flown' from the ground or by a pilot in a 'mother' ship 20 or more miles away, they can serve as air-superiority fighters, as command and control and surveillance platforms, for reconnaissance or as decoys, target markers and covert jammers.

"They could mount guns, rockets and missiles, or, since they are expendable, could be flown directly into the target."

Lieutenant Colonel William H. Starnes, Jr., Chief of Tactical Air Command's Electronic Warfare Requirements Division, supports this view in an article published by Electronic Warfare magazine in late 1971.

"Tactical Air Command's newest capability (tactical drone operations) may be the catalyst for an entirely new and different way to conduct future air warfare." He concluded his article by stating, "Indications are that unmanned aircraft have a definite place in tactical operations."

If additional testimony to the values served by RPV air warfare were needed, there were abundant sources available by January 1972.

Writing for Popular Science magazine's million-plus readers, Ben Kocivar directed attention to what was termed by his article as, the "Wild New World of Drones." His graphically supported presentation echoed what a growing number of military, aerospace and scientific-technical authorities have been repeating in print since mid-1970: "The newest age of aviation is here. Its catalyst is most likely the Remotely Piloted Vehicle."

One of the nation's most highly regarded aerospace writers, Barry Miller, wrote for Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine in June 1970, "A system project office was recently set up at Wright-Patterson (Air Force Base) to coordinate and plan USAF drone activities over the next decade. It is investigating a family of drones, including a silent, jet-powered aircraft for directly monitoring acoustical noise generated by trucks, tanks, etc."

His article reported investigations of possible combat applications of remotely piloted vehicles by the Air Force's Air Systems Command and Rand Corporation in the areas of Air Superiority, Interdiction and Close Air Support, Reconnaissance and Surveillance, Command, Control and Communications and other areas.

There followed in the succeeding 18 months a deluge of more than 39 major articles, presentations and speeches on the subject of RPVs, offered through major trade-industrial and military publications in the U.S. and abroad as well as network television and news syndicates.

Air Force magazine's Associate Editor, Edgar Ulsamer, in October 1970, led off an article by stating: "For certain Air Force pilots, tomorrow's combat cockpit may be a swivel chair in a bombproof underground control center. From there, a USAF pilot may 'fly' by remote control his air-superiority fighter or interdiction bomber against targets hundreds of miles away."

"His system will be deadlier and cheaper than any manned system. Most important of all, these pilots will not be exposed to death, injury or capture."

Barry Miller turned to the subject again for AVWEEK in November 1970, supporting his article with drawings and photographs of vehicles (produced by Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical) that are in use today.

Miller reported in this article, "The Cuban missile crisis proved to be the final catalyst for an all-out drone reconnaissance effort. Shortly after an Air Force U-2 was shot down on a mission over the Caribbean island, killing its pilot, Major Rudolph Anderson, Jr., the government was stunned to learn that while an unmanned aircraft might have done the same job, only two drone aircraft were available in the U.S. military inventory."

"At that point, drone reconnaissance aircraft development won presidential backing and needed funding." His article reports that two years later, the Chinese Communists succeeded in shooting down their first American reconnaissance drone after many fruitless tries, in what had by then come to be known facetiously as a "Chinese William Tell" shooting match.

In a succeeding article, Miller reported, "The main motivation for resorting to RPVs is the growing cost of modern aircraft and increasing reluctance to risk men's lives in conventional warfare. During World War II, the United States lost about 40,000 aircraft and about 80,000 crewmen."

"The cost of these aircraft was about \$100,000. The cost of these losses in today's prices of about \$4 million per aircraft would be a staggering \$160 billion."

Continued Miller, "In World War II, it cost about \$100,000 to kill a target. Today, at the lower attrition rate accepted in North Vietnam, it costs about the same. But at an attrition rate approaching that of World War II, it would cost about \$10 million per target, a measure of better defenses and limited weapon delivery accuracy."

"Thus, to conduct modern warfare with manned aircraft without reducing Circular Error of Probability (CEP) of weapon delivery will require diminishingly low attrition rates, especially as the enemy continues to improve the quantity and accuracy of his defense. The RPV offers possibility of degrading enemy defenses, improving CEPs, reducing losses of trained pilots and saving manned aircraft."

A Chicago Sun-Times article, syndicated in December 1970, contrasts the costs of a modern fighter "which costs millions of dollars apiece with an RPV estimate of about \$175,000 that could offer a 250-mile range and a 2,200 pound payload."

The article reports that Milt Thompson, a top space agency test pilot, has actually 'flown' an RPV-type aircraft at altitudes of 50 to 75 feet and at speeds above 500 mph. He is quoted as saying that operating an RPV makes him as emotionally and physically tired as actual cockpit flying.

Physiological aspects of the manned fighter versus RPVs is offered by Business Week magazine, reporting January 2, 1971, that "In many respects, a robot plane may perform even more effectively than a manned aircraft. It could be designed, for instance, for 12g sustained acceleration, nearly double the gravity pull an experienced pilot can briefly tolerate."

"The plane's turn rate could be set up to exceed that of a manned aircraft by nearly 100%. It could thus outmaneuver even the most advanced manned fighters over a broad range of speeds and altitudes."

"RPVs could be built of inexpensive materials, such as fiberglass, and molded plastics." Upgraded cost estimates over that offered by the Chicago Sun-Times article are projected, noting that, "One preliminary design of a robot fighter aircraft—one that would be launched from a mother plane and be recoverable—bears an estimated price tag of \$250,000. It would weigh 3,500 pounds gross, have an 18-foot wingspan and be able to maintain Mach 2.5 pursuit capability for two minutes."

As in any uniquely new concept, design configurations, costs, performance capabilities and specifics vary according to points of reference and authority.

Writing for Air Clues magazine in January 1972, Royal Air Force Flight Lieutenant R. W. Health-Whyte explores a broad spectrum of values related to RPVs, arriving at the conclusion that, "The Firebee II is a subsonic fixed-wing jet target aircraft and an obvious choice for development of RPVs."

"Similarly, the supersonic Firebee II is ideal for development as a supersonic weapon carrier or reconnaissance RPV."

"The cost of procurement of new aircraft and equipment for the RAF inventory has now reached the stage where even with multinational collaboration we cannot afford to build as many equipments as we need to meet even our reduced commitments. To maintain a credible conventional deterrent in Europe we must build up the strength of our air forces. In short, we need more, not less, airborne weapon systems."

U.S. News & World Report magazine, in its Feb. 28, 1972 edition, emphasized the view that, "RPVs are regarded by Air Force sources as a complement to the manned aircraft and not a substitute."

A key logistics factor is described by the magazine's report, related to enormous costs

currently associated with manned fighter aircraft. "Since planes are boosted from their launch railings by rockets or mother aircraft in flight, there would be no need for airfields. They return and land (or are recovered) by parachute," according to the magazine.

Its presentation continued, "In a guarded discussion of the RPV, an Air Force officer—a pilot—said, 'The day of automated warfare is closer than we think, with machines fighting machines.'

"But there is more to this business than just military applications. It is perfectly possible that children alive today will fly in robot planes. The Apollo lunar-landing craft is essentially that. So is the Mariner satellite circling Mars. The potential is unlimited."

Reporting for the San Diego Union March 21, 1972, Military Affairs Editor Kip Cooper quoted Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical President Laurence M. Limbach's prediction that, "Air missions of the next 10 or 15 years may be flown by pilots seated in consoles on the ground."

"Tactical Air Command is going to be the next big user of the present generation of drones, plus improvements," the article quoted Limbach as saying.

Limbach said his company, which is a leading manufacturer of drones and remotely piloted vehicles, has also had specific discussions with the Navy about using RPVs on the new 'sea control ships' of the future.

Cooper's article also noted that the Air Force is reportedly flying armed Teledyne Ryan 147 reconnaissance vehicles using air to surface missiles and guided bombs.

Of a certainty is this knowledge. Feasibility for RPV applications supporting manned military aircraft has been proved. One article published in 1971 reveals use of a photo reconnaissance vehicle bringing back strike damage assessments in North Vietnam that had previously been attempted by two manned aircraft without success.

Robert R. Schwanhauser, Vice President, Aerospace Systems for Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical, claims there is no simple answer to the question of why this country needs Remotely Piloted Vehicles.

"The short of it is that we possess the technical as well as practical capabilities and that it is a cheaper, more effective way to go." He adds that RPVs are not meant to compete with pilots. "It can provide a role under very hazardous conditions. It can provide a lead role where follow-up would be provided by manned aircraft. It is complementary to manned aircraft as well as to the ballistic missile field."

The man guiding the Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical RPV study for the Air Systems Command, Schwanhauser notes, "A point to emphasize is that the subject of RPV is not something new. It has been around for many, many years."

"What we're talking about today is the application of newly developed technologies. Without question, no major identification will be given to RPV's in terms of new hardware within the next five years. Within that time frame, many small projects will evolve. Out of this effort will come the major new programs which could be equal to the major programs we are engaged in today."

One of two prime contractors assigned to the RPV study, Teledyne Ryan's efforts include joint work by RCA in areas of avionics.

Just as the coming age of Remotely Piloted Vehicles has been heralded throughout the world during the past 18 months, there is certain knowledge that current studies will point the way for this new era.

And men like Navy Commander "Mink" Ehrman may someday "fly" their missions hundreds of miles from the combat environment in the relative safety of a "cockpit" swivel chair.

ANCHORAGE-FAIRBANKS JOINT
RESOLUTIONS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, we in Alaska are naturally interested in development of our public works facilities. Alaska is a huge region, and though we have done much to fulfill our public works needs, a great deal more remains.

In connection with this I have recently received copies of four joint resolutions passed by the city councils of the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska. Because the developmental needs in Alaska are so great, development with foresight regarding preservation of our environment, I wish to include in the RECORD for my colleagues' attention copies of these four important joint resolutions.

The resolutions deal with requests for appropriations and allocation of grants for sanitary sewer systems, and for the improvement and extension of municipally owned water systems. Additionally, these resolutions concern the need for office building construction and the need for improved parking facilities.

The resolutions follow:

ANCHORAGE-FAIRBANKS JOINT RESOLUTION No. A/F 7-72

A resolution urging the adoption and allocation of grants for sanitary sewer systems

Whereas, there is a continuing need in Alaska for improvement and expansion of sanitary sewer collection and treatment systems, and

Whereas, the capital funds demands for the construction of such improvements and expansions exceed available local funds, and

Whereas, the provision for this important utility is of both State and federal interest.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Councils of the City of Anchorage and the City of Fairbanks, in joint session: That the State of Alaska and federal government are urged to appropriate and allocate adequate funds for State and federal participation in the sanitary sewer improvement expansion programs in Alaska.

Copies of this resolution shall be distributed to the Governor of Alaska, the Alaska Legislature, Department of Housing and Urban Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and members of the Alaskan Delegation in Washington, D.C.

Passed and approved, this 17th day of March, 1972, in Anchorage, Alaska.

ANCHORAGE-FAIRBANKS JOINT RESOLUTION No. A/F No. 2-72

A resolution urging the appropriation of Federal funds to assist in the improvement and extension of municipally owned water systems

Whereas, the Cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, as well as other cities in the State of Alaska, are experiencing an unprecedented growth and resultant demand for municipal water source and distribution system improvement and expansion, and

Whereas, the cost to meet such demand is a financial burden greater than can be absorbed by municipal water system funds, and

Whereas, the public supply of water is mandatory to the health and safety of the cities of the State, and

Whereas, Alaska has unique and unusual problems in that most of the basic water systems are only now being built,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Councils of Anchorage and Fairbanks, in joint session, urge the Department of Housing and Urban Development to give special consideration to the development of a funding program that will take cognizance of the special financial problems confronting municipally owned water systems in Alaska.

Copies of this resolution shall be distributed to the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, in Washington, D.C., Members of the Congressional Delegation, Washington, D.C., the Governor of Alaska, and all Members of the Alaska Legislature.

Passed and approved this 17th day of March, 1972.

ANCHORAGE-FAIRBANKS JOINT RESOLUTION No. A/F No. 4-72

A resolution urging the approval of Federal office building construction in Anchorage and Fairbanks

Whereas, existing Federal office buildings in Anchorage and Fairbanks are inadequate to meet the needs of the Federal agencies of the respective areas, and

Whereas, legislation is pending in the Congress to broaden the programs for acquisition and/or lease of Federal office buildings, and

Whereas, approval of this legislation would provide the authority under which Federal office building can be accomplished in Anchorage and Fairbanks, and

Whereas, to best serve the public these new Federal office buildings should be located within the central business districts of the respective communities,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the councils of the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks in joint session that approval of appropriate amendment of the Public Building Act of 1959 to provide for financing the acquisition and construction of Federal public buildings is urged, and sites for the Anchorage and Fairbanks Federal office buildings should be in the central business districts of the respective communities.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Public Works Committees of the Congress; Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.; Regional Administrator, General Services Administration, Auburn, Washington; and the Alaska Delegation in Washington, D.C.

Passed and approved this 17th day of March, 1972.

ANCHORAGE-FAIRBANKS JOINT RESOLUTION No. A/F 3-72

A resolution of the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, endorsing House Resolutions No. 9360 and 9361

Whereas, H.R. 9360 would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to States, local public bodies and agencies thereof for parking projects and facilities; and

Whereas H.R. 9361 would, under certain conditions, authorize cities to use monies apportioned to the Federal Aid Highway System for construction of parking projects and facilities in connection therewith; and

Whereas, the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, because of unprecedented growth are suffering from a critical shortage of parking facilities, both on-street and off-street; and

Whereas, passage of the above House Resolutions would do much to alleviate the existing traffic congestion in the central business districts of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the city councils of Anchorage and Fairbanks:

1. That the City Councils of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, respectively, endorse passage of House Resolutions No. 9360 and 9361.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Chairman of the Committee on Bank-

ing and Currency, Senator Mike Gravel, Senator Theodore Stevens and Representative Nicolas Begich.

Passed and approved by the City Councils of the City of Anchorage and City of Fairbanks, Alaska, this 17th day of March, 1972.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE
PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the issue of a comprehensive national health insurance program is one which is receiving increasing attention in the public press and news media. It is an issue which will continue to grow in importance since it affects the lives of practically every American.

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, recently addressed the Health Care Conference of the United Steelworkers of America on this most important issue, and I would like to insert into the RECORD the text of his remarks for the information of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

About 2½ years ago, President Abel kindly invited me to speak at an Industrial Union Department conference on "The Crisis in Health Care."

That conference focused public attention on the need for comprehensive national health insurance. It also pointed up some distressing facts about the health care many Americans receive or don't receive.

In the intervening time, many others—even President Nixon—have discovered the health care crisis.

It is important, then, for us to consider where we are today. The health care crisis is still with us—and, if anything, it is getting worse.

National health insurance hasn't been enacted. Millions of Americans are deprived of even the most basic health services. Medical costs continue to soar—creating a vast gap between the health care American families need and the care they can afford.

That is why the entire trade union movement is united behind the National Health Security bill introduced by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths and Senator Edward Kennedy.

It is the only bill that meets these tests:

Provides quality medical care for all Americans at a right;

Controls costs;

Emphasizes preventive care to keep people well, instead of just treating them when they are sick;

Would transform the health care system from an uncoordinated wasteful one into a system that maximizes the resources that are available for the benefit of all Americans;

Relies on proven ways of providing better care for more people—such as prepaid group practice plans; and

Eliminates the costly middleman—the insurance companies with their gluttonous profits, and their policies that only an attorney can read and their high expenses for advertising, executive salaries and commissions.

We are justly proud of the Health Security program. But just because the trade union movement has its own proposal in the fight for national health insurance doesn't mean that we have ignored the other proposals.

We try to keep an open mind. So we have examined closely the proposals of the Nixon Administration, the American Medical Association and the commercial health insurance companies.

While I'm confident that other speakers will go into more detail on these proposals—and, for that matter, Health Security—I would like to give you an idea of what our opponents are proposing and what they are saying about Health Security.

First, the proposal of the Nixon Administration.

It is wrong to call President Nixon's proposal really his. It was written with the insurance companies, not health consumers, chiefly in mind. There isn't one thing in the Administration bill that the insurance companies can't live with and get fat on.

It seems to me, that there is real cause for concern when people like Clement Stone—the son of the Republican fat cat insurance executive from Chicago—are called in to help write a federal health insurance program.

Stone's daddy—W. Clement Stone—has two claims to fame: he boasts about contributing a million dollars to Republican candidates; and secondly, that his insurance company—Combined Insurance Company—is notorious for writing policies that are long on profits and short on benefits.

The more "respectable" companies—and I say that in quotes—helped to write the Nixon proposal. The big boys—Aetna, Occidental, Mutual of Omaha—want to make sure that they get a big piece of the national health insurance pie.

And the Nixon Administration took care of them. Its health insurance bill reads like an insurance policy—deductibles, coinsurance, exclusions, limitations, "high" risks, "low" risks. In other words, business as usual, and the health consumer pays the bill.

That philosophy is unacceptable when we are talking about health care for the American people.

Let me give you just two examples of how the Nixon Administration is protecting the insurance companies.

When President Nixon announced his national health insurance program—and, believe me, he used all the right words, like "health care for all" and "reform"—he said that insurance companies were going to be regulated by the federal government.

Now that's something the labor movement has been after for many years—regulation of insurance companies. The states are "supposed" to regulate insurers. Actually, with the exception of three or four states, the insurance companies have regulated the states, not vice versa.

Well, the insurance company big boys were worried that President Nixon meant it when he said they were going to be regulated.

They haven't learned what we in the labor movement learned a long time ago. What the Nixon Administration says and what it does are two diametrically opposite things.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare sent over to the White House the first draft of the so-called regulations. The White House sent them back. Too tough. It seems that the HEW staff had things mixed up—they proposed to protect the consumer, but the White House wanted to protect the insurance companies.

So every couple of weeks Secretary Richardson would tell the press or a congressional committee that the regulations would be out next week. That went on for seven months.

And when the regulations finally were announced, it was business as usual, again. In other words, the Administration was giving the job back to the states, although the only reason for national regulations is that the states can't or won't do it properly. Outmanned, understaffed, poorly-financed state

regulatory agencies have been trying to keep track of conglomerate insurers, with their retinues of high-priced lawyers, sharp-pencil accountants and teams of public relations experts. I don't have to tell you who is winning that one.

The Nixon Administration did precisely what the insurance companies wanted done. It gave the regulatory power to the states. Of course, the companies aren't afraid that the Nixon Administration would be zealous regulators, but they are scared to death about what would happen when a new Administration—one concerned about the consumer—comes into office.

But that's just one example. I promised you two.

HEW is covering up the full story on how the private insurance companies undermined Medicare, squandered millions of dollars, padded expense accounts and payrolls, failed to check on fraud and, in general, have tried to ruin a program to help the nation's senior citizens.

The tip of the iceberg has been found by AFL-CIO staff members. And it is not just the fly-by-night companies that are involved. It is the so-called "respectable" companies.

Aetna—which has free and easy access to the highest levels of government—was found to have made an estimated \$3.2 million in duplicate payments in 28 months. They paid out another \$1.3 million in Medicare funds in excess of reasonable charges.

When these facts were first revealed, HEW and Aetna quickly reassured the public that these "errors" had been taken care of. But no refunds were made of the \$3.2 million in duplicate payments. The overcharges were not returned to Medicare. Instead the overcharges help force an increase in the premiums and deductibles paid by the elderly.

HEW may consider the case closed, but the American people, who pay for the Medicare program, consider the case still open.

Medicare is only a small part of Aetna's health insurance business. And if that accounted for \$4.5 million in squandered funds, can you imagine how much was wasted in their entire health business?

Aetna is only one of the companies involved. There are others. Mutual of Omaha, for example, spent nearly \$1 million in cost over-runs for Medicare contracts. In addition, they were short about \$5 million in overpayments Mutual of Omaha had made to nursing homes and hospitals.

You know, Mutual of Omaha sponsors a pretty good television show, "Wild Kingdom", that many of our children and grandchildren watch. Well, "Wild Kingdom" is the only phrase I know that describes their insurance practices.

Perhaps the worst offender of the insurance companies is Occidental—loyal friend of Governor Ronald Reagan of California. These are the problems the auditors discovered:

1—Occidental paid about \$3.2 million to certain physicians and medical groups with past histories of defrauding Medicare, or who were under investigation for possible fraud, or had past histories of irregular billing practices. As a result, the propriety of these payments is in question.

2—Occidental permitted unauthorized people to approve claims from these questionable sources.

3—Occidental paid about \$437,000 in excessive claims for physician visits to patients in nursing homes.

4—By bad money management, Occidental cost Medicare \$168,000 a year in interest payments from banks.

5—In nearly one-quarter of the cases in which Occidental paid claims for the rental of what is called durable medical equipment—wheelchairs, braces and the like—the rental price exceeded the purchase price.

What this adds up to is millions of dol-

lars wasted by insurance companies. And there are many more cases amply documented.

On top of the millions the insurance companies have wasted through Medicare, what does President Nixon propose to do? He wants to give the same companies billions to waste through what he calls national health insurance. Of course, it isn't; it's the same old insurance company gravy train.

The Administration bill would rely on insurance companies which have proven themselves incapable of administering even a limited national health program like Medicare. Insurance companies exist for the purpose of making a profit. But the goal of national health insurance should not be profit. That goal should be good health care for all Americans.

And the Nixon bill wouldn't begin to provide that.

It would be a bureaucratic nightmare. Thirty-five different categories of health benefits would be established—35. On top of that there are 1500 insurance companies with separate forms, differing deductibles and varying degrees of responsibility and concern for the policyholder. Elaborate means tests would be established to determine which class of health care a family is entitled to—tests that would be revised every six months.

Contrast that with Health Security. Doctors who choose to be paid on a capitation basis would file one form a year for a family—not a form every time a member of the family was sick.

The Administration calls Health Security a "monolith." Then, they say, Health Security will take away the patient's right to choose his doctor and the doctor's right to choose how he wants to practice medicine. That's just more baloney—more scare propaganda. I don't know where they get their propaganda, but Health Security offers more "freedom of choice" for patients and physicians than any other program. This includes prepaid group practice, fee-for-service physicians and virtually every other form of delivering health care yet devised.

Prepaid group practice is emphasized by Health Security, because, as I said earlier, it is the best way to provide care. President Nixon agrees—at least verbally.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the Nixon health program is its blanket endorsement of "for-profit" Health Maintenance Organizations, which are similar to prepaid group practice plans.

What they are trying to do is deviously simple. It is just another foot in the health care door for insurance companies.

A year ago, the AFL-CIO Executive Council said, and I repeat today: "The profit-making philosophy of the market place—to make money for those who provide and finance medical services—is not an acceptable philosophy for medical care."

On this basis, and because of its failure to provide a single standard of high quality medical care for all Americans, we completely reject the Nixon Administration proposal.

It would be easy to dismiss the health insurance industry bill—the so-called Healthcare proposal—for the same reasons as the Nixon bill. Except for one thing: everything that is bad about the Nixon bill is worse in the insurance industry bill. Maybe, just maybe, the reason they made their bill so bad is to make the Nixon bill look good.

It is the classic example of how insurance companies operate. They would take all the so-called good risks—the young, healthy, middle-class people who would probably make fewer claims—and leave the poor risks to the government. By insurance company standards, anyone is a "poor risk" if they are poor, if they are a member of a minority group, if they are over 50, if they are a

female head of a household or if they were born in a foreign country.

That would work the opposite of the way national health insurance should work. The element of "risk" should be spread throughout the entire society to reduce costs. Under both the Nixon and insurance industry bills, the cost to the federal government of providing health care for the poor would be excessive, difficult to administer and wasteful.

One of the arguments to union people that the insurance companies use in favor of their bill goes something like this: unions should be free to bargain for better health benefits for their members. That may sound reasonable, but it really isn't. Health Security would provide better health benefits at less cost to our members than the best policy any insurance company could ever write—today or five years from now.

So we reject their bill, too. That leaves the American Medical Association proposal.

It's got a cute title—Medicredit. What it would do is use income tax credits to offset part of the premium cost of private health insurance voluntarily purchased by the taxpayer. Those who have no tax liability, for example, would receive a certificate for full payment of the premiums.

This means that the millionaires who pay no taxes because of loopholes in the tax laws could receive money from the federal government to purchase sickness insurance.

For example, the late Mrs. Dodge, who had an annual income of \$1.5 million from tax-free municipal bonds, would have had private health insurance purchased for her by the federal government.

The AMA, of course, also attacks Health Security as "monolithic". However, it is important to note that not all doctors oppose Health Security.

In fact, a recent poll of 17,000 doctors by the magazine *Modern Medicine* showed that, while most physicians are against any form of national health insurance, more preferred the Health Security program than the Nixon program or even that of the AMA.

So, here we are. We are still talking about the need for national health insurance. But there is a difference now. We are closer today to enactment of a good national health insurance program than at any time since the Truman Administration.

People are listening. Doctors are listening. We have a good program; one that the trade union movement can take pride in having championed. And we are going to win. Because America needs Health Security, and just as fast as we can get it on the books.

**TERRY PHILLIPS OF WINDBER, PA.,
HONORED BY RED CROSS FOR ACT
OF MERCY IN SAVING MAN'S LIFE**

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally one comes across a man who rises above the tide of isolationism which is so popular today and voluntarily gets involved in the service of a fellow human being. One such young man, I am happy and proud to say, is a constituent who was recently awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit for his act of mercy which resulted in saving a man's life. His name is Terry D. Phillips of Windber, Pa.

On January 27, 1972, Mr. Phillips and a fellow worker, both trained in Red Cross first aid, came upon an automobile accident where the victim's car had crashed into a bridge abutment, gone over an embankment, and the driver had received severe head injuries and amputation of the left leg below the knee. Mr. Phillips and his fellow rescuer called for an ambulance, applied a tourniquet to the victim's leg and gave immediate first aid for other injuries. The attending physician stated that their knowledge and skill had undoubtedly saved the victim's life.

When Terry Phillips came across this accident, he did not stop to consider what personal repercussions could result from his involvement; he did not stop to outline the reasons why he should not get involved. He only knew that a human life was in jeopardy, and he was in a position to help. And he did.

For this, Terry Phillips was awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. But more importantly, he has set an example which could result in the saving of even more human lives. He showed that good breeds good, and if we act in an unselfish cause, in an act of human mercy, the most important thing is that, like the Good Samaritan, we reached out to a fellow human being without regard to self.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House this heroic act of mercy and extend to Terry Phillips the congratulations, admiration, and gratitude of all of us for a job well done.

DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INCOME

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as has been my practice in past years, I am again disclosing my income as shown on my income tax return for 1971.

My salary as a Member of Congress is shown at \$42,500 on my return, and with other income, totals \$46,533. My adjusted gross income for 1971 was \$41,810, taking into consideration my business expenses as adjustment to income in the amount of \$4,723.

My total income tax was \$8,378, plus a self-employment tax of \$225, making a total tax of \$8,603. Total Federal income tax withheld from my salary was \$8,391, leaving a balance paid with my return of \$212.

My principal sources of income, aside from my congressional salary, were dividends in the amount of \$191.33; \$3,000 from the law firm of Waldie & Rockwell; interest accrued in the amount of \$1,533 from savings and loan deposits; and a speech honorarium in the amount of \$500.

My deductions totaled \$7,157, which included medical expenses in the amount

of \$371.71, real estate taxes in the amount of \$1,444.92, State and local taxes in the amount of \$2,685, contributions in the amount of \$573.50, interest expense in the amount of \$1,493, and professional dues and subscriptions expense in the amount of \$589.

My tax return is prepared by a certified public accountant.

CREATING A VIABLE SOCIETY FOR YOUTH IN THE 1970'S

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading an address presented to the North Shore Child Guidance Center in Nassau County by Mr. Michael Gorman.

Mr. Gorman is executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness and is a member of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. He has been elected an honorary fellow of the American Psychiatric Association and a fellow of the New York Academy of Sciences, one of a small group of laymen ever to be singled out for these honors.

Mr. Gorman's remarks, entitled "Creating a Viable Society for Youth in the 1970's," concerned the need for developing imaginative programs to ensure the healthy development of this Nation's youth. The comments of this recognized authority on such a vital topic, I believe, are worthy of note, and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

CREATING A VIABLE SOCIETY FOR YOUTH IN THE 1970'S

(By Mike Gorman)

In 1965, Senator Abraham Ribicoff introduced legislation providing partial federal funding for a privately incorporated Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children to take a long, hard look at the plight of our emotionally disturbed children and come up with specific legislative and policy recommendations.

The Commission, composed of representatives from 53 national organizations interested in children, labored long and hard over a period of four years. Those of us who had the privilege of serving on its Board of Directors waded through thousands of pages of documentation from 10 expert task forces and held innumerable meetings—many of them quite stormy—in an effort to produce the most meaningful final report.

We frequently assert that ours is a nation devoted to its young. Our acts, however, belie our words. We have failed to commit our vast resources to eliminating the innumerable ills which hinder the healthy development of our young. Through our failure, we do violence to our most precious natural resource and, ultimately to the destiny of our nation. The number of mentally, emotionally, and physically handicapped youngsters in our midst is living testimony of the most devastating form of this violence.

From the time of the first White House Conference on Children in 1909 we have repeatedly, and with considerable eloquence, announced our intentions to develop strong,

imaginative programs for children and youth. Yet, our programs for maintaining the health and mental health of infants and children remain woefully inadequate to the present day. Further, our preventive programs are most deficient where they are most crucially needed, that is, during the prenatal period and the first three years of life. For millions of our young, these highly critical periods of development go unattended. The consequent damage to health and mental health are inseparable and frequently lead to irreversible handicaps.

Our corrective and remedial efforts often reflect the same historical apathy. For example, we have not even met the needs of our emotionally disturbed children and youth although these needs have long been recognized. The 1930 White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, composed of several thousand citizens and government officials, proclaimed that:

"The emotionally disturbed child has a right to grow up in a world which does not set him apart, which looks at him not with scorn or pity or ridicule—but which welcomes him exactly as it welcomes every child, which offers him identical privileges and identical responsibilities."

The 1930 White House Conference estimated that there were, at that time, at least two and one-half million children with well-marked behavioral difficulties, including the more serious mental and nervous disorders.

In the four decades since the issuance of that report, the care of the emotionally disturbed child in this country has not improved—it has worsened considerably. During the four years of its deliberations and fact-finding efforts, the Joint Commission gathered together an impressive body of descriptive material on the plight of the emotionally disturbed child in America today.

Our major national, professional organizations estimate that there are now approximately four million children under the age of 18 who are in need of some kind of therapeutic intervention because of emotional difficulties. Of this number, anywhere from one-half million to a million children are so seriously disturbed that they require immediate treatment.

Are they getting this treatment? A survey undertaken recently by the National Institute of Mental Health concluded that, of the 70 million children under 18 in the United States, 1,400,000 were in need of psychiatric care. Only 473,000 of these children received even minimal attention, indicating that our service facilities failed to reach two-thirds of those in need. Other estimates of those in need of care, based on surveys conducted through various school systems, all confirm the need for psychiatric care for two to three percent of the children. However, these studies identified an additional seven to nine percent who need help for emotional problems.

What happens to these emotionally sick children for whom there are no services in the community? Each year, increasing numbers of them are expelled from the community and confined in large state hospitals so understaffed that they have few, if any, professionals trained in child psychiatry and related disciplines. It is not unusual in this year 1972 to tour one of these massive warehouses for the mentally ill and come upon a child, aged nine or ten, confined on a ward with 80 or 90 sick adults. Data for 1969 indicates that over 27,000 of these children were confined in state and county mental institutions. On the basis of a trend which had been developing over the past few years, the National Institute of Mental Health correctly projected in 1963 that by the end of

1970 the number of children aged 10-14 hospitalized in these institutions would double. Sad to relate, it did.

The National Institute of Mental Health also reports that thousands upon thousands of elderly patients now confined on the back wards of these state institutions were first admitted as children 30, 40, and even 50 years ago. A recent report from one state estimates that one in every four children admitted to its mental hospitals "can anticipate being permanently hospitalized for the next 50 years of their lives."

What happens if the disturbed child is fortunate enough to escape the state institution treadmill? In a few of the major cities in this country, there are private, residential treatment centers which care for about 10,000 children a year. Since the average cost to the parents of such hospitalization ranges from \$50 to \$75 a day, it is obvious that only those of our citizens who are in the higher income brackets can take advantage of such services. Even among those rarified income brackets the situation is far from satisfactory; for every child admitted to one of these private facilities, 10 or more are turned away because of lack of space. In 15 of our states, there are no such facilities for children, either public or private; in 24 of our states, there are no public units to care for children from low and middle income groups.

What about all the rest of our four million children who, as indicated above, need some kind of help for an emotional disturbance? Here the statistics become much less precise, since a vast majority of these children are literally lost. Many are bounced around from training schools to reformatories to jails and whipped through all kinds of understaffed welfare agencies. No one is their keeper. No agency in the community is equipped to evaluate either the correctness of their placement, or the outcome of such placement.

If they are sent to a training school, as cent testimony before a Senate committee revealed, they may receive poorer treatment than caged animals or adult convicts. Appearing several years ago before a Senate committee, Joseph R. Rowan, an expert on delinquency who is now director of the John Howard Association of Illinois, characterized these institutions for juveniles as "crime hatcheries where children are tutored in crime if they are not assaulted by other inmates or the guards first." Another witness, Arlen Specter, the District Attorney of Philadelphia, told the same committee that these so-called correctional institutions for juveniles take a 13-year old and, in 11 years, turn out "a finely honed weapon against society."

Commenting on the failure of juvenile courts and juvenile correctional facilities even to begin to meet the manifest needs of emotionally disturbed and sociopathic children Judge David Bazelon, a member of the Joint Commission, noted in a recent talk that, although this nation is aware of the problem, it does not support funds to treat and care for these children because it has really given up on them.

From all of its studies, the Joint Commission concluded that it is an undeniable fact that there is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children.

The Commission therefore recommended that federal funding be provided for the establishment of a network of Child Development Councils throughout the nation. These Councils would act as the direct advocate for children and youth. They would have the responsibility and prerogative of insuring that complete diagnostic treatment, and preventive services were made available

to all children and youth in the neighborhoods which they serve.

Our report received almost unanimous acclaim. Practically every professional organization concerned with the problem of mental health hailed the Commission report as both a definitive description of the crisis in child mental health and a bold and pragmatic prescription of the measures we had to take as a nation to tackle the problem.

A task force of the Commission was appointed to work with Congressional leaders in devising legislation designed to drastically alter our priorities with regard to our concern for emotionally disturbed children. Although one of our task forces had noted that the federal government spends approximately \$190 per capita a year for services to children, as compared to \$2,000 per year for services to individuals over 65 years of age, we were modest in recommending an initial appropriation of \$200 million a year to get our child advocacy network off the ground.

Legislation was introduced early in 1971, but it languished on the back burner while the Congress voted a \$250 million loan to Lockheed and pledged hundreds of millions of dollars to save the Penn Central and other examples of creative American enterprise from immediate collapse.

While the legislation was bottled up in committee, the problem didn't go away. Drug addiction among our youth reached a record high. Because of shortages of staffs and facilities, Mental Health Clinics and Community Mental Health Centers all across the country turned away hundreds of thousands of children who could not function either in the world of school or in the world of work. In the nearby borough of the Bronx a recent report noted that, although an estimated 15% of children in the South Bronx suffer from serious emotional problems, only a handful of these can even be evaluated. At the other end of the age spectrum, a Harvard University psychiatrist reported on a five-year study which indicated that of the 7½ million students in college today, at least one million will drop out because of mental illness.

However, a remarkable series of events occurred last year which gave strong hope that we could develop and pass a monumental piece of legislation which, under the umbrella concept of comprehensive child development centers, could bring about an even more dramatic revolution in child care than the child advocacy concept.

We are not talking here about baby sitting services for working mothers. Let me give you the definition of a comprehensive child development program as enunciated by the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"An attempt is made to meet all the needs of a growing child and his family. The program directs itself to the educational, nutritional, health and psychological needs of children and involves parents through instruction in the fundamentals of child development and family counseling."

There is nothing new in this comprehensive child development concept. It exists in one form or another in most of the European countries and has reached its fullest fruition in the Soviet Union. Those of us who were members of the official U.S. Mental Health delegation to the Soviet Union in 1967 came away with the very crystal clear impression that from the fifth month of pregnancy, every resource is brought to bear to aid the new-born child. I cannot give you the full flavor of the Russian system in a short time, but let me quote just two paragraphs from an article I wrote for the International Journal of Psychiatry:

"For children under the age of three, there is a vast network of nurseries. It is estimated

that more than 50 percent of Russian children get their early upbringing in these nurseries. Working parents may leave them in these nurseries during the entire working week, just bringing them home for weekends. In addition to intensive pediatric care, the nurseries in recent years have concentrated on developing educational staffs to motivate the child and introduce him to the learning process. If the psychiatric consultant to any of the regular nurseries detects an emotional problem in a child, he can transfer him to one of the specialized nurseries that handle psychiatric disorders in children.

"From the ages of four to seven, the child goes to a kindergarten, which may be located in the district where he lives or in the factory in which his father and/or mother works. Here, again psychiatric consultation is available, and there are several specialized kindergarten schools for disturbed children."

Contrast this with the situation in our country. Today, more than 26 million children have mothers in the labor force (up ten million in a decade); six million of them are under six years of age. That's a lot of kids.

What happens to these children while the mother is working? The average woman in the work force earns \$4,000 a year. Even the least expensive center charges \$10 to \$20 a week per child; the services vary from good to deplorable. Because of these obvious economic considerations, day care centers (defined as facilities for more than six children) enrolled only a little over half a million children in 1970—less than ten percent of the preschoolers with working mothers.

How are the rest of the children "cared for"? You should know the story. For some of the kids, it's a latch key as they wander the streets; for others somewhat more fortunate, a relative, a boarder or a neighbor may try to do the job.

Both the House and Senate addressed themselves to this problem with great energy and determination throughout the latter part of 1970 and all through 1971. A House committee, under the leadership of Congressman John Brademas of Indiana and Congressman Ogden Reid of New York, held innumerable days of hearings, as did a comparable Senate committee under the jurisdiction of Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota. Their major purpose, as outlined by its sponsors, was to give reality to President Nixon's oft-quoted 1969 commitment "to provide all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulative development in the first five years of life."

As finally drafted, the legislation which was sent to the White House late in 1971 was exceedingly modest in scope. For a family of four with an income ceiling of less than \$4,300, day care would be free. Between that figure and \$7,000 a year, a small escalating fee would be charged depending upon income. For families above \$7,000, there would be a fee schedule to pay for the services.

It seemed for a while as though the Administration looked favorably on this tremendously important development in the care of our children. In June of 1971, for example, Doctor Edward F. Zigler, director of the Federal Office of Child Development, which was supposed to carry out President Nixon's 1969 commitment to the first five years of life, was quoted in the New York Times as saying that, "people don't recognize the monumental nature of this legislation and what effect it can have on the country in 20 years."

A few months later, the situation looked even better. The Washington Post noted that on September 9, 1971 the Senate had approved legislation "that could dramatically change the lives of American children and their mothers. The bill would provide high quality child day care at no cost for millions of poor children and at partial cost for millions more in the middle class . . . it would

deeply involve the country in comprehensive early education for its pre-school children."

But the story does not have a happy ending. Despite overwhelming votes for its passage in both the House and Senate, President Nixon vetoed the bill on December 9, 1971. The veto message is a weak collection of old bromides about "the family weakening implications of the bill and the dangers of collectivizing our young." The one about the weakening of the family is a little hard to take when one thinks of several million latch key children wandering around the streets all day while their mothers work. What kind of family structure is that?

But the main thrust of the President's veto was directed at the estimated cost of the program—roughly \$2 billion a year. As a nation with a trillion dollar gross national product, we just couldn't afford this kind of money to salvage these many millions of children Mr. Nixon was seemingly so worried about in the spring of 1969.

Can we afford it? Well, last year as a nation we spent 20 billion on recreation; 12 billion for alcohol and 7 billion for tobacco products.

I could talk about cost over-runs at the Pentagon running into billions of dollars, and I could question a projected 15 billion for a space-shuttle program; 10 to 15 billion dollars for a new generation of bombers and, somewhat on the same order, 15 billion for ULMS (Undersea Long Range Missile Systems).

But I would like to bring it somewhat closer to home where you all participate and must share a portion of guilt. Since the passage of the original Federal Highway Act of 1956, which President Eisenhower described as "the greatest public works program in history," we have spent billions and billions of dollars in an effort to cover this country with a layer of concrete. In 1956 the announced goal was for 41,000 additional miles of interstate highways; the cost was estimated at \$27 million. Each time the Highway Act was renewed, the cost estimates soared. The latest estimate when this "temporary" act was renewed again in 1970 was that 90 billion dollars will ultimately be expended by 1977, when the present act expires.

But this is not all. The Highway lobby is insatiable. The American Association of State Highway Officials was quoted recently as stating that when the present Highway Act expires in 1977, it will lobby for another \$78 billion worth of public taxes for a vastly expanded road system by 1985.

You participate actively in this conspiracy in Nassau County. You should know that each year there are more than 60,000 deaths on our highways and two million serious injuries. You participate in the prevailing belief that the super-highway is king—we tear up beautiful rural America so that its reach can be expanded.

It really all gets down to a set of priorities, and that's all I am really talking about this morning. In the very same year that the Highway boys added billions of dollars to their program, we passed a miniscule amendment to the Community Mental Health Centers Act providing \$62 million over a three-year period to start some Children's Units in our Community Mental Health Centers. What happened to this \$62 million? Mr. Nixon recommended not one cent of the first year's authorization of \$12 million, so we got not one cent. In 1971, when the authorization was \$20 million, he again recommended nothing. After a vicious eight-month battle, we were able to get the Congress to vote \$10 million for these Children's Units. This year Mr. Nixon has recommended \$10 million—the same amount as the Congress voted last year. In very simple terms, with the fantastically small authorization of \$62 million for Children's Units, the best we have been able to do is \$20 million—less than one-third of the authorized sum.

In the coming year, as H.E.W. officials ad-

mitted in testimony exactly two weeks ago before the House Appropriations committee, we will be able to open the staggering total of four new Children's Units for the needs of the entire nation.

As you drive your cars along the turnpikes and super-highways which have desecrated the Nassau and Suffolk counties which I used to know as a boy, just think about this—billions for highways and pennies for children.

And you are partially responsible. The elected officials are spending your taxes, and they have decided that these are your priorities.

But you and I know that these aren't really your priorities. I have read very carefully the material on the development of the North Shore Child Guidance Center; it is a magnificent story of citizen initiative starting with the pioneer work of the Willets Road PTA some two decades ago. From those modest beginnings, you now operate a major center affiliated with the North Shore Hospital and four branch clinics which together serve hundreds of children and their parents each year. Your therapeutic nursery school is a pioneer example of the kind of service we have been struggling to achieve nationally for so many years.

In reading very carefully the paper which your board and staff presented at the American Orthopsychiatric Association meeting in Washington, D.C. exactly a year ago, I was impressed with the thoughtful approach the team used in examining, not only the roles of professionals and nonprofessionals on the staff, but the challenge in developing a board which was more than a middle class operation serving the less fortunate. The use of Child Guidance Assistants has been a key element in your success, for they are recruited from the neighborhoods you serve. I have observed the work of Child Advocates or Child Guidance Assistants in the few centers where they exist over the past few years; you and I must continue to push for the addition of thousands of these people to our mental health services in the years ahead.

Your association has 1,700 members. This is impressive evidence of citizen involvement. If every one of the 3,300 counties in this country had such citizen representation, we would not have suffered the setbacks I outlined earlier in this talk.

Mr. Thomas Jefferson, in many ways the most glorious figure in our history, put it very simply when he wrote:

"There is no substitute for the enlightened action of an aroused citizenry."

What you have done here at the local level we will eventually do on a national scale. I am absolutely convinced that our defeats have been only temporary; we will in this decade begin to invest heavily in mental health services for children from the pre-primary level through the college years.

May I express my deep gratitude for your shining example of citizen action.

Thank you very much.

MARSELLUS CASKET CO. CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 100th anniversary of a business enterprise which has played a major role in the development and expansion of Syracuse, N.Y. The firm is the Marsellus Casket Co., which is known and recognized nationwide as the leading manufacturer of hardwood caskets.

The following article appeared in the Syracuse Herald American newspaper April 30. It details the evolution of an enlightened business and the progressive family which has molded it into the major enterprise it is today.

CASKET FIRM TO CELEBRATE 100TH YEAR
(By Kenneth F. Sparrow)

A young commercial traveler, selling his wares in the areas along the Erie Canal a century ago, found strong evidence of future growth and economic stability in the Syracuse community.

That is why John Marsellus selected the city as the location for his own business enterprise which today is Marsellus Casket Co., recognized as the leading manufacturer of hardwood caskets.

Tomorrow marks the 100th year of the Marsellus family association with the casket industry and four generations have played important roles in its growth and expansion.

On May 1, 1872, John Marsellus, at the age of 26, entered the casket business in New York City, later coming to Syracuse in 1877 because, according to his diary, "the city had a bustling atmosphere about it."

John Marsellus retired as president of the company in 1917. He died in 1941 at the age of 95.

His son, John C. Marsellus was made general manager in 1917, president in 1925 and chairman of the board in 1948. He died in 1959.

Since 1946, John F. Marsellus, grandson of the founder, has been president and currently also serves as chairman of the board.

The latter's son, John D. Marsellus, representing the fourth generation, is now executive vice president.

Originally the company was established to serve the local community. The factory was located in the Gere Block at what is now W. Fayette and School streets. A downtown selection room was maintained on S. Clinton St. Usually the trip from the factory in Geddes to the showroom was made on a packet boat.

As transportation facilities improved, the area served by the Marsellus company was broadened to include all of New York State and then New England and today serves the entire nation and parts of Canada.

IMPROVEMENTS IN TRANSPORTATION SPARKED SERIES OF EXPANSIONS

The expansion in business resulted in a move in 1888 to a new factory site along the Erie Canal. That same site, at Erie Boulevard W. and Van Rensselaer Street, today is the location of a greatly expanded manufacturing facility and showroom. The company has undertaken eight major expansions since its founding and has acquired various adjoining buildings and property as recently as 1971.

At the beginning of the business, advertised products were broomsticks, novelties, medicine chests, shoe brush handles and caskets. There was no machinery. Everything was made by hand.

For more than 40 years, John Marsellus had numerous stockholders, bank loans and mortgage commitments. At one particularly troublesome period loyal employees worked for six weeks before being paid.

Company records show that in 1918 when the company was financially troubled, there was but \$331 in the bank and the factory was mortgaged with \$67,000 due to four banks.

John C. Marsellus, son of the founder, assumed responsibility for the company in 1917 and began to reorganize its financial structure, product line and organization.

As a first step, all products unrelated to the casket business were eliminated and the company started concentrating on manufacturing caskets exclusively. Under his guidance, the firm gradually worked off its debt. Plant and equipment additions were made and capital was further increased to stimulate steady, solid growth.

COMPANY RECOGNIZED AS MODEL OF ENLIGHTENED FREE ENTERPRISE

Since 1954, more funds have been re-invested for expansion in new equipment and modernization than in the entire preceding 32 years. Today it serves leading funeral directors from coast to coast and in Canada. Two years ago, Marsellus formed Heritage Casket Co. in Burlington, N.C. for assembly and distribution operations to serve the mid-South area.

It has been a model of enlightened free enterprise. There has not been a layoff or shut-down at the company in more than 50 years. Many Marsellus employees have never worked for any other firm. Sons, daughters and other relatives of present and former employees have joined the company. Likewise, Marsellus is serving the third and fourth generations of several of its funeral directors and customers.

Late in life, John Marsellus was asked why he selected Syracuse as the location for his own business enterprise. He explained "the city had a bustling atmosphere about it." In the privacy of his diary he confessed to "having a love affair" with the then small upstate community.

In retrospect, it is impossible not to conclude that the young salesman, endowed with considerable insight, saw in Syracuse strong evidence of future growth and economic stability. And he recognized its strategic location.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI EDGAR MAGNIN

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 11, 1972, a ceremony will be held by the West Gate Masonic Lodge No. 335, Free and Accepted Masons, at the Scottish Rite Temple in Los Angeles to honor my friend Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin and to celebrate his 50th anniversary as a member of the lodge and as a Master Mason.

Born in San Francisco in 1890, the grandson of early California pioneers, Edgar Magnin grew up in the bay area and attended Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. In Cincinnati he met and, later, married Evelyn Rosenthal. They have two children, Mac and Henry, and celebrated their golden wedding anniversary in Vienna in 1966.

In 1915 at the age of 25, Rabbi Magnin was called from his first pulpit, Temple Israel in Stockton, to Congregation B'nai B'rith in Los Angeles. He has been a leader in our community for 57 years.

Congregation B'nai B'rith, which was the only Reform Temple in this area when Rabbi Magnin joined it, is presently known as Wilshire Boulevard Temple. The congregation has grown to 2,770, one of the largest in the world.

Rabbi Magnin has received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Wilberforce University in Ohio; an honorary doctor of human letters degree from the California College of Medicine; and an honorary doctor of sacred theology degree from the University of Southern California.

He has served as grand president and grand orator of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, District Four; as president of the University Religious Conference; and as grand chaplain of the

Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, the State of California.

Rabbi Magnin was asked to deliver a prayer at the inauguration of President Richard Nixon in January 1969. He also participated in inauguration ceremonies for Governor Reagan in 1967 and 1971. He has been named "Man of the Year" by both the Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce and Los Angeles Lodge, No. 487, B'nai B'rith.

He is a member of the Newspaperboy Hall of Fame; a contributor to the Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge and to many national periodicals; the author of "How to Live a Richer and Fuller Life," published by Prentice Hall; a former contributor to King Features Syndicate and, presently, a columnist for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner.

In 1962 Rabbi Magnin received the National Brotherhood Award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews for what was called "his distinguished contribution to the advancement of good human relations among all people."

He is internationally known and is one of the most distinguished and respected religious leaders in our Nation. He has been a towering progressive and moral force in Los Angeles for more than half a century.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I call attention to the ceremony of the West Gate Masonic Lodge No. 335, Free and Accepted Masons, honoring Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin on May 11 and note that I will be joining his many friends in southern California on that evening to show him something of our profound admiration, gratitude, and respect.

BILL'S LAST HAND

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the legendary exploits of "Wild Bill" Hickok have been the subject of songs, prose, and films for 10 these many years.

From the time he started on his road to fame in Springfield, Mo., to the day he died, holding aces and eights, Bill is the subject of a poem, penned by a friend and neighbor, Mr. George V. Hennessey, who resides in the "Queen City of the Ozarks," Springfield, Mo.

For those who are interested in the saga of Wild Bill Hickok, I offer the words of George Hennessey:

BILL'S LAST HAND

(By George V. Hennessey)

After Hickok killed Tutt on the Queen City's Square

He traveled to Kansas, turned lawman out there;

Became U.S. Marshal in tough Abilene Where outlaws were plenty and all of them mean.

He was fast on the draw and he laid down the law

With a shotgun whose end he'd cut off with a saw,

Toted twin 44's plus a big Bowie knife, His tools to cool fools bent on taking his life.

In his fancy frock coat, ruffled shirt, vivid vest,
Well-dressed was this lawman who walked
to old West;
His eyes icy-blue pierced a man through
and through,
And law-breakers learned that a lie wouldn't
do.
On the 2nd of August, 1876
Out to Deadwood, Dakota, he rode just for
kicks;
He played cards with some pards in Saloon
No. 10,
Where a "Damn!" was heard oftener than
an "Amen!"
Wild Bill had a rule not to play cards at all
Unless he could sit with his back to the
wall;
His only real fear was attack from the rear
In face-to-face fighting the man knew no
fear.
Some way off that day Bill ignored caution's
call
And he sat where his chair was away from
the wall;
With all eyes on the shuffle, the ruffle, the
deal,
Back of Bill crept a cur with the soul of a
heel!
Jack McCall, with the gall and the cunning
of Cain
Fired a 44 slug in the back of Bill's brain;
Red gore stained the floor—Wild Bill was
no more—
From the West he loved best he was gone
evermore!
Still clutched in his paw was his ill-fated
draw:
Two Aces, two Eights and a Queen, viewers
say;
And to this very day, careful card-players
say,
Draw this death-branded hand and it don't
pay to stay.
Though I hope there's no "croaker" in your
poker game,
Don't buck Lady Luck—she's a dangerous
dame;
As you scan your card's pips, take this
truest of tips:
If you land "Dead Man's Hand," better cash
in your chips!

PULITZER PRIZE FOR NEW YORK TIMES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Pulitzer Prize was awarded to the New York Times. The Pulitzer carries with it high honor and seldom has a single newspaper been more deserving of that profession's highest distinction.

The Pulitzer this time was awarded for publication of the Pentagon papers, those most revelatory of documents, detailing as they do the folly of American policy in Southeast Asia. Publishing the Pentagon papers was, and will remain, one of the supreme moments in journalism history. That judgment will stand, I believe, long after the passions aroused by their publication have cooled and when the principals involved no longer matter in the formation of public policy.

What the Times did and what the Pulitzer judges have acknowledged exemplifies best what Louis Brandeis meant when he wrote:

This function of the press is very high. It is almost holy. It ought to serve as a forum for the people, through which the people may know freely what is going on. To misstate or suppress the news is a breach of trust.

Mr. Sulzberger and his editors at the Times understand very well what the late Justice Brandeis was saying.

Those of us who serve in elective public office have, at best, an adversary relationship with the press. That is as it should be. Even when, as we are from time to time, hoisted on the sharp end of a reporter's pen. For the issue is not whether politicians are well served by the press, but whether or not the public is.

Fewer Presidents, Mr. Speaker, were more assailed by the press than Thomas Jefferson, but he knew the value to a democratic society of a free press. And it was Mr. Jefferson who wrote:

To the press alone, chequered as it is with abuses, the world is indebted for all the triumphs which have been gained by reason and humanity over error and oppression. . . .

It is thus that I congratulate the Times for its Pulitzer Prize and I hope the day will soon come when all men of reason will both understand and appreciate the magnitude of what the "good, gray lady of Times Square" did in publishing the Pentagon papers.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I take this action to help keep my colleagues informed of activities preparing for the bicentennial in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the news staff of the ARBC communications committee. The bulletin follows:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN

The White House announced last week the appointment of eight new public members to the ARBC. They include Dr. Frank Angel, Jr., Albuquerque, New Mexico; Mr. Kenneth L. Beale, Jr., Westchester, Pennsylvania; Mr. Roy Lavon Brooks, Storrs, Connecticut; Miss Thomasine Ruth Hill, Tucson, Arizona; Mr. Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., White Plains, New York; Miss Judith L. Kooker, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Charley Pride, Dallas, Texas; and Mr. Clarence W. Taylor, Wilmington, Delaware. An indoctrination meeting will be held at ARBC headquarters for the new members prior to the next full Commission meeting in Boston. Complete biographical data on the new members will be included in the May issue of the ARBC Newsletter.

On Wednesday, April 19, Mr. Jack I. Levant was sworn in as Director of the ARBC by The Chief Justice of the United States, Honorable Warren E. Burger, at ARBC headquarters.

A contest to design an emblem for the Oyster Bay (New York) ARBC was announced recently by Town Supervisor John

W. Burke. The contest, which will run until June 1, is open to resident elementary, secondary and college students. The winning entry will become the official symbol for the Oyster Bay commemoration of the Bicentennial, and its designer will be awarded a \$200 prize. Two of the seventeen member local Bicentennial Commission are high school students. Chairman of the Oyster Bay ARBC is historian Dorothy Horton McGee.

ARBC Chairman David J. Mahoney appeared on NBC's TODAY show on Thursday morning, April 27. On that same evening he was presented in a special ceremony with the Congressional Medal of Honor Society's Patriots Award "in recognition of his outstanding contributions toward a more significant understanding of the historical meaning and future implications of the American experience."

Mrs. Gene Jones Riddle has been named Executive Director of the Texas ARBC. Mrs. Riddle was previously Assoc. Executive Director of the Commission and assumes the office formerly held by Dr. Frank E. Vandiver. Dr. Vandiver resigned to accept his appointment by President Nixon to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. Richard S. Allen, program coordinator for the New York State ARBC has informed the Commission that the Oneida County Historical Society recently sponsored an Upper Mohawk Valley Bicentennial Forum for representatives of town and county historical societies to discuss the state's proposed Bicentennial observance. Dr. Louis Tucker, Executive Director of the New York ARBC, delivered an address to the larger than expected crowd. Other Empire State forums planned for the next year include the Hudson Valley and Northern New York regions.

On Wednesday, April 19, Chairman Thurston Twigg-Smith and the Hawaii Bicentennial Commission held a news conference to invite every citizen in the state to suggest how Hawaii should officially commemorate the Bicentennial. A "Bicentennial Idea Chart" was unveiled with easy-to-fill-out sections in which citizens can summarize their ideas, how much money they think should be spent, and suggest who should carry out the task. Local newspapers in Hawaii have been publishing the Chart. The Commission plans to start and maintain a Registry of Bicentennial Projects and Events for public information and planning coordination.

Mrs. Marion Russell, editor of Coin World and vice-chairman of the ARBC's Coins and Medals Advisory Committee has been speaking recently to several diversified groups on the Bicentennial, including Alpha Delta Kappa Sorority of Ohio, the Delta Kappa Gamma Honorary Teachers' Society, and the Sidney, Ohio Reading Club. In concluding, Mrs. Russell tells her audiences that almost every person in every community in the nation will be involved in the Bicentennial between now and 1976.

A Mississippi ARBC has been appointed by Governor William L. Waller to be chaired by Judge James P. Coleman of Ackerman. The Commission has 18 members who will hold their initial meeting in the next several weeks. All state correspondence should be directed to the Executive Director of the Commission, Dr. R. A. McLemore, Director, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, P.O. Box 571, Jackson, Mississippi 39205.

The National 4-H Conference was held in Washington, April 23-28, and some 240 youth members viewed the Bicentennial film, "Call to Action." On Wednesday, April 26, a group of 4-H'ers who will be concentrating on involvement in the Bicentennial met with ARBC staff at Headquarters and discussed potential programs for the 4 million youths who belong to various 4-H clubs across the nation.

On April 28, the American Revolution Bicentennial Committee, Special Libraries Association, New Jersey Chapter inaugurated their 1972 committee activities with a ceremonial "Liberty Tree" planting on the Centennial of Arbor Day. New Jersey Governor William T. Cahill issued a statement endorsing the festivities, which also commemorated New Jersey's participation in the American Revolution and acknowledged the group's concerned interest in environmental ecology. The committee pointed out that in the ceremony the American Revolution was symbolically linked to the Bicentennial decade with a seedling from the Mercer Oak at Princeton Battlefield.

ARBC member, Mrs. Ann Hawkes Hutton, addressed the 81st Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington last week on the subject "The Bicentennial and You." Mrs. Hutton urged the delegates "to work together in the shaping of a new 'Spirit of '76' that recognizes the enduring strength of our great, our incomparable American heritage."

Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania has hired Carol Briels of the Netherlands to make an 80-minute film dramatizing the role of immigrants in building America. One of the aims of the \$50,000 venture is to interest Europeans in the Bicentennial. Briels plans to return to the U.S. in March with a budget and script and to complete the film by Christmas. It will be shown in major European cities and in countries that gave the United States most of its immigrants. According to Briels, "The film will thank America for freedom, the help it has given other nations, its preservation of democracy throughout the world and the liberation of Europe in the Second World War." Briels organized his own theater company during the German occupation of the Netherlands. After the war he produced two dramas about the occupation and the liberation.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Hoover was a legend in his own time in the field of law enforcement. He became the Director of the FBI in 1924 and transformed that organization into the No. 1 crime-fighting body in the world. We are all well aware of the major cases which the FBI solved over the years.

In 1932, for example, the son of Charles Lindbergh was kidnaped. Once the FBI was put on the case, they used the most modern methods available and scientific processing of evidence which led to the arrest of Richard Hauptmann. Hauptmann was later convicted and executed for the kidnaping and murder which had shocked the country.

The 1930's also saw the FBI, under the able leadership of its Director, track down the major public enemies of the time. Mr. Hoover's highly educated agents ripped into the gangs and hoodlums and put such notorious criminals as John Dillinger, George "Baby Face" Nelson, Charles "Pretty Boy" Floyd and "Ma" and Fred Barker out of operation.

From that time on the American public

had a deep respect for J. Edgar Hoover and his Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Indeed, Mr. Hoover had the respect and support of eight Presidents all of whom considered the Director as an indispensable crimefighter.

Mr. Speaker, as a former police officer, I have a profound personal respect for the memory of J. Edgar Hoover. During my 23 years with the New York Police Force I was deeply impressed with the success of the FBI as a crime-fighting organization.

The success of the Bureau during World War II in apprehending Nazi spies was most impressive. These spies were arrested as fast as they infiltrated into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the country has suffered the loss of a great man. A man who dedicated his entire life to protecting America from criminal and conspiratorial influences. No one can question the sincerity of his convictions nor the depth of his feelings for what he considered to be the fundamental values of America. This feeling was reiterated by Mr. Hoover recently when I was fortunate enough to have spent some time with him in his office. At that time he told me stories of his colorful past during which a recurrent theme came forth that his prime concern was for the betterment of the American way of life. Indeed, this great man never wavered in his conviction that America is a great Nation.

He shall always be remembered for maintaining his ideals even in the face of criticism. It is not surprising that such a man became America's No. 1 crime fighter.

HON. ALTON A. LENNON RECEIVES
THE 1972 NEPTUNE AWARD

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography, the Honorable ALTON A. LENNON of North Carolina is the recipient of the 1972 Neptune Award of the American Oceanic Organization.

This award is given to an individual or group that has made to the national oceanic program an outstanding contribution involving strong elements of innovation and imagination, and representing a distinct recognition of and contribution to the overall public interest in the marine environment. The contribution may be in the nature of present or potential resource development, improvement in the economic, legal, social or esthetic utilization of the marine environment, more viable organization and communication affecting the national oceanic program, or a combination of these.

The 1972 award was presented to our colleague with the following citation:

To Alton A. Lennon: The Neptune Award—1972.

As an eminent legislator of our Nation. As an able, humble, and dedicated public servant of the people of the State of North Carolina and of the United States of America.

For his outstanding, vigorous, and effective sponsorship of oceanic science and technology for the prosperity of our nation and the utilization and conservation of its resources for mankind.

For his unwavering devotion and endeavors in support of strong national defense, a powerful military establishment, and a superior navy.

For his prominent leadership and energy in preparing and managing the establishment of laws to advance the cause of marine affairs, to foster the growth of the technology and commerce of the sea, and to enhance the stature of the oceanic community.

For his outstanding achievements in guiding this nation to the more effective use and management of the oceans and our coastal lands, especially in the creation of the legislative cornerstones—the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, the National Sea Grant Program Act of 1966, and the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Act of 1971.

And for his wise understanding and love of the sea, the shore, and his fellow citizens.

The presentation was made by Dr. William A. Nierenberg, director of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography and chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.

In his acceptance remarks, Congressman LENNON traced the Nation's program in oceanography and set forth certain goals of which we must constantly remain aware. As a further tribute to our distinguished colleague who has chosen to retire from our midst at the end of this Congress, I am pleased to include his remarks in the RECORD:

AMERICAN OCEANIC ORGANIZATION NEPTUNE
AWARD, APRIL 26, 1972

Thank you, Dr. Nierenberg, for your gracious and kind remarks.

President Shepherd, Dr. Nierenberg, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, friends all—I deeply appreciate the American Oceanic Organization's Neptune Award. It is a high honor and particularly gratifying to be recognized by one's peers for public service. This will always be a cherished honor. Thank you.

I cannot say that my efforts in ocean affairs have been as extensive as Dr. Nierenberg has just told you, but I have worked closely with marine problems for the past fifteen years. I recognize many of you here who have participated in formulating national programs in ocean affairs—my distinguished colleagues serving in the Congress, the able administrators and military leaders from the executive branch, the dynamic leaders from industry and the brain trust of ocean affairs from the academic sector.

In many ways, each of you has contributed to the effort for a more responsive national ocean affairs program. I believe the Neptune Award to be symbolic recognition of all this effort, and I humbly accept this award for all who are joined in this great work.

In the history of ocean awareness, I consider the year 1959 to be a milestone. The National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Oceanography had just released a comprehensive report entitled: "Oceanography 1960-70." Two days later, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee established the special subcommittee on oceanography which immediately began hearings under the able leadership of the Honorable George P. Miller.

This marked the beginning of a concerted effort to create a national awareness in the oceans. We began the task of defining national goals and developing the necessary attitude toward serious formulating a national policy for marine affairs. We saw the first efforts to organize and coordinate the ocean activities of the Fed-

eral Government—a difficult task, I can assure you.

Partial results were achieved in the sixties by the enactment of the Marine Resources Act of 1966, and its title II, the Sea Grant College Program. As most of you know, the act established the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, and the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. The council was our answer to the need for coordination while the commission conducted its studies and made its recommendations.

This act also declared it to be the policy of the U.S. "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind to assist in protection of health and property, enhancement of commerce, transportation, and national security, rehabilitation of our commercial fisheries, and increased utilization of these and other resources"—still meaningful goals to be achieved.

In January, 1969, the commission submitted its famous and authoritative report—"Our Nation and the Sea". The report covered every component of oceanography and marine affairs. It recommended an array of reforms, legislation and organization. In my view, the most focal were coastal zone management, the establishment of an independent ocean agency called NOAA and an advisory body called NACO—National Advisory Committee on Oceans.

At this point we witnessed the acrobatics of interagency rivalries, with every department or agency of the Federal Government with a marine program trying to become the lead agency. When the dust settled, the Nation had an ocean agency—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—under the Commerce Department. It is not the independent agency the Commission recommended and it falls short of the specifications deemed necessary for its success—but it is a step in the right direction.

I mean no criticism of NOAA or of our esteemed Administrator, Dr. White, but I firmly believe that an independent NOAA is essential for the survival of our oceanographic programs—but time will tell on that score. We have our advisory committee on oceans and atmosphere in operation under Dr. Nierenberg with its capable membership, and they know of our great expectations.

The oceans become progressively more important as time goes on and world population increases—scientists must be free to conduct ocean research—rights and ownership of the resources of the seabed must be determined—marine technology must be developed to give us more precise knowledge of the deep ocean and its resources, and international questions must be resolved for peaceful use of the oceans.

Under the capable and dynamic leadership of Chairman Hébert and Chairman Garmatz, steps have been taken to strengthen our Navy with a modernized fleet and to revitalize our maritime service with a new shipbuilding program. The Armed Services Committee has authorized an expenditure of close to \$10 billion over the last three years for a new naval fleet, while the House just passed a maritime authorization bill in excess of \$550 million as part of the planned expansion of our marine program under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

This is progress. Yet there is much to do, and I have confidence in those who will carry on this struggle. Even though I am leaving public life, I intend to continue my interest in marine affairs.

In closing, I want you to know that I am proud of what we together have accomplished in marine affairs—much of this progress can be attributed to the bipartisan solidarity of the members of our committees. I am convinced that this cooperation will be the key

to future progress. But let us make no mistake—when the life of the Marine Science Council expired, we lost an important national focal point for marine affairs under the Office of the Vice Presidency. We need that focus and the support of the Chief Executive.

Let us make the American Oceanic Organization's annual Neptune Award a reminder to rededicate ourselves to the affirmation of renewed vigor in oceanic and marine affairs. We cannot win this struggle by a philosophy of acceptance of things as they are. Definitive action can be taken, and I would like to suggest to you that we determine to insist that our national political parties include in their respective platforms significant policy positions for forthcoming emphasis on marine affairs. Unified in this common goal, we can make our voices heard for a cause vital to this Nation's future.

CONGRATULATIONS TO AMTRAK

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, you might almost classify me as a railroad buff because since boyhood I have enjoyed traveling by railroad. I guess I have gone coast to coast by rail more than most people. I started as a student and in the past 20 years as a Congressman whenever I had time I used this method over a weekend so I could arrive in Seattle on a Monday morning refreshed and ready to take care of my business in the district, having done my homework and rested crossing the broad plains and lofty scenic mountains of this great land. Since Amtrak took over the intercity passenger business, as a rail enthusiast, I have traveled on practically every one of the intercity trains and now on the first anniversary of Amtrak I can speak firsthand as to the progress and success of this Government experiment.

As was to be expected, at first the inherited schedules were not coordinated and there were all too frequent incidents causing justified customer complaint. However, conscientiously the employees sought to please their customers the service was far from good.

One of the causes of this situation, I was told, was that when the various railroad companies knew that their equipment such as sleeping cars, diners, and coaches were to be taken over by Amtrak, all regular servicing of equipment was discontinued. Furthermore, the extra parts for repair of air conditioning and heating fans and the like were in short supply and the cars not in use were cannibalized. As a result Amtrak was unable to fix their equipment promptly, and usable cars were in short supply.

However, I have found the morale of the railroad employees good and I give them a very high mark for their efforts. They are determined to make the program proceed.

One immediate change instituted by Amtrak was to find out passenger destinations and connecting trains and within reason these trains are held. In fact, I was on the Broadway Limited departing from Chicago and it was held

for an hour and thereby 94 passengers arriving on the Santa Fe made their connection. Also, in many cases schedules used to be such that the trains did not connect which was a source of great irritation to passengers and entailed extra time and expense in waiting over a day, thus driving customers to the airlines and buses.

As for critics, I have long known that before Amtrak and since, the most vociferous critics in Congress, especially one Senator from the West, have never ridden trains. One or two complaints by his constituents caused him to condemn railroad management without mercy.

As to the public, I do think their complaints have been justified on the basis of their experiences, but none perhaps as irritating as one of mine years ago when I was marooned on the North Coast Limited in a huge snowdrift near Fargo, N. Dak. for 2 days. That was before Amtrak but no management can meet every contingency. In general, I have found that the public is happy with the new management.

Meanwhile, considering the difficulties due to old equipment, I think Amtrak employees do their utmost to overcome these problems. They want Amtrak to succeed, and given time, I believe it will succeed. Recent improvements are making new friends and customers, such as with the increased service and patronage between Washington, New York, and New England.

So, on the occasion of its first anniversary, I extend congratulations and best wishes to all those connected with Amtrak.

And, Mr. Speaker, may the future see ever-increasing improvement and ultimate success.

CONCILIATOR FOR LABOR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times included an excellent article which gives an insight into the character and accomplishments of Jacob Samuel Potofsky, one of the great leaders of the American labor movement. Mr. Potofsky is about to retire from the presidency of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, a position he has held since 1946. I believe that the Times article is a fine tribute to Mr. Potofsky's independence and vision and request that it be inserted following my remarks.

The article follows:

CONCILIATOR FOR LABOR—JACOB SAMUEL POTOFSKY

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

Erect and vigorous-looking, despite his 77 years, Jacob Samuel Potofsky stood yesterday before a microphone at a journalism award luncheon in the Commodore Hotel and declared:

"The labor movement can only thrive and grow in a climate of freedom." This philosophy has guided his devotion to progressive causes since he joined the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at its founding

in 1914 and from which he is about to retire after having served as its president since 1946.

Mr. Potofsky has long been considered a mediator between the right and left wings of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. Nonetheless, as a senior member of the merged labor movement's 35-man executive council, he has not hesitated to differ with George Meany, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. president, on American involvement in the Vietnam war, which Mr. Meany and most of the council supports. But he and Mr. Meany have remained warm friends.

AN IMPECCABLE DRESSER

Trimly bearded and a conservative, impeccable dresser, Mr. Potofsky looks more like a State Department dignitary than a labor leader and one-time pants-pocket maker. In fact, he has been occasionally mistaken for a diplomat. One such occasion was in 1949 when he debarked from the Queen Mary in Cherbourg on a trade union mission and found himself the object of a welcoming address by a representative of the French Foreign Ministry.

The man from the Quay d'Orsay had mistaken him for Count Carlo Sforza, the Italian Foreign Minister, who was a passenger on the same ship.

Mr. Potofsky does not pound tables. He is a conciliator, as well as a leader, and other labor leaders often turn to him for advice in complicated situations. His prestige is enhanced, too, by the fact that he heads a union of 385,000 members.

For five decades, he has been an advocate of the concept that labor unions should affirm their needs through political involvement as well as on the picket line. In the days when garment workers were laboring in sweatshops, he would declare: "What you win at the bargaining tables can be taken away in the legislative halls."

Under his leadership and before that under the presidency of Sidney Hillman, the amalgamated has been innovative and socially conscious. It was the first to open health, housing and recreation centers for its members as well as the first to have lobbyists in Washington.

For one who began working as a 13-year-old, marking tags in a pants shop 54 hours a week at \$3 a week, he developed into a self-educated and cultured man with a polished wit.

On one occasion, at a dinner in New York he jokingly reproached President Dwight D. Eisenhower for creating unemployment among clothing workers by wearing a dinner jacket that was several years old. When the President asked how he knew that, Mr. Potofsky said he could tell by the cut of the coat.

He is a restless sleeper and keeps a pad at his bedside in his apartment at 19 East 88th Street in New York. He will frequently switch on the light to jot down a note about some union problem. When he was a young man, he used to write poetry. He relaxes mainly at the 90-acre farm he owns near Flatbrookville, N.J., in the Delaware Water Gap.

Mr. Potofsky came to Chicago in 1908 with his parents from Radomski in the Russian Ukraine. Two years later, he joined his father and two older brothers on a picket line that led to the formation of the amalgamated. He went to work for the union in 1914 as a business agent at \$15 a week and successively moved up in its hierarchy.

His first wife, Callie Taylor, a one-time shirtmaker, died in 1946. Five years later, he married his present wife, Mrs. Blanche Lydia Zetland, widow of a Brazilian exporter. He has two daughters and three grandchildren.

PERSECUTION OF LITHUANIAN CATHOLICS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, when a country so relentlessly pursues a policy of discrimination against one group, it can only expand its activities to include many others. Many of us in Congress have expressed our sense of outrage at the religious and cultural persecution of Soviet Jewry. Now, Lithuanian Catholics, the predominant religious group in this small republic on the Baltic Sea, also appear to be the victims of intense repression and harassment by Soviet authorities.

The following article from the Catholic Standard outlines recent developments in this matter. It is further evidence that persecution begets only persecution.

The article follows:

[From the Catholic Standard, Washington, D.C., Apr. 20, 1972]

APPEAL MADE TO U.N.—SOVIETS PERSECUTING RELIGION, CATHOLICS IN LITHUANIA CHARGE

Moscow (NC).—More than 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics sent petitions to the United Nations accusing officials of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic of persecuting Catholics.

Copies of the petitions were made available to Western newsmen here. The petitions, bearing the signatures of more than 17,000 "believers," were sent to UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim in February after Soviet officials in Moscow had ignored earlier protests, according to a group of dissident Russians.

The Soviet Union annexed Lithuania, a small republic on the Baltic Sea, in 1940. Its population of more than three million is predominantly Catholic.

Last September, about 2,000 Catholics in the south central Lithuanian town of Prenai, whose population is less than 10,000, signed an open letter to the Soviet leadership charging that Prenai authorities were curbing freedom of religion.

The Prenai Catholics said that Lithuanian clergymen were being restricted in the performance of their religious duties and that the petitioners' own parish priest had been arrested for "teaching catechism to children."

The letter to Waldheim said that three other open letters, with a total of 5,000 signatures, were sent last fall to Soviet Communist party leader Leonid Brezhnev and that police in Lithuania, "using threats, prevented the mass collection of signatures."

"Such action by the authorities," the letter said, "prompted the conviction that the present memorandum, signed by 17,000 believers, will not attain its aim if it is sent by the same means as previous collective declarations."

The signers also said they were complaining to the United Nations because "believers in our republic cannot enjoy the rights set out in Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Passed by the United Nations, with the Soviet Union abstaining, the declaration calls for the recognition of religious freedom by all countries.

The constitution of the Soviet Union, while guaranteeing the "freedom to perform religious rites," also grants the right of antireligious propaganda, widely used to promote atheism.

The Lithuanians petitioning the United

Nations said that Soviet officials limit the number of candidates admitted to seminaries to 10 a year and control the assignment of priests to parishes.

There are so few priests in Lithuania, they said, that one priest often has to serve two or three parishes and that "even old and sick priests have to work."

They also said that Lithuanian officials do not enforce a law requiring that those who persecuted churchgoers be punished.

Lithuanian officials have not allowed Catholics to rebuild churches destroyed during World War II, the petitioners said, and have made it difficult to obtain permission for services in private homes.

The petition to the United Nations repeated charges made last fall that two parish priests had been sent to labor camps for giving religious instruction to youngsters and that two bishops had been exiled without trial.

"If in the future, the organs of the state take the same attitude toward believers' complaints as they have until now," the petitioners said, "we will be obliged to address ourselves to international bodies, to the Pope, the head of our Church, or to the United Nations, as an authoritative institution defending human rights."

NIXON WOOS TEXAS—NEW ENGLAND PAYS THE PRICE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last weekend President Nixon made a pilgrimage to Treasury Secretary John Connally's ranch in Texas. Gathered there were Secretary Connally's personal friends, the oilmen and bankers whom Nixon hopes can deliver him Texas in the election and help finance his campaign.

While he was there, he assured the oilmen that he would not alter the depreciation allowance, quota system, or tax privileges which transfers billions of dollars from the taxpayers of the Nation to the corporate accounts of the large oil companies.

New England suffers most from the aid for dependent oil companies program by having to pay artificially high prices for artificially scarce oil. The New England congressional delegation has been attempting to get the President to eliminate import quotas on No. 2 fuel oil, or at least to increase the amount that New England can import. This is the oil we use to heat our homes in the winter.

If next winter is a severe one, a serious fuel shortage could occur, one that could adversely affect the health and safety of the citizens of New England, not to mention their pocketbooks. Yet letters sent to the administration by the New England delegation have simply been ignored.

Perhaps it is cynical to note the fact that the New England winter will not come until after the November election. But cynicism comes naturally when one reads that the President piously told his audience of oil men and bankers that too many people were getting the idea that this was a "something for nothing" economy.

This comment and others were reported in a column by David Broder, political reporter and columnist for the Washington Post. That column, which appeared in the May 2 edition of the Post, follows:

A BARBECUE SPICED WITH POLITICS
(By David S. Broder)

SAN ANTONIO.—The scene was right out of Edna Ferber's "Giant." The flagstone ranch house was ablaze with light. The magnificent live oaks in the yard were hung with pots of orange mums, swaying in the evening breeze; more flowers floated in the pool, and the sweet scent of the prairie grass mingled with the odors of the steaming barbecue.

The guests arrived Texas-style, setting their executive jets down on the Pecos Ranch airstrip, with the great red Santa Gertrudis cattle watching. Nearby, two cowhands sat astride their perfectly groomed horses, posed against the last rays of the sun, as if by a photographer.

But not even a novelist would have dared concoct the guest list that was present Sunday night when President Nixon visited John Connally's Floresville Ranch, just south of here. As Neal Peirce says in his new book, "The Megastates of America," "The political life of Texas is directed by a single, moneyed Establishment. There is no other state of the union where the control is so direct, unambiguous and commonly accepted."

Connally, the Democratic former governor, is as Peirce says, "The epitome of the Establishment," and his guest list was a directory of its members.

For years, there has been speculation and anticipation of the political realignment that would bring the wealth and power of the Texas Democratic Establishment into firm alliance with a conservative Republican president.

Once before, in the 1950's, the marriage seemed on the verge of consummation. Governor Allen Shivers (Democrat) led the Democratic Party into support of President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952.

But the Eisenhower-era Republican romance with the Texas Democratic Establishment was broken up by the ambitions of Lyndon B. Johnson, who carried his state in 1960, 1964 and 1968.

But Johnson is old and ailing now; the state Democratic leadership is tainted by scandal and wracked by division; and the national party is veering off in dangerous directions; talking of nominating a George McGovern with his unacceptable views on oil depletion, capital gains and the Communist menace.

The time is ripe for a new romance, and Richard Nixon knows it. As one watched that picture book scene under the trees Sunday, the ladies in their long dresses, the men in tailored ranch suits and cowboy boots, the strolling Mexican Mariachi band, and the black waiters passing drinks, the realization dawned: It's happening: it's really being consummated right here.

Our President moved easily in this group, the grocer's son who rose to the heights of political power feeling right at home among the millionaires, many of whom are also self-made men.

After supper, he answered their questions for more than an hour, never hitting a false note. He told them exactly what they wanted to hear. He praised their friend and host and hero John Connally, who saved the state government from a serious liberal challenger in 1962 and gave them six years more of freedom from corporate income taxes or real utility regulation; the President called Connally a man "capable of holding any job in the United States."

He told them that American bombing of North and South Vietnam would continue until Communist aggression has been defeated and they were moved to toast "the courage of the President of the United States."

He said that Washington was full of doubters, the victims of "intellectual incest," but that the country was strong and confident and that if they would stand with him "against the trend toward permissiveness, the trend toward weakness," America would be itself again.

He told them that "rather than moving in the direction of reducing the depletion allowance, the government should do more to provide incentive . . . for people to go out and explore for oil."

He noted pointedly that his adviser on tax reform was sitting at his right—John Connally.

And having said that, he quickly added that he was concerned that too many people were getting the idea this was a "something-for-nothing" economy. If there was irony in the juxtaposition, the President did not note it.

Look at all the want ads, he told the bankers and publishers and oilmen, and ask yourselves why there are millions unemployed and millions on welfare when jobs are going begging. It is because too many people have forgotten that "no job is menial if it provides bread on the table and shelter for a family. . . . It is that spirit we need revived," the President said.

It was late now, and the jets would have to take off, returning their owners to Houston and Dallas. But there was one more topic that might serve to foster the romance a bit further, so Connally himself asked the President if he might, perhaps, have any thoughts on busing.

The President did, and those too went down as easily as bordeaux and champagne Connally had served. At the end, when one of the publishers said he'd like "as a newspaper man," to say the traditional, "thank you, Mr. President," it was hard not to believe that a transaction of some significance had occurred. The Pecos Ranch barbecue just might make political history.

I CAN'T BELIEVE WE WON THE WHOLE THING

HON. JOHN WARE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, Immaculata College, in the Ninth Pennsylvania Congressional District, surprised the sports world on March 19 when it won the first women's national intercollegiate basketball championship in Normal, Ill.

The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin carried an excellent story in its March 26 edition. Because I am proud of the recognition gained by this college in my district and because I believe that Immaculata's team, its coach, Mrs. Catherine Rush, and the school itself deserve tribute for the combined efforts which brought victory, I am having this article reprinted below:

BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

The Philadelphia sports world was caught napping last Sunday when Immaculata College won the first women's national intercollegiate basketball championship in Normal, Illinois.

Suddenly national titlists were in our own

backyard and some sportswriters had to brush up on girls' rules. "I didn't even know they'd gone to full court," exclaimed one startled TV newsmen when he heard about the victory.

For years, girls played a ladylike game of basketball in which forwards on one team could only do their stuff in half the court with guards passing the ball up to them from the other half of the court. A toe over the center line meant a penalty. They were also limited to a couple of dribbles. After that they had to pass the ball.

"Today, it's just like the boys' game with only a couple of minor differences," said Mrs. Catherine Rush, the pretty, blonde 24-year-old coach who has been with the girls two seasons.

SOMEWHAT SURPRISED

Even Mrs. Rush and the eight jubilant players who made the trip were somewhat surprised at the U. S. victory, it turns out.

"I thought that if we could win two games, putting us in the top four, that would be enough," she said.

Maureen Mooney, a junior from Philadelphia and co-captain of "The Macs" with Pat Opila, a senior from Drexel Hill, said that she went to the national competition feeling that "we'd put our best game on out there."

A banner hanging in the rotunda of the main building at Immaculata reflects some surprise, too. "I can't believe we won the whole thing!" It says.

Immaculata, a girls Catholic college, near Frazer, in Immaculata, Pa., had the distinction of being the smallest school qualifying for the nationals. They have about 800 students and don't even offer a physical education major.

"And we only had eight girls out there, five playing and three on the bench," said Sister Mary of Lourdes, president of the college. She is still reeling a little herself from the title.

Most schools, Mrs. Rush said, brought 15 players.

NEIGHBORS OF "MACS"

If there was a team that local sports watchers would have put their money on, it would have been the West Chester State College team, neighbors of "The Macs."

"The Macs," who went into the eastern regional competition at the University of Maryland the weekend before the nationals with a 20-game winning streak, were beaten in the finals there by West Chester. Score, 70-38.

At Normal, "The Macs" beat the University of South Dakota in the quarter-finals, Indiana State University in the semi-finals, University of Mississippi in the playoff semi-finals, and in the finals, March 19, they met West Chester again. "The Macs" squeaked through with a 52-48 victory.

Cathy Rush believes that Immaculata, small as it is, has developed such a good team for a variety of reasons.

"We were sort of lucky that several good players came into the school at the same time," she said. "We'll lose only one of our starting eight players next year."

She said she thought they came through with the title because of their "excellent defense" and deadeye foul shots and because "the girls are calm under pressure."

"A lot have come from the Catholic League and are used to playing at the Palstra before crowds of 8,000" she said.

TEAM'S TALLEST GIRL

High-scorer and tallest girl on the team, Terry Shank, a sophomore from Glenolden, who is slightly over five feet 11 inches tall, played on Catholic League championship teams from Cardinal O'Hara High School. So did "Mac" teammate Maureen Stuhlman, a freshman from Havertown.

The other "Macs" are Janet Ruch, a junior

from Upper Darby; Janet Young, a sophomore from York, Pa.; Denise Conway, a sophomore from Havertown, and Maureen Muth, a freshman from Broomall.

School spirit was another factor in the win, said Cathy Rush, whose husband, Ed, is a National Basketball Association official. Students, faculty, alumnae, trustees and parents raised the \$3,000 for the trip to the nationals, and presented the money to the team at a big pep rally held in the school rotunda.

NATIONAL MINORITY BUSINESS DIRECTORY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. Peter Meyerhoff is a former electronics engineer who has published the National Minority Business Directory. Mr. Meyerhoff has devoted much of his time and all of his considerable talents and energies to persuading this country's industries to buy goods and services from minority-owned businesses. The attached article from *Newsday* of February 21, describes Meyerhoff's success in publishing his national directory.

The directory of 1,600 minority-owned firms has been sold to businesses throughout the United States. Surveys indicate that the directory has been a successful business builder for minority firms. Meyerhoff, his former employer, Honeywell, Inc., and the Minneapolis Urban League, and the many citizens who have worked with him on producing this directory are to be congratulated. We are proud that this national success is located in the city of Minneapolis.

The *Newsday* article follows:

[From the Long Island *Newsday*, Feb. 21, 1972]

DIRECTING BUSINESS TO MINORITIES

(By John Lundquist)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—An electronics engineer who used to put gyroscopes together to guide missiles is now trying to steer more of the nation's industries into buying goods and services from minority-owned businesses.

After nearly four years of campaigning, H. Peter Meyerhoff has come up with a new edition of the National Minority Business Directory, listing about 1,600 firms. Earlier editions tended to plug the "buy black" theme. Now, it urges industry to buy from all minority entrepreneurs, whether Aleuts, American Indians, Eskimos, Orientals, Mexicans, or others.

Meyerhoff's current goal is to get industry to make one per cent of purchases from minority suppliers. And to help achieve this, he is working toward a computerized version of the directory. He hopes eventually to include more than 40,000 industry-oriented minority firms in all major cities.

Meyerhoff knows what it is to be in a minority. He was a boy in Nazi Germany. As a Jew, his father, the operator of a profitable cannery, was imprisoned in a concentration camp. Shortly after he was freed, the family fled to the United States. He graduated from City College of New York in 1950 and spent two years in the Army.

In 1959, he went to work for Honeywell, Inc., an electronics control and computer manufacturer. When the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated in April, 1968, Meyerhoff was shocked and grieved.

"I asked myself what I could do to help out in this troubled time of hostility and resentment," he says. "One thing I decided was that I could buy from blacks. I don't have to ask questions. I don't have to get organized. I don't have to ask anyone's permission. That's what was appealing, the simplicity and directness of the approach. I didn't have to worry about any organization."

But it wasn't long before Meyerhoff did get involved in a big way. He located a black grocer and started buying from him. Soon, he'd talked nine neighbors into doing the same, and the grocer could truck deliveries to suburban Fridley and make the long route pay off.

His initial success spurred Meyerhoff to get out a mimeographed directory of all black-owned business in the area. These were distributed to churches and human rights organizations and more than 20,000 area homes of whites. The campaign began to have an impact on black businesses. The grocer took on 75 new customers in five neighborhoods. A second black-owned grocery started a similar delivery service. A painter doubled his workload and an upholsterer got 20 to 30 per cent more business.

It wasn't always a smooth path. Meyerhoff was heckled by anonymous callers who'd phone even at 3 AM.

By late summer of 1968, his sideline was beginning to swamp him. An official of the Minneapolis Urban League convinced Honeywell officials to give him a three-month leave with pay. For about two years, the Urban League paid his salary, and since June, 1970, the enterprise has been largely on its own.

"Last year, we didn't quite make it," he says of the nonprofit organization, which was \$1,600 short of breaking even. Meyerhoff says several community-minded companies or agencies have made donations or furnished research personnel.

In association with Business Enterprises for American Minorities, Meyerhoff began by sending out thousands of letters to urban leagues, urban coalitions, Small Business Administration offices, and local offices of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as well as black newspapers. From these leads, he mailed questionnaires asking minority-owned businesses to list basic data so a potential buyer could size up the company.

"I had to make hundreds of long-distance telephone calls to get exact information," he said.

A six-month survey in 1970-71 conducted by General Mills' research department for the directory indicated 22 per cent of firms that bought copies of the directory had made purchases from minority businesses.

"It's better than I had hoped for but not as good as it should be," publisher Meyerhoff says.

More than half of the nation's 1,250 largest businesses have at least one copy of the current 100-page directory. Numerous government agencies use it. Of the 10,000 copies that have been printed of the \$6.50 book, about 3,000 have been sold.

Interspersed with the listings are sketches and brief biographies of some achievers among minorities. Examples are William Keeler, a Cherokee Indian who became board chairman of Phillips Petroleum Co.; Dr. Daniel H. Williams, a black who pioneered in heart surgery, and Maria Tallchief, described as the "unsurpassed" Osage Indian prima ballerina.

Meyerhoff, a 46-year-old father of three, whose hair is tinged with gray, gave up an \$18,000 salary at Honeywell and now earns \$6,000 less in his campaign for minorities. His wife and another woman help run the office, in a cramped former plumbing and heating office, with a "Buy Black" sign out front. The Neighborhood Youth Corps helps parttime.

A sign on one wall states: "Black people

have excelled whenever a door was opened. The most important closed door in America today is business."

And the director offers this advice: "If you are unlucky and have a bad experience with a minority business, try another one. After all, you haven't stopped patronizing white firms just because you have had trouble with a few."

NIGHTMARES PRODUCED BY THE COMMITTEE BILL TO INCREASE THE MINIMUM WAGE—PART I

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, today and tomorrow I will cite examples of how H.R. 7130, a bill approved by the Education and Labor Committee, irresponsibly deviates from its intended purpose of remedying the inadequacy of current minimum wage scales.

EXPANSION OF COVERAGE

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The committee bill would bring the Federal Government under the minimum wage law's definition of employer. Obviously, to do so encroaches upon the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission; but that is not all.

This alteration of the definition of employer includes your staff and mine, and the staffs of our committees. Few, I doubt, are now paid less than the minimum wage; but how many are paid overtime? How many Capitol Hill offices keep time cards? How many of our offices and committees can budget their payroll funds if overtime has to be paid?

Needless to say, employees of the judicial branch would similarly be covered, and the same problems would be experienced.

STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

With equal flippancy, the committee bill would extend coverage to State and local governments. Again, it is likely that the number of people involved is nominal so far as the minimum wage is concerned. However, to require our city, county, and State governments to pay overtime—when almost without exception they are finding it difficult to meet their budgeted needs—can only result in increased taxes at these levels.

DOMESTIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Many of our elderly who do not want to lose or to reduce their social security benefits—or who do not have social security—turn to now-and-then domestic service to supplement their incomes. Grass cutting, baby sitting, and doing odd jobs are the primary avenues available to those who can only work a few hours or a few days a week.

The committee bill would close the doors to work for many of these people. If requiring that they be paid the minimum wage will not do it, the record-keeping entailed will.

CONGLOMERATE EMPLOYEES

What is a conglomerate? More of us know what a conglomerate is not than what it is, and the committee bill's definition is a complete misnomer.

A conglomerate is not simply an employer engaged in two business activities; but the committee bill would require such an employer to pay the minimum wage and overtime in both businesses, even if one is a losing proposition.

The small franchiser is not a conglomerate; but the committee bill would make these same requirements of the small franchiser, ignoring the fact that he or she does not share in the profits of the parent company.

PHASING OUT EXISTING EXEMPTIONS

AGRICULTURAL (CANNERIES, TOBACCO) PROCESSING, SEASONAL INDUSTRY, AND SUGAR PROCESSING EMPLOYEES

Have the peak employment demands that brought about exemptions in agricultural processing, seasonal industries, and sugar processing magically disappeared? The committee bill assumes that they have by removing their exemptions.

TRANSIT EMPLOYEES

Do you know of any industry where more companies are perched on the brink of bankruptcy than the transit industry? The committee bill would help push them over the brink by phasing out their overtime exemptions.

NURSING HOME EMPLOYEES

Removal of the provision in existing law that exempts work up to 48 hours a week in nursing homes from overtime requirements can only raise the costs of taking care of our elderly. And not one of us needs to be reminded that these are the people who inflation hurts the most.

These are but a few of the faults of H.R. 7130. You need not despair, however; there is an alternative.

Two of our colleagues—Mr. Fuqua and Mr. Quie—and I will offer a substitute to this committee bill. Our substitute, H.R. 14104, does not extend coverage of the minimum wage law; and it does not remove or reduce any exemptions in the existing law.

Our substitute has only two major provisions: it grants reasonable increases in the current minimum wages rates and encourages the employment of young people by establishing a special youth differential wage.

Tomorrow, I will tell you of other damaging defects of the committee bill.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO SAVE LIVES—COVER CANALS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned over the mounting toll of human lives being lost yearly in uncovered, open irrigation, and municipal water supply canals.

It is estimated that more than 100 persons each year die by drowning in these canals.

In my district, the Contra Costa Canal operated by the Contra Costa County Water District has claimed 48 lives—most of them small children who have wan-

dered too close to the canal, slipped, and were unable to climb out of the steep sides of the canal.

Mr. Speaker, these tragedies will continue as long as canals existing in areas of urban encroachment continue to be open.

Today I am introducing legislation that will allow the U.S. Department of Interior to participate in up to 50 percent of the cost of covering those canals.

Presently, the water users must bear the entire cost of covering or fencing canals. It is a terribly costly business and many water districts are simply unable to finance this construction.

The need is clear and I am hopeful that this legislation will be acted on in the near future.

GREATER KANSAS CITY MOBILIZES FOR PLANNED GROWTH

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there is an air of such defeatism and despair pervading so many of our cities that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development was recently prompted to plead for "one example of a city concerned about saving its residential areas as well as its downtown business areas." In still another instance the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future wrote off as obsolete many of this Nation's old, smaller towns as not worth rehabilitating.

As is so often the case, negative news creates more attention than the positive. I know there is at least one city of the type Secretary Romney seeks, a city that is concerned about its downtown as well as its residential area, a city that is spending \$3.2 billion for its own growth, of which only 2.8 percent comes from Federal sources, a city where two State legislatures, the government of six counties, two metropolitan areas and some 30 other self-determining subdivisions have managed to work collaboratively in a rational program that is planned to double the area's population to 2½ million by 1980 without eroding the quality of life of the area.

I speak of Greater Kansas City, encompassing 316 square miles and parts of two cities, Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to everyone's attention a report made recently by four of that area's leading citizens, Mr. Donald J. Hall, Mr. Ilus W. Davis, Dr. Charles Kimball, and Mr. Miller Nichols.

Mr. Hall, chairman of a citizens committee representing business, city, and county government in the area, sounded what I consider the keynote when he flatly declared at a news meeting in New York City recently that all cities are not obsolete or unmanageable. He said that the coalition of city officials, county government, and private businessmen was introducing more progressive change

in the city than has ever taken place in a similar metropolitan area in a similar period of time—but he emphasized that the growth was a controlled or managed growth, not growth aimed at satisfying a lust for bigness.

Mr. Davis, two-time mayor of Kansas City, Mo., former councilman and chairman of the Mayor's Committee on Municipal Finance, has admirable credentials to put into perspective the extraordinary growth story of the area. It is an object lesson for many other cities who still have the physical plant and the options for growth if they bestir themselves and take the initiative and not wait for the government to do their jobs for them.

And there are, Mr. Davis emphasizes, some 75 metropolitan areas in the United States with populations under one and a half million now that appear to be logical centers to absorb in an orderly fashion the expected increase of 75 to 100 million people in our country by the end of this century.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the reports made by these four citizens in New York on March 28, 1972:

REMARKS BY DONALD J. HALL, CHAIRMAN, KANSAS CITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

My name is Don Hall. I am president of Hallmark Cards, Kansas City, and chairman of a citizens committee representing business, city and county government organizations in the Kansas City area.

On behalf of the gentlemen here with me—all of whom you will meet shortly—I would like to thank you for coming here today.

An obvious question is why have we come to New York from Kansas City today and why have we asked you here this morning.

It's really not complicated. We're here because New York is the communications capital and we have a story to tell—an extraordinary story, we believe.

We've also chosen New York to tell our story because this city has come to symbolize the beleaguered state of many cities—cities that are characterized as ungovernable, unlivable and unhappy homes for millions of Americans.

What is happening today in Kansas City is not just exciting, but an important urban case study for problem urban centers. Our coalition of city officials, county government and private businessmen want to share the Kansas City story with you.

We don't happen to believe that all cities per se are obsolete or unmanageable. Ours isn't, and we're about to show you why. We are here to report that Kansas City is in the midst of an unprecedented revitalization. This is manifested in a building and expansion program that is introducing more progressive change in our city than has ever taken place in a similar metropolitan area in a similar period of time.

Our construction boom is only one tangible evidence of the area's recent surge—it is the result of important changes.

The trouble with statistics is that they are one dimensional. They do not reveal what changes really lie behind all this activity.

Viewed historically, what is happening in Kansas City today and tomorrow is very much what happened in our coastal communities yesterday.

In an age of jet airplanes and modern communications systems, Kansas City has become a communications and distribution center, a foreign trade zone, an international city. In an age of urban migration, Kansas City has become an urban center—still a center for the agricultural businesses to its east and west, but much more deeply involved in industry and science, government

and finance, in manufacturing and trade crossing both oceans.

The Greater Kansas City area is moving inevitably toward its role as America's Inland Capital—a regional center with direct international links to other nations, a regional capital for federal government soon to decentralize out of Washington, D.C., a center of international trade, a planned metropolis of several million people that is not only the geographic center of this nation, but the center of population as well.

We have come to New York because so few people realize what is happening in our area. We have been identified with machine politics, but we cleared that up 32 years ago.

We are frequently considered a dominantly agricultural city, yet only Detroit builds more motor cars than we do.

We are not often considered as culturally conscious, yet our art gallery is among the top ten over-all and one of the top three in the excellence of its oriental collection.

We are viewed as flat and dusty with wheat piled in the streets by those who have never visited our area, yet we live amid sizable hills, in a forest, with ample water, and enjoy the nation's finest park system.

We would like to be recognized for our quality of life and our scenic beauty. But it is more likely that the national press will only look our way because of the current construction boom. Some aspects of this hyperactivity have interesting perspectives:

The current \$3.2 billion construction program exceeds any similar program of any city our size—including Dallas, Atlanta, St. Louis.

Of all construction investment, more than three fourths is private capital—indicating the strong confidence of the business community.

Our per capita investment in the building under way in Kansas City is more than \$2,500. This is the largest per person investment in growth of any city anywhere in America. As a matter of fact, it's five times that of New York.

Most of the construction projects serve people directly—stadiums, convention centers, sports arenas, airports, inner-city residential communities, streets and highways, innovative retail centers, schools and colleges, and hospitals.

The fact that more than \$2 billion of this building comes from private investment in an inland metropolis of international importance also means that this money will stimulate an additional \$7.7 billion in income. And, this \$10 billion total will unquestionably add impetus for additional investment.

Such multiplying growth concerns us. Our concern—and our mission—is to talk about controlled growth, managed growth, not bigness, but growth based on quality of living.

REMARKS BY ILUS W. DAVIS, MEMBER, KANSAS CITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

You've heard in general terms the thrust of the \$3.2 billion in construction that will be coming on stream in Kansas City over the next 18 months or so. You've been given an overview of what we call the centrality of Kansas City that heralds our inevitable emergence as the nation's distribution and computer-communications capital.

I'd like to put some of the facts and figures already mentioned—plus some new ones—into perspective for you, and touch upon the relationships among the various government bodies involved in the Kansas City growth story.

First, how much is \$3.2 billion in public and private construction? Although we'll see most of it up and in operation by the end of this year, it's only fair to average the expenditures out over a three-year period. While some of the projects were initiated more than three years ago, they were held up by two long construction industry strikes, and the bulk of the activity would fall in a

three-year time span. Incidentally, we and the unions have made our peace and we have no damaging labor strife facing us.

On an annual basis, Kansas City is spending something in excess of \$1 billion a year.

For the three years, the Kansas City metropolitan area is spending \$2,552 per person in new construction. If the New York metropolitan area spent at the same rate, it would come to \$29.4 billion—enough probably to upgrade your schools, subways and commuter lines and have enough left over for another World Trade Building, in three years!

HIGHEST PER CAPITA INVESTMENT NATIONWIDE

Comparative statistics are awfully hard to come by, but we believe the investment being made in Kansas City far exceeds that of other cities on the move during their most expansive three years of redevelopment. And we believe that Kansas City's per capita spending is higher than that of any major city, anywhere, anytime.

We think it's significant—particularly to this audience which is accustomed to, if not happy about, staggering portions of your taxes being sopped up by Washington and Albany—that only \$88.8 million, or 2.8%, of our area's \$3.2 billion comes from federal sources, and that is for a new federal office building, some interstate highway construction and some education and airport grants.

The states' contributions, both Missouri and Kansas, amount to \$209.6 million, or 6.6%, mainly for highways and universities.

Of the remainder of the \$3.2 billion, the citizens of the Kansas City area, through local and county government bonds and taxes, authorized \$587.6 million, or 15.2% of the entire cost.

More than 75% of the entire investment—\$2.4 billion of the \$3.2 billion—comes from the private sector, which proves to us that, at least in Kansas City, private enterprise is not only alive and well; it's downright precocious!

There have been proposals for the creation of 100 new cities to accommodate our nation's population increase through the year 2000.

This is a provocative concept, but in my experience and study, I just don't think it provides a viable way of meeting the needs of the people.

SEVENTY-FIVE METROPOLITAN AREAS IN UNITED STATES TO HANDLE POPULATION GROWTH

There are 75 metropolitan areas in the United States with populations under one and a half million now that appear to have the physical plant to absorb in an orderly fashion the expected increase of 75 to 100 million people in our country by the end of this century. Many of these cities still have options open that, properly exercised, can assure that they will be both livable and governable in the year 2000.

Unfortunately, few of these cities today appear to be thinking about this or exploring their options in this context. Because of where Kansas City is today, we feel a responsibility has been thrust upon us to show clearly just how a city can continue to grow, can continue to make life more attractive for its people, and continue to be manageable and governable.

Our people are setting the style and standard for urban life as we hope it will be in the United States in the next century.

Our position today is, as has been said, a result of planning and efficient use of our resources. But just as important—and perhaps of more significance to you in the East—is the ecumenical spirit that has been created among the multiplicity of governments within the area of Greater Kansas City.

Strides have been taken in establishing new and unusual forms of government units that, while maintaining the sovereignty of conventional political division are effective in dealing, sometimes by law and some-

times by protective covenant, with the problems of orderly growth for the benefit of all.

ECUMENICAL POLITICAL ACTION

The governmental problems we face and are solving in Kansas City are compounded by the fact that a state line runs through our metropolitan area. If we are to treat the entire area as a whole, and we are, we must plan, zone and take advantage of all resources on both sides of the Missouri River.

This means bi-state compacts and agreements among two state legislatures, six counties, two cities and some 30 other self-determining sub-divisions. The land surrounding the Kansas City International Airport for 100 miles in each direction, encompassing a multitude of communities, counties and the two states, is zoned according to a master plan.

In one endeavor, a treaty between the states of Kansas and Missouri was drawn up and approved by the Senate of the United States.

You will see more of this kind of thinking and planning in the future in other cities, if they are to meet the challenges of the decentralizing of American industry and government, an increasing population, and the continuing quest for a better way to live.

REMARKS BY MILLER NICHOLS, KANSAS CITY CITIZEN COMMITTEE

I will start with two statements from men who have known our city. The French intellectual, Andre Maurois, after spending several months in Kansas City following World War II, described the city as, "one of the most beautiful in the world." He further commented that the Kansas City residential suburbs should be copied by the most vaunted cities of Europe.

The other man was Brian Dunning of BBC, who knew our town as an undergraduate student in the mid-fifties. He wrote, "If Kansas City were in Europe, everyone would rave about it, including American tourists who would fall all over themselves to see a city which contrives to be modern without being brash, historic without being senile, and polished without being flamboyant."

This hasn't happened by chance. Kansas City for more than 100 years has had the advantage of great planners and dreamers. Men capable of transforming their dreams into realities. One of them was my father, the founder of the J. C. Nichols Company. Starting in 1905, with no money and little credit, he built in the southern portion of Kansas City, residential areas recognized throughout the world, as the largest high-class contiguous residential development under one management.

His concepts were based more on philosophies than they were on profits, that is not to say, however, that there is no profit in creating the very best in living environment, for I assure you, there is. His planning and building ability was recognized by three of our nation's Presidents, who appointed him as a dollar-a-year man to serve on our National Capital's Park and Planning Commission. Also, he was the founder of the Urban Land Institute.

One of his statements lives on to guide us today. He said, "Let us endow Kansas City with the elements of beauty and permanence and build a city affording the commercial opportunities of New York and the cultural amenities of Paris."

Our Country Club District, recognized as Kansas City's finest residential area, offers its residents a way of life unexcelled by any city. We emphasize beauty with curving streets, preserved streams, adorned parks with gracious-sized lawns and gardens. Throughout the residential area, we have erected and contributed to the residents, many fountains and fine pieces of statuary brought from the Old World.

We are celebrating this year, the 50th anniversary of the first shopping center that was conceived and built without the benefit of public transportation. In 1922 no one thought the automobile would play an important role in suburban shopping. During the intervening years, many shopping centers have come and gone—not so with the Plaza.

Much of our area is committed to parks and guarantees to future generations that these green areas, "the lungs of the city," will always be there. We have ample land within our city limits and nearby rural areas to accommodate orderly growth.

However, many cities' growth will be controlled by the availability of water. The Missouri River that runs through the middle of Kansas City flows more water in a day than we could possibly use in a year.

The heritage of a great newspaper man, William Rockhill Nelson of the Kansas City Star, provided funds to build the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery and Mary Atkins Museum, truly one of America's finest structures. The Gallery is located at the apex of a huge Cultural Center which also includes our Kansas City Art Institute; the Conservatory of Music; Rockhurst College, a Jesuit school; the 100-acre campus of the University of Missouri at Kansas City; Midwest Research Institute, and finally, the Linda Hall Library, which is exceeded in scope and importance as a technical resource only by the Library of Congress. This library serves every state in the Union and many foreign countries. Among the states, New York is the second largest user.

In the field of spectator sports, our Chiefs have made it twice to the Super Bowl. Our Royals, an expansion team, have moved up to second place in their division. We have just gotten our basketball Royals from Cincinnati and we expect to have a major league hockey team by the start of next year's season. Kansas City is really sports oriented.

In the field of participating sports, we are fortunate to have an abundance of both public and private golf courses, and to be within an afternoon's drive to one of America's finest recreational playgrounds, the Ozarks, where both rivers and lakes afford our citizens ample opportunity for varied types of recreation. Skiing, the fastest growing sport in the country, is at our doorstep and thousands of Kansas Citizens ski the Rocky Mountains, an hour away, where skiing is not "just good," but truly the finest and most dependable of any place in the world.

We have under construction a \$21,000,000 Disneyland-type park called "Worlds of Fun." Located on 500 acres of wooded, rolling land within our city limits. The owner and developer is Lamar Hunt, also the owner of the Chiefs.

Our Starlight Theatre is the second largest open-air theatre in the country. During the summer a full season of Broadway musicals entertain on a seven-nights-a-week basis. Our Philharmonic, Galleries, libraries and Universities provide the people of Kansas City and our territory, a wide variety of cultural opportunities.

Of the six Presidential Libraries in the nation, three are in the Kansas City trade area, with one, the Truman Library, within the metropolitan area.

We have our problems as all cities do, but ours are manageable and we are accomplishing our goals. The leadership in the various groups work amazingly well in a community that tries to understand. I am not saying, however, that we don't have imperfections to keep us busy seeking solutions.

We are not a "hustling, bustling" area racing "pell-mell" in many directions to achieve growth for growth's sake. Our rate of immigration is slower than Dallas, Houston or Atlanta and we like it that way so long as we

can obtain quality oriented growth for we expect to maintain our life style. Newcomers to Kansas City find that it is easy to establish roots and to become a part of the community. Life can be rewarding in a community like Kansas City, so much so that corporate personnel officers frequently find that asking a man to transfer away from Kansas City is difficult to accomplish and many resign before they move their family away from their home and friends in Kansas City. This speaks well for our town.

REMARKS BY DR. CHARLES KIMBALL, MEMBER, KANSAS CITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

What I would like to say about the larger subject of all cities is the distillation of some 25 years of experience at Midwest Research Institute, observing, measuring and forecasting events in both the private and public segment of our country. There are important changes under way—not all of them as tragic, depressing, and hopeless as headlines imply. There is a marked shift in the cities that lead in our country—a rejection of traditional influences—and Kansas City is in the forefront.

Historically, the inland cities have always looked to the sea coasts as models for their life style. The mass communication offices (be they Hollywood studios or New York editorial offices) told us what to wear, how to govern, where and how to live. This is unacceptable today. We are not willing to embrace either the sprawl and smog of Los Angeles or the degrading density of the East.

The cities we live in are not plagued as are the coastal cities, with too many people, too rapid growth, extreme poverty, commuting, and lack of recreation. These are great issues, now commanding the highest level of your attention.

So, the time has come for a new set of alternatives. The people and leadership of Kansas City are serving notice to the nation that we now offer an attractive new option for quality life in a metropolitan center—an option so favorable in the case of Kansas City, that it will serve as a progressive model throughout the balance of this century.

A second major shift in the course of American cities is interconnected with what we might call the revolution of the service industries, a dramatic historical progression following the agrarian revolution and the industrial revolution.

Our cities—nearly destroyed by archaic property taxes and the onslaught of the internal combustion engine—now face a new series of demands brought into focus by the new employee, the service employee.

EVOLUTION OF SERVICE-ORIENTED ECONOMY

Ours is the first country in history to employ more people in services than in manufacturing. This calls for a new kind of city, not the gathering place where farmers can buy, sell, and barter goods, and not the waterfront town of the industrial revolution, but a new approach with reduced emphasis on industrial sites and railroad sidings, cheap labor and hauling heavy goods over water.

It emphasizes values based on being in the center of things, geared to house skilled minds and highly mobile people, linked to international air routes, and structured for the dignified life style demanded by those within the service professions. The company town we knew as kids is passe.

Have you ever wondered why the insurance industry, one of the most powerful of the service forces, repeatedly selects cities like Hartford, Omaha, Kansas City, Wausau, Des Moines?

Finally, and perhaps most important, we must ask ourselves now where all of us are going to live in 1999, or more practically, where our kids are going to live—and not just where but how we are going to live—in good style, with dignity, with reasonable ac-

cessibility to each other, and above all, with room to stretch?

It is generally held that by the turn of the century, all but 10 to 15 per cent of Americans will live within metropolitan areas, and there is much talk of the nation's need for 100 new cities to accommodate the then population of 300 million people—thus 100 new cities for 100 million more people.

There are arguments that are convincing to me, at least, against the idea of many new cities, rising unnaturally on the virgin landscape, without the cultural traditions of the present communities. More sensible, less costly, less damaging to the countryside, and more rewarding in human values—is to plan now on the 100 million additional new persons to locate on the average in each of one hundred cities of manageable size.

MODEL OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

This is what is happening today in Kansas City by a group of private businessmen, an involved city hall, a county court, and sound planning.

As one example, in Kansas City, Hallmark has created and funded a "downtown suburb" called Crown Center to provide quality living, safe living, for 10,000 people just a few blocks from downtown, without losing openness, trees, and parkland normally associated with the suburbs.

Barbara Ward, the British economist, put the current urban problem very well when she said that "excessive growth in very large cities can best be controlled not by any rigid attempt to set limits; expansion can be checked only by attracting it to other centers."

Much more serious thought will need to be given in the years immediately ahead to some redistribution of population, which is as was done a hundred years ago when the inducement was the Homestead Act—the GI bill of rights for Union Soldiers, which opened up the West. But plans cannot be forced on the people. They must not conflict with our rising personal level of expectations.

Ours is one of the four largest cities in America in area with room for growth—lots of it, even within our present city limits. We are not here to pirate your factories or your corporate offices. Instead, we wish to put the nation on notice that we are ready to take our share of the 100 million new people who will show up in the next 30 years.

Over the 25 years I have lived in the Middle West, we have seen an exodus of talented people to both coasts, the best ones leaving first, what the British called the "Brain Drain." There simply were not adequate-level employment opportunities. But now we notice a marked reversal in that trend. Some of the best ones, former emigrants who have located in the cities on the coasts and the Great Lakes, have "had it"—commuting, congestion, corruption, and concern with pollution. Many of the key people on my own staff have come back to the Midwest, and this movement is not due only to the fact that the cost of living and cost of doing business in Kansas City averages \$1,000 annually per employee less than New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Los Angeles, Atlanta, St. Louis and Dallas.

Some of the "return of the native" movement has to do with what unions call "portal to portal time." In our area of 1.3-million persons, more than 90 per cent live within 30 minutes of their work—most within 20 minutes.

This sort of accessibility has new and important meaning today, for it enriches leisure time for the individual without reducing productivity for the employer. To the brainy, talented, individuals of the service revolution, "portal to portal time" is increasingly significant.

Some thoughts about Kansas City.

Our city is solvent, thanks to former

Mayor Davis. It has the most modern tax structure of any city in the land with more than half a million people. Its economy is beautifully balanced. We never did manage to cash in on the Space Age, like many coastal cities, nor are we now suffering from the Space Age recession.

We manufacture everything but ships and cigarettes. On a per capita basis, we are first in the country in the manufacture of automobiles and trucks, vending machines and greeting cards. Per unit of population, we are first in retail sales, in the number of consulting engineers, and in printing and publishing.

The centrality of Kansas City is money in the bank with a great concentration of AT&T facilities and Long-Line headquarters, Western Electric Plant, United Utilities, the third largest telephone company in the country. You newsmen know our community as a regional center for the wire services.

This centrality is one reason why the federal government selected Kansas City as a regional headquarters for at least a dozen major federal agencies.

Our future is not just national, but international—soon to become the nation's first inland foreign trade zone; something heretofore reserved only for seaports.

It is exactly this sort of anachronism that American cities must overcome. The seaports now have too many people, responsibilities, problems, and corporate expansions. The airports like Kansas City, are bound to attract this activity away from the congested areas as Barbara Ward suggests, based on the careful planning we have been doing for certain growth.

As 100 million Americans expand into 100 cities like ours, the centralization of our inland capital will greatly enhance personal mobility. For example, I can now take a morning flight from Kansas City to 48 of the 50 largest cities in the country, hold a meeting, make a speech, sell something, and be back in time to sleep in my own bed. Typically, our new airport, and the massive support systems built by TWA, are planned for the 1990's. To show the interest of the man in the street in these matters, the airport bond issue passed not by a 3 to 2 margin (as required) but by 24 to 1.

While the dollar value of our construction projects is emphasized, these are projects that serve people directly.

In Rodgers and Hammerstein's *Oklahoma*, Ado Annie's boyfriend used to sing "Everything's Up To Date In Kansas City." He was right then, and he would be right today.

But, then he went on to sing, "They've gone about as far as they can go." Don't you believe it!

HIGHLIGHTS OF KANSAS CITY \$3.2 BILLION CONSTRUCTION

A total of \$3.2 billion worth of public and private construction projects will be coming on stream in the Kansas City area this year and next.

Here is a list of the major projects, which include colleges, hotels, office buildings, a new international airport, twin stadiums for pro football and baseball, a convention center, retail and service facilities and a major theme amusement park:

Completion this January of the nearly-\$5-million American Telephone & Telegraph accounting center.

Groundbreaking in January of the \$13-million University of Missouri-Kansas City Medical School.

Grand opening this April of the \$8-million 400-room Alameda Plaza Hotel near Kansas City's Country Club Plaza.

Begin construction in mid-April on 10-story Executive Plaza office building in downtown section of Kansas City.

Opening this April of Phase One of the River Quay recreation-shopping development,

a riverfront area being restored in 19th Century style.

Celebration in May of the 50th anniversary of the Country Club Plaza, America's first organized and planned shopping center district.

Completion this spring of four buildings totaling more than \$8 million at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

Completion this spring of \$25-million Hallmark Cards distribution center on 595-acre site in suburban Liberty.

Completion this May of the 100-bed Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Hospital, located in the black community and financed with \$2 million in federal grants and \$3 million in community-wide contributions.

Completion this June of the last 12.5-mile link and bridge of Interstate 435 linking Jackson and Clay counties.

Completion in July of \$8-million, 8-building learning center of Kansas City, Kansas Community College.

Opening in June of \$29-million teaching hospital of the Kansas City College of Osteopathic Medicine. The 10-story, 426-room structure is the largest all-private-room hospital in the Midwest.

Completion this summer of the Kansas City Royals Baseball Club's new 42,000-seat stadium in Harry S. Truman Sports Complex.

Transfer of commercial airline service from Municipal Air Terminal to the \$212-million Kansas City International Airport.

Groundbreaking in 1972 for Kansas City's \$20-million convention center, in a two-block area adjacent to Municipal Auditorium downtown.

Completion in August of the first five buildings on the new 222-acre campus of Johnson County Community College, a \$13-million addition to the area's junior college facilities.

Completion this August of 78,000-seat Arrowhead Stadium in the \$51-million Truman Sports Complex; the stadium is the new home of the Kansas City Chiefs Football Club.

Groundbreaking this September for the 600-room Stouffer Inn within Tiffany Centro, a \$75-million planned business community under construction two miles from Kansas City International Airport.

Begin construction on \$28-million, 32-story office tower and commercial retail complex in the heart of downtown Kansas City.

Completion in late 1972 of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's 13-story, \$14-million office building.

Completion this September of the \$20-million Penn Valley Community College, the first of five community colleges to be constructed in Greater Kansas City during the early 1970's.

Completion in November of \$2.2-million Municipal Courts Building in Kansas City.

Completion by the end of 1972 of a series of new TWA facilities adjacent to Kansas City International Airport totaling \$55 million and including new overhaul facilities for jumbo jets, a new test cell for 747 jet engines, water treatment and total energy plants.

Dedication in March, 1973, of the 730-room Crown Center Hotel.

Opening in April, 1973, of Worlds of Fun, a \$20-million theme park in Clay county being backed by Lamar Hunt, owner of the Kansas City Chiefs.

Completion in mid-1973 of Southwestern Bell's \$14-million long-distance facility expansion.

Completion by Labor Day, 1973, of Phase One of Crown Center's \$200-million urban redevelopment project. This phase comprises about half the total cost of the project.

Completion by January, 1974, of a \$2.3-million two-floor addition to the diagnostic and treatment center at Kansas City General Hospital.

THE CHILDREN'S LOBBY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that children are the future. They are one of the most precious natural resources in any country.

A group called the Children's Lobby has organized in my State of California. Their aim—which I believe is a very worthwhile one—is to look after the interests of young people.

While the large majority of children have parents who love and care for them, there are an unfortunate few whose parents mistreat and neglect them or whose parents are limited in their ability to provide adequate opportunity for them. There are others whose families are unable to afford medical or dental care. They too need help.

The following article from the March 31 issue of the Los Angeles Times, by Art Seidenbaum is about the Children's Lobby. I would like to share it with my colleagues in the hope that they will take cognizance of the needs of a fairly substantial, if voteless, part of our population. The article follows:

HELP FOR HALF-PINTS

(By Art Seidenbaum)

And now we have the Children's Lobby, which is to give clout to little Californians with no political voice of their own.

There are 1.6 million kids in this state 4 years and younger. There are 80,000 kids who are beaten or neglected annually. There are as many as half-a-million children in need—financial need, educational need—of care beyond their immediate families.

The Children's Lobby has those kids as their single special interest, the first state body in the country in behalf of the voteless.

Rep. Jerome Waldie described the new group for his national colleagues: "Wigmakers have a paid lobbyist in Sacramento, Calif. So do the abalone, wine, mortuary, and motorcycle associations . . . The fact is that 650 special-interest groups have a 'voice' in the halls of the state Legislature. But until recently, a crucial segment of the population has been unrepresented—children and young people . . ."

The three areas of major concern at the moment are child care centers, child abuse prevention and children's dental care.

CENTERS POPULAR

Care centers, especially for children in single-parent working families, are already popular on a bipartisan basis. Last year's Welfare Reform Act included such facilities and made possible state-federal funding of about \$17 million—but enabling legislation, spelling out county implementation, is still to come.

Liz Berger, lobby executive director, is working with legislators to move a bill by next month, careful not to call such institutions "day care centers" because that term somehow sets up bad communal associations in the minds of sensitive conservatives.

Meanwhile, state Sen. Donald Grunsky, himself a sensitive conservative, is helping the lobby's effort to assure that all counties will protect children suffering from parental beating or neglect.

One of the most gut-wrenching aspects of the battering business, says lobby president Robert Pauley, is that many victims still love their parents, "beating being better than

no love at all." While the children need outside intervention, the parents are the ones who need outside treatment.

CRUNCH AND CLOUT

No politician in his running mind is going to announce against children but the lobby has already learned that many legislators would like to exercise their love for little nonvoters freely, without appropriation. The crunch comes when clout has to cost.

The lobby is bound to run into other problems as child-advocacy grows up. Children are the unrepresented pawns in matters ranging from public education to divorce. The simple proposition that in certain cruel circumstances society may know best—better than natural father or natural mother—is a profound philosophical issue at odds with many old ideals.

And I have another reservation about adults trying to represent children: How arrogant do we have the right to be in predicting their needs in the next culture? The battering must cease and attention must be paid to human beings not yet big enough to be their own advocates. But I hope the good lobby remembers that while pleading for children one does not necessarily speak for them.

THE BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to attend a meeting of the Byelorussian-American Association commemorating the 54th anniversary of the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence. At this affair an address was presented by Dr. Roger Horoshko, president of the Byelorussian-American Association.

In his remarks, Dr. Horoshko decried the forced assimilation into the Soviet Union of Byelorussia, a charter member of the United Nations, and today a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R.

I would like to share with my colleagues Dr. Horoshko's interesting comments, as well as the resolution adopted by the Byelorussian-American Association commemorating Byelorussian Independence Day.

The material referred to follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas this year marks the 200-th anniversary of the first significant Russian attempts to enslave Byelorussian people and which attempts in 1772 had resulted in the Russian conquest of Eastern Byelorussia;

Whereas this year also marks the 50-th anniversary of creation of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, the latest Russian instrument used to deprive the Byelorussian people of their natural and inalienable rights as free men and which rights had been granted to them by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in 1918;

Whereas currently within the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR) the campaign against Byelorussian national institutions is intensifying and new attempts are being made to eradicate a "recurrence of Nationalism";

Whereas the Soviet censorship of Byelorussian Soviet literature and art, which in 1971 was tightened to require a universal glorification of Soviet ideology now attempts to extend its influence into the Free World

and even over publications of UNESCO which depict Byelorussia in non-Soviet terms;

Whereas within the territorial limits of the BSSR and the USSR Moscow follows a calculated colonial policy of Russification, political and economic exploitation of Byelorussian people, and of demoralization of Byelorussian intellectuals with rigid party controls;

Now, therefore, we the participants of this Commemorative Assembly observing the Fifty-Fourth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, do hereby unanimously condemn the governments of the BSSR and the USSR for perpetuating the crime of genocide against the Byelorussian people; furthermore—

We appeal to all freedom loving peoples and nations to speak for Byelorussia in the United Nations;

We urge the United States to adopt a policy which would help the Byelorussian delegation to the United Nations to become a true representative of the Byelorussian people;

We demand that the "Voice of America" end its discrimination against Byelorussian language, the language of the second most populous non-Russian nation within the USSR and Poland, and that Byelorussian broadcasts be added to the current list of seven Soviet languages used by the "Voice of America" in its broadcast to the USSR;

We appeal to the people of Byelorussia to continue their arduous opposition to Russian attempts to rule them and to destroy them as a nation;

We pledge our continued support and dedication to the cause of Byelorussian freedom and independence, and the resurrection of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

New York, March 26, 1972.

THE GOLDEN AGE OF BYELORUSSIAN CULTURE INTRODUCTION

Byelorussia, a charter member of the United Nations, and today a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R., is a country of rich cultural and national heritage dating back a thousand years. Soviet Russia is using its "Operation Rewrite" to obscure this fact and in its place promotes its own thesis, namely that only with Soviet help did the Byelorussian people attain their nationhood.

In reality, the political and cultural role that Byelorussia played, especially during the time of its "Golden Age" in the 16th century, had a paramount impact on Eastern Europe. In Byelorussia this was an era characterized by advanced democratic basis of life and by religious and political tolerance hardly found anywhere else in Europe at that time. While most of Europe suffered from the effects of religious fanaticism, from persecutions and from inquisitions, the enlightened atmosphere in Byelorussia permitted Symon Budny, a philosopher, theologian and a disciple of Michael Servetus, to freely preach, publish and to disseminate his religious ideas. This took place at the time when in Geneva, Michael Servetus was burned at the stake for his "heretic beliefs."

It was this tolerance of all ideas and an almost unlimited freedom of speech, conscience and faith, which led Todar Eulsheski, a Byelorussian writer of the late 16th century, to call that century golden.

Historically Byelorussia was known as Litva and the Byelorussian State as the Grand Duchy of Litva. The name Byelorussia was introduced during the Russian occupation of the Grand Duchy in the 18th and 19th centuries and has since then gradually gained acceptance. Litva should not be confused with the present day Lithuanian, which under its historical name of Zhamoyc (Samogitia in Latin), was but a small part of the Grand Duchy to which it was semi-permanently annexed. On several occasions Zhamoyc was traded by the Grand Duchy in return for favorable military settlements.

BYELORUSSIA—THE CROSSROADS OF EAST AND WEST

During the last quarter of the 15th century, the Grand Duchy of Litva attained its maximum territorial expansion, encompassing vast territories from the Baltic to the Black Seas. To the east the boundary reached to within eighty miles of Moscow. Byelorussian lands formed the nucleus of this huge state and Byelorussian people were its masters both politically and culturally.

Simultaneously with the territorial growth of the Grand Duchy, commerce expanded. The rivers Nioman, Dzvina, Dniapro, and various overland trade routes connected Byelorussia with countries of Western and Eastern Europe. Along these routes also came new cultural and spiritual ideas and influences of the Western and Byzantine civilizations. The synthesis of these two cultural elements occurring on the substrata of Byelorussia's own national traditions later became the cultural characteristic of the Byelorussian people.

Cultural ties of Byelorussian with the West were also maintained through the educational opportunities which Byelorussian youth found at the Universities in Prague, in Germany and in Italy. A great number of Byelorussian statesmen, officials and well-to-do citizens used this opportunity to educate their sons, and through them Byelorussia was exposed to a continuous stimulating flow of progressive and bold ideas of the Renaissance and the Reformation.

Especially fruitful contacts with Western Europe were in the arts—painting, architecture, and graphic arts. Churches, castles, palaces and city halls were being built or renovated in the Gothic style, in the styles of the Renaissance and later in the Baroque style. In the 16th century an original Byelorussian building style was developed which combined harmoniously the Gothic and Byzantine forms with local architectural traditions. Excellent examples of this "Byelorussian Gothic" style are the churches in Mazheiki, Synkavichy and Suprasi.

BYELORUSSIAN—AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

An important prerequisite for the fast pace of development of Byelorussian writing and literature during the "Golden Age", was the high level of development of the Byelorussian literary language attained previously. For centuries the Byelorussian language was not only the language of everyday use and religious writing, but also the official language of the Government of the Grand Duchy of Litva, and not only in Byelorussian lands, but also in all other lands comprising this state.

Byelorussian language was used widely by the Orthodox Church which served 80% of the population of the Grand Duchy. Only in liturgy and other prescribed services was Church-Slavonic retained. The Catholic Church of the Grand Duchy used Byelorussian side-by-side with Latin. Scholars and preachers of the Reformation used Byelorussian language in their writings and publications. In the 16th century, Byelorussian was also introduced into the Holy Books (Koran) of a small but politically significant Muslim population of the Grand Duchy.

The dominant political and cultural position of the Grand Duchy in Eastern Europe inevitably led to the wide use of Byelorussian language beyond its borders. Trade and peace agreements with other states of Eastern Europe were written in Byelorussian. The great Dukes used Byelorussian language in their correspondence and relations with the rulers of states and regions of Eastern Europe, among them Muscovy (Russia), Great Novgorod, Tver, Pskov, the then German Riga, Poland, Moldavia, Walakhia, and the Tartar Khanates. The rulers of these states, as a rule, replied to Great Dukes of Litva also in Byelorussian.

Latin was the only other language used by the Grand Duchy in diplomacy, and its use

was limited to relations with Western Europe.

Thus during the 15th and 16th centuries Byelorussian language played an international role in the diplomatic relations of Eastern Europe similar to that of Latin in the West. For example, when in 1646 a dispute arose between Poland and Moscow concerning the language which was to be used in their diplomatic relations, the settlement came only after they both agreed to return to the established tradition—the use of the Byelorussian language.

AN ADVANCED LEGAL SYSTEM

The ancient democratic traditions of the Byelorussian people and a mass of accumulated legal and judicial records, provided just the right conditions for a high level of development of law in Byelorussia during the "Golden Age".

Codification of law had already begun in the 15th century and in 1468 the first compilation of laws of the Grand Duchy, entitled "The Judgement Book", was completed. However, it wasn't until the 16th century that the high level of Byelorussian legal system was reached with the publication of the judicial code of the Grand Duchy known as the "Litouski Statut". The basic principles embodied in this code were deeply rooted in the traditional norms of Byelorussian common law.

Following two handwritten editions of 1529 and 1566, the first printed edition of the "Litouski Statut" appeared in 1588, and because of its completeness became one of the most authoritative judicial codes in Europe. Byelorussia's neighbors, the despotic Moscow and the anarchist-aristocratic Poland did not at that time attain a similar achievement in the legal field.

The chief editor and publisher of the third edition of the "Litouski Statut" was the Chancellor of the Grand Duchy, Leu Sapieha (1577-1633). In all three of its editions, "Litouski Statut" was written in Byelorussian. Later it was translated into Latin, Polish, Russian, and German. The "Litouski Statut" remained in use for three centuries, and was used even after that Russian occupation of Byelorussia. It was only in 1839 that the judicially binding force of the code was terminated by Czar Nicholas I and Russian laws were universally imposed.

CHRONOLOGY

Chronology was another field which reflected the vigorous political and national life of the Byelorussian nation. During the 16th century there appeared a large number of new editions of old chronicles as well as a host of new chronicles. The more important chronicles that have survived the turbulent events of history are the chronicles of Bykhavits, of the Great Dukes, of the Dukes of Slutsk, chronicles of Krasinski and Baczynski, and a whole series of lesser local chronicles.

BYELORUSSIAN PRINTING

A very important factor in the development of Byelorussian written "Golden Age" was the birth of Byelorussian printing at the beginning of the 16th century. The foremost pioneer of Byelorussian printing was a renowned scientist and humanist of his time, Francisak Skaryna (1485-1540). After obtaining his Doctorate in Medicine from the Padua University in Italy, Francisak Skaryna set forth as his main goal the dissemination of knowledge and education among his own people with the aid of printed books, and in the language best understandable to them, that is in his native Byelorussian. In 1517-19 in Prague and later in 1522-25 in Vilna, Skaryna published the books of the Bible in Byelorussian translation. This was the first bible printed in Eastern Europe and one of the first in the world.

Commentaries and introductions to Skaryna's books were filled with expressions of intense patriotism, love of the common

people and with religious tolerance. Historians of printing refer to Skaryna's richly decorated and illustrated books as "Slavic Elsevir". Skaryna's varied interests and activities, typical of the learned men of Renaissance, left a legacy in many areas of Byelorussian cultural life—in religion, literature, art, linguistics, as well as in printing.

Following in Skaryna's footsteps were such men as Symon Budny, Vasil Ciapinski, Vasil Haraburda, Peter Mscislaviec, brothers Lukas and Kuzma Mamonich, Ryhor Chadkivich, and the Orthodox Brotherhood of Vilna. By the end of the "Golden Age" there were over ten publishing houses in Byelorussia. Their books could be found not only throughout Byelorussia, but also in the territories of the southern Slavs and even in Moscow despite the fact that there they were banned and often burned as "heretic".

Printing literature was used extensively by the Byelorussian Reformation movement, forcing the Orthodox and the Catholics into a lively debate in print. Consequently, an extensive religious and polemic literature had been accumulated by the second half of the "Golden Age."

The most prominent representative of the Byelorussian Reformation movement was Symon Budny (1530?-1593), a philosopher and a student of the Bible. Budny, first a Calvinist, and later the leader of Byelorussian Unitarians, was a prolific writer of polemic letters and theological treatises which he wrote in Byelorussian, Polish and Latin, and distributed in Switzerland, England, Prussia, Poland, Hungary, and in Byelorussia. Budny's main work in Byelorussian is a large theological treatise "Katykhizis" (Niasviz, 1562) which lays down the basis for his reformist ideas and expresses his views on the main social problems of that time.

Among the Orthodox, a notable activist and a reformer of the Orthodox Church of the "Golden Age" was the Metropolitan of the Grand Duchy, Jazep Soltan (Metropolitan in the years 1497-1519). A prolific contributor to Byelorussian Orthodox writing was Archimandrite Sjarhei Kimbar (1532-1565) of the Suprasl Monastery. The second half of the century marks important literary and editorial activity by Ryhor Chadkivich (1505-1572). In 1575 Orthodox books were being printed in Vilna by Peter Mscislaviec. Famous for both their quality and the number of religious books published, were the Vilna publishing houses of Mamonich Brothers and of the Holy Trinity Brotherhood.

EDUCATIONAL AND SECULAR LITERATURE

Along with the general rise of the educational level in Byelorussia, the need for textbooks and reference books also increased. Publishers of religious books of all denominations turned their attention to this need. Special credit goes to the Orthodox Brotherhood in Vilna which published Byelorussian grade school readers, Byelorussian grammar and textbooks, and in 1595 published the first Byelorussian dictionary and lexicon edited by Laurenci Zyzani, an educator, scholar and theologian. Zyzani's Byelorussian grammar later became the primary source material for the Russian grammar of Michael Lomonosov.

In the field of secular literature both Byelorussian and Latin were used. In 1521, during his stay in Rome, Mikola Husouski wrote a poem for Pope Leo X, entitled "The Song of the Zubr". This poem of nearly 2000 stanzas was written with remarkable talent and presents vividly the beauty of Byelorussian wilderness and masterfully describes a relative of the bison—zubr, the king of Byelorussian forests. It further describes all the dangers of hunting the zubr, and clearly reflects poet's love for his country and his views on the major political events of his time. Also in Latin, Michael Litvanus published "The Habits of Tartars, Lithuanians

(Byelorussians) and Muscovites (Russians)". In the years 1573-74, Filon Charnabylski of Orsha wrote in Byelorussian his "Vodpisy" (Reports). During the last quarter of the century poet John Radvan glorified Byelorussian magnates, his benefactors, with his Latin poems. A "Diary" describing a wealth of topical and historical events was written in Byelorussian by Todar Eulasheuski (1546-1604?).

CONCLUSIONS

This short survey points to a record of remarkable cultural and political achievements of the Byelorussian people and of the Byelorussian State, the Grand Duchy of Litva. In the 16th century, this level of accomplishment could not even be approached by Moscow, Poland or any other state in Eastern Europe. This is also the record which Soviet Russia tries to camouflage and falsify, thereby attempting to deny the cultural inheritance and historical achievements of the Byelorussian people. In this connection the change of names from the historical Litva to Byelorussia and from the historical Zhamoyc (Samogitia) to Lithuania, contributes to the confusion which the Russians exploit. However, a heritage of this scope and an abundance of documentary evidence from the era of the "Golden Age" still in existence, can not be suppressed either by might or by fraud.

BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Today we are commemorating the 54th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, proclaimed on March 25, 1918 in Minsk.

The will of the Byelorussian people to be free was expressed by the Declaration of Independence as follows:

"We the Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, cast off the last fetters of political servitude which has been imposed by Czars on our free and independent land. From this day, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is declared free and independent state. The people of Byelorussia, through their Constituent Assembly, will henceforth decide the future relations of Byelorussia with other states."

A Constitution was then adopted which provided:

1. for the creation by a direct and secret ballot of a Byelorussian Legislative Assembly based upon proportional representation of all citizens regardless of national origin or religion;
2. for a guarantee of all freedoms of speech, press and assembly;
3. for full national and cultural autonomy of all people of the Republic;
4. for the institution of an eight hour working day;
5. for the protected legal right to strike.

This Declaration of Independence soon became a new life-force of the Byelorussian nation and left deep impressions on the whole of its people.

The meaning of the Declaration of Independence was very eloquently expressed by the former president of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, Peter Krecheuski, speaking in Prague at the Sixth-Anniversary of the Declaration of Byelorussian Independence. He said: "Nothing is more beautiful than a birth of a new idea, the content of which is liberation of its people. In Byelorussian history, the Declaration of Independence of March 25, 1918, has become this new idea. It is the most beautiful flower that has sprung up from our soil, and its delicate petals watered by the tears of our people, will live forever."

This "most beautiful flower", or the idea of liberation of which Peter Krecheuski spoke, can not ever grow old, nor will it lose its allurements for the Byelorussian people.

The newly established Byelorussian Democratic Republic was unable to enjoy its independence and sovereignty for long. Rus-

slan Communists consolidated their forces and the Red Army invaded Byelorussia. Byelorussian territory was turned into a battlefield, and the nation soon found itself in Russian captivity again.

The government of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, being unable to defend itself successfully against the overwhelming Communist forces, had made repeated attempts to secure aid from the West, but to no avail.

In order to pacify the national aspirations of the Byelorussian people, the so called Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR) was created and which was supposed to replace the Byelorussian Democratic Republic (BDR). However, the new Soviet regime turned out to be nothing more than a new form of subjugation of the Byelorussian people.

This year will mark the 50th anniversary of creation of the USSR of which Byelorussia is a part. According to its constitution, the BSSR is a totally sovereign nation. It has the right to freely secede from the Soviet Union, has the right to enter into direct relations with other states and to conclude agreements and exchange representatives with them, and has the right to determine the manner of organization of its military forces. The distinctive national flag, emblem, and anthem of the BSSR symbolically represent its sovereignty and independence. Furthermore, it was as a sovereign nation that the BSSR became an original charter member of the United Nations.

But is the BSSR really independent? Clearly not. Today the BSSR is hardly more than a colony of Moscow, equivalent in every respect to the "North West Province" as Byelorussia was often called under the Czarist Russia.

In the BSSR, its administration, army, foreign policy, economics, agriculture, education, theater, press, radio and television are all under Moscow's direct control.

According to Moscow's interpretation of sovereignty, the BSSR must become an integral and an inseparable part of the new Soviet Nation. This concept of a Soviet Nation, which now is being observed for the first time in history, can also be called either a "new theory of modern Russian imperialism", or else a "National-Communist-Totalitarianism". Foundations of this theory are the antithesis of the principles expressed by the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence on March 25, 1918 and by the Constitution of the BDR.

This year Moscow began a new campaign against Byelorussian National Institutions. The Central Committee of the Byelorussian Communist Party has issued its grave warning against the apparent "resurgence of Byelorussian Nationalism". The "Teacher's Newspaper" of Feb. 5, 1972, issued in Miensk, reports:

"Particular attention is being given to the question of combating a resurgence of nationalism and nationalistic views. Today, the national question is one of the most crucial elements in the political and ideological struggle between Socialism and Capitalism. The leaders of anti-Communism place an ever increasing emphasis on nationalism and try to use its poisonous weeds against Socialism. Within the USSR the national question no longer remains in such form as it still is in the bourgeois countries and in some others. As a consequence of the Socialist victory, a new historical entity of the Soviet people has arisen—the Soviet Nation."

The author of this article completely agrees with the directives of the Central Committee of the Byelorussian Communist Party. In their understanding a nation is not a permanent factor of social and historical development of the people, nor an organic element of humanity, but rather that the Byelorussian nation, as well as other nations of the USSR, have attained their na-

tionhood only with Russian help after 1918, and that the national liberation of all nations of the USSR must now be considered complete.

The new entity, the "Soviet People", according to Moscow is the only and the most realistic solution to the nationalities problem of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, according to this theory, in the course of history, all non-Russian people of the USSR are supposed to melt and to disappear for the good of the new "entity".

The concept of the "Soviet Nationality" is of course dangerous and alien to the Byelorussian nation; and it is the implementation of this concept, more than anything else, which explains the recurrence of Byelorussian nationalism as described in the "Teacher's Newspaper". "Regeneration" of nationalism is an understandable natural consequence of opposition and of reaction to this "Russian entity." It is very characteristic and significant that the Russian interpretation of Socialism departs ever further from the orthodox concepts of Marxism and historical materialism, and transforms ever closer into purely Russian nationalism.

The intensifying attacks on the Byelorussian national institutions, particularly Byelorussian language, are very apparent, and they do arouse counterreactions from the people. The native language is first of all a means for cultural ties and contacts between whole generations, between the present and the past, and between the present and the future. The alien Russian language which is being forcibly imposed upon the Byelorussian people, if successful, can have the effect of neutralizing these contacts, and in the end may even lead to a cultural collapse of the nation. Finally the very history of a nation without a language of its own is incomplete, uncolorful and ill. In such cases the national culture, particularly for the smaller nations, stops being the central moving force of that nation.

Such is a general plan devised by Russia, for assimilation of all nations enslaved by her. It is however doubtful whether a forced de-nationalization plan, no matter how cleverly conceived, can have much success. There is ample historical evidence that forced assimilation on a large scale never succeeds. This is true especially now in the times of strong nationalistic feelings in much of the world. Forced assimilation attempts only provoke resentment and opposition and lead to ideas and attitudes of the people which no physical force can change. The situation is of course different when a man freely agrees to abandon some of his national principles, but this happens only under conditions of relatively complete political and religious freedom, and when equal economic opportunities exist.

This year also marks the 200th anniversary of the first Russian conquest of Eastern Byelorussia. In 1772 these territories, for the first time in their history, became part of the Russian Empire. Russification began then has not ceased to this day. However the net result of this 200 year long occupation of Byelorussia by aliens, and their constant attempts to eradicate Byelorussian national conscience, is largely a failure. Byelorussian people, especially the peasants, have remained faithful to their national traditions and have preserved their language in its complete purity.

Already in 1962, in his book "Freedom and Foreign Policy", Senator Thomas J. Dodd, was one of the first to note that Russia is not only a captor of nations of Eastern and Central Europe, but in the future will be a real threat to the rest of the world and the United States, and for this reason it is necessary of the United States to help all nations of Eastern Europe in their struggle for freedom.

Senator Dodd wrote as follows:

"But more important we must devise a

carefully thought out policy that will encourage the liberation movements in the captive countries, and we must find ways of sharpening our ideological impact on the enslaved peoples."

"Liberation is indeed a pipe-dream, if the word is used to signify an external initiative using subversive movements under the aegis of Western governments. But it is not a pipe-dream if one accepts a premise that liberation will come from within, that the role of the West must be limited to keeping the spirit of liberation alive through its propaganda and supporting it through its diplomacy."

"Thus the most effective deterrent to Communist expansion in Europe at this juncture would be to place our basic diplomatic emphasis on the ultimate freedom of the captive people of Eastern Europe. If we are not prepared to do so for their sake, then we must do so to save ourselves."

"Liberation does not mean that we confront the Soviets with an ultimatum and launch a war if they reject it. Nor does it mean that we organize subversive movements and foment revolutions in the captive nations. Either proposal would be irresponsible folly, in addition to running counter to our entire tradition. Liberation as I have pointed out, will have to come essentially from within. But what we say and what we do can encourage or discourage the spirit of liberation and, in this sense can exert a decisive influence."

"How do we go about encouraging liberation movement? The first step would be to demonstrate the earnestness of our concern by raising the issue of captive nations at every diplomatic conference and at every United Nations session—"

The thoughts and ideas expressed by Senator Dodd have, in recent years, found their reflections in several resolutions submitted in the House of Representatives.

Last year Congressman John Rarick of Louisiana had introduced a resolution which would have had the United States Ambassador to the United Nations place the question of denial of the right of self-determination, and other human rights violations, including genocide, in the Soviet-occupied Byelorussia on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

More recently, after the expulsion of the Nationalist China from the United Nations, two resolutions were introduced. One sponsored by Congressman Burke of Florida and by over 27 other Congressmen, would question the eligibility of the USSR for membership in the United Nations because Byelorussia has not been a truly independent nation since 1920. The other resolution sponsored by Congressman Zablocki of Wisconsin, would use Byelorussia membership in the United Nations as a leverage to crack open the Soviet block by establishing diplomatic relations with the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

In conclusion we note that the movement for Byelorussia independence is gaining momentum, both within Byelorussia and without, and that the principles of freedom and justice expressed by the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence on March 25, 1918, are approaching their fulfillment.

THE J. EDGAR HOOVER BUILDING

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would name the new Federal Bureau of In-

vestigation building the J. Edgar Hoover Building.

Mr. Hoover has become an institution in law enforcement during his nearly 48 years as Director of the FBI. He has suffered much criticism of late, but that criticism has never overshadowed the contributions of this man who always put service to public above all else.

Over the years, J. Edgar Hoover's name has become synonymous with the FBI. I can think of no finer tribute to him than to have the new home of the Federal Bureau of Investigation bear his name.

Mr. Hoover's contribution to the modernization of law enforcement in the country will never be equaled or forgotten. He has rightly become an institution.

THE UNIONS—EMPLOYERS—AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, for 3 months, two Washington Post staff writers, Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz, examined the state of the labor unions in this country. They have interviewed union leaders and union members alike, as well as businessmen and the general public, so their examination has been both from within and from without. The results of their study have now been published in a series of 10 articles in which they report on what they found.

Mr. Speaker, their reports are an unusually objective and comprehensive insight into the accomplishments and failures of unions, the frustrations and aspirations of union members, and the future role of unions in our industrial society.

The articles are especially timely, in light of the serious disruptions our economy has experienced due to strikes by big unions in the transportation industry.

As chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Labor-Management Relations, which has been working to help the Congress find a viable solution to strike crises, I wish to commend Mr. Johnson and Mr. Kotz for their valuable contribution to the present-day debate over the state of labor unions and their influence on the economy. All Americans should benefit from the information they have gathered.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will insert the 10 articles in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1972]

UNREST AMID RANK AND FILE—I

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

When tough old Sam Gompers was the unchallenged leader of the American labor, he spelled out simply and bluntly his goal for all trade unions: "More."

Over the years, at great cost in energy, effort and bloodshed, the unions broadened their goals, perfected their organizing and bargaining techniques and got more—more members, more wages, more benefits, more legislation, more influence.

Today, with their direct challenge to the President over wage and price controls and

the prospect of a potentially historic conflict between organized labor and the government, the question of union power in America has assumed critical importance. There appears to be no neutral ground. The unions are either the most positive—or negative—force in the country.

Listen to these critics of the unions.

Says Herbert Hill of the NAACP who deals principally with organized labor:

"There's probably no more bureaucratic institution in the United States than organized labor. The most powerful affiliates of the AFL-CIO have simply become narrow protective organizations functioning for a small group of dues payers in a collective bargaining unit. In every industry, organized labor has now carved out an area of control. This is the basis of their strength."

"George Meany is not running a labor movement. George Meany and his colleagues are now businessmen engaged in the business of unions."

A liberal Democratic senator on Capitol Hill:

"They have the power because they have the money and the manpower. There are damn few free men on this Hill."

Malcolm Denise, vice president in charge of labor relations for Ford:

"I think it's fairly obvious that the unions, as institutions sanctioned by the law of the land, have power denied to the employer side."

Unfavorable comment is hardly new to labor leaders. They do not feel they have to plead their case or worth. They think their accomplishments speak for themselves.

"We are the only group in America society—the only organized group—that works day in and day out on a broad range of progressive social and economic issues," says Nat Goldfinger, research director of the AFL-CIO. "There is no other such group in the country. We are the whole solid-core base of progressive social and economic change in America. Without us, there's nothing."

What is new today is a set of conditions that threatens the unions both from without and within.

The problems are political, economic and, in an almost indefinable way, psychological. Taken together, they add up to hard times in the house of labor.

"Politically, you don't need any special clairvoyance to understand that at the present time the President of the United States is going against big labor," said Edward Carrough, president of the Sheet Metal Workers union. "We're the substitute for the Red Scare. I think we're as threatened legislatively and politically in this presidential election as we were in 1948. And I think on labor issues this is the most important election we've had."

This spring's dramatic developments, when union leaders walked off the Pay Board denouncing the President and the President quickly and forcefully picked up their challenge, underscore the seriousness of the present situation. They pose the threat of open labor-management, labor-government conflict—strikes, injunctions and court suits—across the country.

A leader in the building trades unions, still the heart of the AFL-CIO, described the main problem facing the unions differently.

"Right now," said Robert Georgine, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO's building trades department, "this is probably the most critical time the building trades have had since their inception, since 1908."

He was referring to the increasing use of nonunion labor across the country and the general economic problems facing the construction industry.

Other union leaders talk about other problems: the export of jobs to overseas markets and the import of foreign goods; personnel changes on the Supreme Court and such agencies as the National Labor Relations

Board, raising the possibility of new restrictions on organized labor; shifts away from blue-collar employment, accelerating use of automation with machines replacing men, and the rise of white-collar and service industries—all holding critical significance for the future of the unions.

Added to these are two related factors. One is what appears to be increasing hostility toward unions, as measured in public opinion surveys. In the recent surveys, for instance, 64 per cent of the public felt that union leadership is doing only a fair or poor job in meeting its responsibilities to the public as well as to its own members. The other involves big business. Some businessmen believe the present climate offers the greatest opportunity since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act a quarter of a century ago to curb what they regard as an imbalance of power between labor and management.

All of these problems, internal and external, will be examined in a series of articles, of which this is the first.

THE USES OF POWER

In these articles we will report on how labor uses its power politically, legislatively and economically; how its influence extends, no matter which party is in power, into all areas of the executive branch; how businessmen are attempting to organize quietly to change what they consider crippling union abuses.

We will explore, also, the changing attitudes of young workers toward the unions, toward union leaders and politics and toward work. These changing attitudes pose a special kind of problem for the unions, for manufacturing companies and for a society oriented toward the consumption of goods. They have produced incidents of industrial sabotage and increasing use of hard drugs in factories.

These articles are the result of three months of travel through the country conducting tape-recorded interviews, nearly all of them on the record, with a score of international union presidents and with labor leaders from George Meany down to workers in their homes and on the job. Accompanying each article will be verbatim extracts from men in labor's ranks as well as from leading business and other public figures who deal with the unions.

We begin with a primer:

1. The federal government lists more than 80 million Americans currently in the work force. Under 20 million—fewer than one out of every four workers—are members of unions. Union membership in the total work force actually has been declining.

These facts are vital for the unions in several respects. It means they represent a distinct minority of the work force—and thus wield a power far out of proportion to their total membership. (One union official, for instance, pointed out that the unions, although representing less than a fourth of all American workers, had all the labor representatives on the Pay Board. That, he suggested, clearly means that George Meany is the second most important man in the United States, ranking only behind the President in power and influence.)

But those figures also mean the unions are not growing, and historically their vigor and influence have depended on their ability to organize new members. This conflict figures in a fundamental debate today about the role of the unions.

When we asked George Meany, for example, if he wasn't concerned that the percentage of union members in the work force has been fairly static or declining in recent years, he answered: "To me, it doesn't mean a thing. I have no concern about it . . ."

Others inside the labor movement are in deep disagreement with that point of view.

2. While the public has the impression that union membership includes the poorer element of society, the fact is that most

union members are now earning at least \$3 to \$5 an hour. A secondary labor market of some 11½ million workers is not affiliated with unions. Their income is far below the union member's. They are, in truth, the poor working man in America.

VIOLENCE BETWEEN UNIONS

3. Another impression has to do with union strife and reports of violence, usually associated with strikes that affect the public. Actually, the greatest union strife lies solely within the trade union family. Jurisdictional battles pit one union against another for control of a job or market. As Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, remarked:

"This is something that is going on in hundreds and hundreds of communities every single day of the week and every single day of the year. I don't think there's any statistic anybody could compile that would give an actual picture of the time and energy and everything else that's wasted and lost in these jurisdictional fights between unions. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of man-hours, with all the countless thousands of dollars behind every one of those man-hours, are involved where two unions are battling for one plant or five unions are trying to organize the same group of workers."

A business agent from another union in Florida expressed the same problem, but less philosophically.

"We have these jurisdictional disputes over different areas of work," said Joe Valdastris of Sheet Metal Workers' Local 223. "And it's back and forth and back and forth until finally we come to a showdown on the job site where three or four or five hundred men get into it with two-by-fours and pipes. We've had two of those in the last three years."

"It certainly doesn't help the building trades as a whole to come together. The people out there are beating each other's brains in."

"My personal opinion is if you're going to do something like that, get out there on a nonunion job and run the goddamn rats off rather than fight among yourselves. If you're gonna fight, go out there and chase someone else."

As we will show in later articles, those are not words of braggadocio alone. Violence, complete with bombings and shootings, are a fact of life on some non-union job sites today.

WHAT THE WEALTH MEANS

4. There is no question that unions have great power. Total union wealth runs into the billions of dollars. The unions collect anywhere from \$75 million to \$100 million a month in dues. They have big pension funds and huge investments in real estate, banks, hotels, motels, transit lines and life insurance companies.

Yet all that wealth does not accurately depict the individual standing of a union member himself. An auto worker in Detroit, for example, the highest paid factory work, averages \$10,000 a year—and has very little economic margin for survival. We have found sheetmetal workers, living in a far less costly area, who have been averaging over \$20,000 a year. At the same time, there are union members working in the most expensive American city—New York—trying to live on \$72 a week.

And for all the union's undeniable power in so many areas, union leaders in Washington inevitably argue that their power is not equal to that of the corporations.

"Our power is inadequate," said Tom Harris, AFL-CIO counsel and one of George Meany's closest associates. "The maldistribution of wealth has grown worse since 1940. The success of the labor unions should be measured on the redistribution of wealth. We haven't accomplished that since 1940."

"The place where we have lost, basically, is in the tax laws. Wilbur Mills has thrown us an occasional bone, but that's all. The power of the corporations is in Ways and Means and Finance congressional committees and that's where we lose."

5. Ideologically, the unions are caught between two irreconcilable views. To some businessmen and conservatives, the unions are militant or radical power brokers for the left, the heart of the liberal legislative lobby on Capitol Hill. To liberals and the left, the unions are often regarded as one of the most reactionary forces in America, a special interest group concerned only with money and defending the Establishment, whether it be on the issues of the war or student protest or permitting itself to be used as a cover for secret CIA financing.

To some extent, both criticisms are valid. Liberals, who are interested in reforming American institutions, see labor as conservative and hidebound despite the role it takes in lobbying for liberal legislation or backing liberal senators for office. Many rank-and-file union members, however, think their union leadership should be working primarily on money issues for workers. They aren't for such liberal causes as defending busing and fighting for civil rights legislation.

A key internal debate among top union leaders today centers around those points of view. One side argues that the unions should revert to their old role, as enunciated by Sam Gompers, of getting "more" for the workers—more meat and potatoes, that is, and less social action. That the unions have been getting more economically and still leading the liberal coalition—all the while being sharply criticized from either flank—is merely another indication of the complexity of organized labor as an institution.

6. Again depending on the cast of mind, labor leadership is often pictured as sterile and monolithic. Much of it is. But it may come as a surprise to some businessmen that top labor leaders often express the same kinds of complaints and concerns as do corporation vice presidents.

These union men are deeply disturbed about the ability of business to remain competitive, and equally concerned about such questions as productivity and poor quality of workmanship.

"We have very serious productivity problems," one international union president said. "I watch the building trades unions and I'm very distressed about several aspects. If you tried you couldn't get a union guy to come in and work on your house, if you own a house. And if you try to build a public building without union guys that's equivalent to gang rape in the White House. The unions and the contractors are gangling up on the * * * consumer, and they're not only killing the consumer but killing the industry and killing the workers and lousing up housing and so on."

RANK-AND-FILE UNREST

Ironically, the day may come when some of labor's most severe critics of the present will yearn for the return of these older men who are leading the unions today. The next wave of unionists promises to be a far different breed—less wedded to the old trade union principles, less certain about the merits of the free enterprise system, less concerned about the old values of pride in craft and work, more independent, more demanding, more insistent on change now. Yet they also could turn out to be more attuned to a rapidly changing society.

Already, union leaders who came up in another era are finding it increasingly difficult to control their own rank and file. They cite lack of union discipline, poor attendance at meetings, increasing wildcat strikes, and rising numbers of cases of rank-and-file members overturning contract recommendations of the leadership.

Something new is stirring among today's workers, particularly the young. Although it is difficult to generalize about so large and diverse a group, nothing struck us more strongly than to discover just how different those young workers really are. Yet many top union and management leaders do not fully recognize what is taking place in their ranks. A communications problem exists at high echelons of both. There are some, of course, who express concern. Two of the most thoughtful union men we met tried to put what's happening to the worker in perspective.

"What goes on everywhere else, goes on inside the union," said Victor Gottbaum, who heads the New York local of the fastest growing union in America, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. "So if there is unrest among the young and the blacks, you'll find that unrest amongst the trade union movement itself."

"You can't escape it, it's too big an institution. This manifests itself in interesting ways. For instance, I read in the paper about young workers recently stopping that General Motors plant. It's understandable. There's a restlessness that's very hard to define among young workers today."

THE DOWNGRADING OF WORK

In Washington, Nat Goldfinger pointed to another dimension of that young worker discontent.

"I think the public attitude toward the worker has declined substantially," he said, "and the American worker is now looked down upon on the radio and television and news media generally. You make fun of the plumber and the carpenter and the working man. Well, why the hell should he put out?"

"Who in American society in the past 15 or 20 years pays any attention to the importance of skilled manual work? The emphasis in society has been on the Ph.D. degree, upon the mathematician, the scientist, the engineer and so forth."

"I use words which sound kind of phony—the dignity and honor of manual work—but I think all of this has been very sharply downgraded in the society."

"And most recently you find it in all the fun that's poked at the hard hats. The hard hat is the bigot, the racist, the sexist, the male chauvinist pig. He's viewed almost as the enemy within."

"And why should he put out? He knows what he's doing, he knows what he's contributing. He's working hard and he also has a keen sense. Maybe he overplays the extent to which he's being imposed upon by society. But the other thing is the pressures of society are mostly focused on him. He's the guy that bears the brunt for racial integration, for all of these social and economic changes—automation in the plant, changes in the neighborhood and schools. The urban crisis impinges most directly on him."

"And so with all these kinds of things—as well as the fact that his individual contribution to the product he makes is slight and that he feels divorced and alienated from that product—there may well be a changing attitude toward work in this country."

The situation he describes poses new problems not only for labor and management, but for the American people as well.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1972]

TODAY'S WORKER: "IDEALISM'S GONE"—II

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

Stan Geist is only 30 years old, but like so many union officials he sees something new and disturbing developing among the young workers he represents.

"It's the young guy who's taking off," said Geist, secretary-treasurer of a large United Auto Workers local in Detroit. "We don't have any answers. They have the 'I don't care' attitude."

attitude. They know they've got to work, but when they wait a day off they want a day off and they don't care about anything else.

"The young guy wants it all without the overtime. And I think it's something that society has created. We've created it. You, me, we all created it."

What Geist was saying was echoed by virtually every other union leader interviewed who deals most closely with rank-and-file workers. Their explanations about what's happening—and why—differ, but they all add up to the same general point of view:

"He's a new breed. He hasn't lived through hard times. He's not a follower. You don't have followers today. You've got a bunch of disbelievers down there. . . ."

"Yesterday's were career people. Today, they're not. . . ."

"I think the problem is the idealism's gone. The worker who comes into a ready-made union is different from the one who builds it. . . ."

"The younger workers today don't have the pride in craft like the older people. There's more going for the younger kid. The car, the TV, the party time. They don't have the consideration toward the union like they did in the past. Talk union to them and they'll say, 'What'd the union ever do for me? They just take my eight or nine dollars and that's all.' They don't remember how our forefathers used to fight for us."

If the young workers we met are a true cross-section, all these comments by their elders are valid. Yet they do not begin to reflect the dimension of the differences.

Indeed, perhaps the most striking conclusion after interviewing union leaders and members these last three months is the degree to which young workers today share common attitudes with the far more publicized—and favored—young college students. Call it what you will—counterculture, drug culture, anti-establishment feeling or youth rebellion—the same forces are moving and motivating both groups.

There are, however, two important differences between them. Even though they far outnumber their collegiate contemporaries, the young workers receive much less public attention. And their frustrations are much more intense.

The young worker, after all, didn't go to Harvard or Berkeley. If he goes beyond high school at all, he often attends a small community college before entering the blue-collar work force to perform some of the hardest, dirtiest jobs in America.

These facts are important to any understanding of the turmoil and tension—the absenteeism, the increasing drug use in factories, the cases of industrial sabotage, the problems of quality and productivity—that exist in so many work places today. What comes through clearly after talking to these workers is the enormous dissatisfaction they feel about their jobs. In effect, they too are rebelling against the system—whether it is a system personified by their union or company official or society in general.

Nowhere is this more prevalent than on the mass-production factory lines.

"The problem on the factory line is that the job controls the man," says Doug Fraser, a top UAW official. "It's different from a job in which a man can put in some initiative. I don't know what will help. Absenteeism runs 12 per cent on Saturday despite 1½-time pay. That should be a message. Guys won't give away their social life or their free time for \$50 or \$60 a day."

A DIFFERENT LIFE STYLE

Paradoxically, that young worker wants more—and less. He wants more cash, now. Fringe benefits as such are not that important. But he also wants more free time and a different life style. Material possessions do not seem all that important. If he can't get the time, he'll often just take off from the job.

Down in Florida, Mike Marshall, 26, a sheet-metal worker, expressed a common attitude. He had been averaging more than \$15,000 a year for the last few years, Marshall was saying, but last year his income dropped to around \$10,000. It wasn't the economy; it was Marshall's own choice.

"See, I only made 10 last year," he said, "but that's because I took time off myself. I took off because I wanted to. I'd just lay around and take it easy. I have a little bit of money put away and I thought, 'What happens if I'm not here tomorrow? I might as well enjoy what I have.' So I decided to take some time off and lounge and take it easy. I have some property and a horse and I messed around there a little bit."

Obviously, such an attitude creates problems for both union and management. It also leads to internal friction between older and younger workers on the job.

Almost without exception, the older workers we interviewed expressed strong resentment against their younger colleagues. One night in Detroit while talking to a group of older and younger auto workers, for instance, the conversation became so heated that two of the men were practically at each other's throats.

The older worker resents many things: what he thinks is the young man's lack of appreciation for how hard it used to be, and how hard he has worked all his life; the wages and benefits the younger man seems to take for granted; the drug use that he believes endangers his own safety, and the new attitudes about work itself. But most of all, he resents being affected by the absentee rate among the younger workers.

He wants to send his children to college so they can have a better life, but finds it increasingly difficult with inflation and his basic income. The younger worker faces the same economic woes. Inflation hits him severely, too. On his average salary of \$10,000 a year, he has a hard time buying a home. In fact, contrary to the popular attitude that today's industrial worker has it made and lives a life of affluence with a boat, two cars, a vacation home in the country, Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that the real income of the factory worker has declined in the last five years.

But the older man feels the pressure most acutely of all, while his younger colleague doesn't seem that interested in material questions alone.

"You take a lot of these younger workers now," said Louis Johnson, a 26-year veteran of the automobile assembly line. "They hire in and they say the hell with it. They say you can take this job and you know what you can do with it. They'll walk off. So that hits me."

"Today they're short of welders. So I go and weld. Well, tomorrow they're short of a man in the grinding booth. Then the next day I'll be over in mill finishing. But time comes for a cutback, I'm the one that gets hurt. The younger man, he gets the job. He gets the gravy that I worked 26 years for."

The young worker's complaint is simple. He says he hates the job, particularly the monotonous factory job. At times he hates it so much that he deliberately will throw a monkey wrench in the machinery, or turn to drugs to escape the boredom. To him, whether the job is better than it used to be or pays more and gives greater benefits is beside the point.

"NOTHING BUT THE TOOL"

Those are, of course, sweeping generalizations, but they are the common denominators of the young factory workers we met. They feel, as James Humphrey, 26, said in Detroit, "nothing but a tool."

But let the experience of one man speak for them all.

Tom Armstead, 28, began working on the auto assembly line seven years ago after getting out of the Army. Armstead, who is

black, was a member of the union and eventually was promoted to foreman. Along the way, he encountered all the problems described in fragmentary form by others.

"Payroll and everything is done by numbers from the minute you hire in here," he was saying. "I was 9374. Names are not important. After 17 months at Warren truck, I was transferred to Plymouth. There I am, a new man in a strange plant. . . ."

"I got there in plenty of time, but as a result of parking in the wrong parking lot, going in the wrong entrance, and going through the maze of departments, I was 12 minutes late. I walked in and I said, 'Is this department 9175?' And he said, 'Yeah.' And I said, 'I'm Tom Armstead. I'm supposed to report here this morning?' And he said, 'Hey, do you know what time we start to work here?' And I said, 'Yes, sir. I was under the impression that we started at 6:12.' So he said, 'That's right. How come you're late?' So I said, 'Well, sir, it's the first time I've been here. I got lost trying to find the office.'"

"And he said, 'Fire him!' And I say, 'Hey, you can't fire me. I've got seniority.' And he said, 'Where are you transferred from?' I said, 'Warren truck.' And he said, 'Well, god-damn it, I don't know how they work it at Warren truck, but you come here every day on time.' And I kept trying to tell him I make a point of being on time."

THE REAL PROBLEMS BEGIN

Much later, Armstead was promoted to foreman. That's when his real problems began. He said both whites and blacks resented his being put ahead of them. After that, he said, "I started applying more pressure in the areas of quality and workmanship—and they [the other workers] started applying their own pressure." He encountered a series of sabotage incidents on the assembly line.

"They would do things like turn the air pressure off in the chute for the tires to come down and call me and say the chute broke. So I'd call the repair man to look at it, and they'd say the air's not turned on. . . . But in the engine room the line would have to be stopped and I would have to let five or six jobs go on without tires."

"Another thing they used to do was a job called the W-500. It's a large four-wheel drive vehicle. They would take a two-by-four and jam it down in the line so I couldn't see it. And when the cradle came by, it would hit the 2-by-4 and throw it out of kilt. The line would be shut down. It would cost us \$2,000 a minute."

"So it took me a few months to learn all the tricks of the trade."

But in the end that wasn't enough for Armstead.

The "feeling with me was that every waking moment—my whole life—revolved around that lousy job," he said. "I'd get up in the morning at 4:30, eat and get myself together, drive to work. Work started at 6:20. I'd get home at 3:30 or 3:45, read a newspaper, have dinner and go to bed. It seemed that every waking minute was involved in that job. On Saturdays and Sundays, you'd spend the whole weekend dreading Mondays."

Four months ago Armstead quit. He now works for an anti-poverty program in Detroit.

THE INCIDENCE OF SABOTAGE

As with the drug problem, described in more detail in two accompanying interviews, there seems to be no way of documenting how serious—or how minor—industrial sabotage is today. That it can—and does—happen at times from plant to plant is hardly disputable.

"Now the whole question of sabotage, you probably won't believe this, but this is not a new technique," said Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers union. "There has to be some control to it some place, I suppose."

"I remember a plant up in Flint that had a lot of sabotage and I went up there and

I met with the union leadership, and I said to them, 'I know you have nothing to do with this, but it would be very useful if the sabotage stopped. It would give us the opportunity to work out these problems.' And sure enough the God-damned sabotage stopped for 10 months.

"And I'm sure General Motors was convinced, since I could go up there and make a speech and stop it, that obviously I had something to do with starting it, controlling it, planning it, whatever. But when you get a wave of hatred in a plant, it communicates itself into guys doing all sorts of imaginative things just to take it out. They do it in some very, very ingenious ways."

"JUST LET IT SLIDE"

However serious the cases of sabotage, drugs and absenteeism may be, they are only symptomatic of a larger problem. That is what appears to be a changing attitude toward work among so many young people today.

Occasionally a worker will articulate something that goes beyond a specific gripe about his job or his union.

Fred DiSisto, a 33-year-old sewage treatment worker and shop steward of his union local in New York City, put in a larger perspective.

If you try to do a job, a man is just beaten down so much that he eventually gives up," he said. "He's one man against the whole system. It's just too much."

"I have to admit I was a little more conscientious about the job than I am now. But I gave up. You keep pounding your head against the wall and you don't get anywhere. It's not the nature of the work. It's just what we call the system today."

DiSisto spoke of a number of incidents to show what he meant.

Then he added:

"They've made it so the guy doesn't worry or doesn't care or have pride in his work. He's worried about the good old buck. I think this is the reason why unions were able to get as powerful as they are. Because this was the main object in everybody's mind. You know, 'Look at what we've done for you. We've doubled your salary in 10 years.' They push for the money, money, money. And they seem to think that'll keep us happy."

"At one time it did make us happy because we weren't making that much. But I think we've reached a plateau where we just about squeezed everything out of it that we can."

Like Tom Armstead, Fred DiSisto is thinking of finding something else. He'd like to move far out into the country where the taxes are low.

"See, I like to hunt and fish," he said. "I like to get into the woods somewhere where I could be next to Mother Nature, so to speak."

He's another reminder of the point made by I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America.

"I think the main problems of the trade union movement," Abel said, "are the problems of society. I don't find it easy to sort out that segment of society known as labor. I think we're a part of society, and a large segment of it, and our problems are similar."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1972]

FOR YOUNG WORKERS, OLD LEADERS—

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

Eddie Carlough wears his hair long and his clothing style mod. Some of his fellow international union presidents tell him he shouldn't wear sandals and body shirts to AFL-CIO Executive Council meetings in Miami Beach, but Carlough laughs off the criticism. He's closer to his young union members than they are, he says. And indeed, at 39 Carlough is one of the youngest union presidents in the country.

When asked how you get to be president of a big union, Carlough replied:

"I'd say the best way is to have a president who is the best president in the history of our union, well loved, who nominates you to succeed him—and who also happens to be your father."

Carlough laughed. Then he said:

"I think that's the best system, although there may be other systems."

Carlough was not speaking only in jest. He explained how he happened to succeed his father as president of the large and powerful Sheet Metal Workers Union:

"My father would have been re-elected unanimously in Atlantic City in 1970 and I suppose he could have run again and been elected and then stepped down and the board would have named me. But when he stepped down it was very open. There was plenty of time for anyone to object and the floor was open for nominations."

Carlough was the only man nominated. There were 737 delegates at the Sheet Metal Workers convention. Not a single delegate voted against young Carlough. It was unanimous.

Carlough's case is not unusual. Two things characterize the make-up of the AFL-CIO's Executive Council, composed of the international union presidents who form labor's leadership elite—old age and nepotism.

John Lyons, president of the Iron Workers Union, succeeded his father, S. Frank (Bud) Raftery, president of the Painters' Union, succeeded his father, Maurice A. Hutcheson, president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, succeeded his father.

Hutcheson will be 75 next month. Patrick E. Gorman, president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters' Union, will be 80 later this year. Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, is 78. A. Philip Randolph, president emeritus of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, is 83. Richard F. Walsh, president of the Theatrical and Machine Operations Union, is 72. Joseph D. Kennan, secretary of the international Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, is 76. Louis Stulberg, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, is 71. Six years ago, he succeeded David Dubinsky, under whom he served as union secretary. Dubinsky is now 80.

At the top of them all is the most powerful man in organized labor, George Meany. The AFL-CIO president is now 78.

Meany is only the third man to hold the presidency of the American Federation of Labor since it was formed in 1886. Samuel Gompers, the first president, died in office in 1924 at the age of 72. He was succeeded by William Green, who died in office in 1952 at the age of 82. Meany, who served as Green's principal assistant for 12 years, has been president since then.

He says he has no intention of stepping down. "I decide if I'm too old," he said in an interview. He also said: "If my health stays good and I feel like it, I'll stay in. And very frankly I think I'd know if there was a movement to push me out within the organization."

JOBS FOR RELATIVES

The mentality of the old days of the family store, when a father automatically turned over the business to a son, lives on in the unions. Friends and relatives are rewarded with jobs.

George Meany, for instance, has three married daughters. All of his sons-in-law are doing union business.

Robert Mayer, husband of his daughter Regina, is a partner in the AFL-CIO's law firm, J. Albert Woll. Mayer is also on the board of the National Bank of Washington, the bank that is owned by the United Mine Workers Union.

John (Jack) Lutz, husband of Meany's daughter Genevieve, is assistant to the direc-

tor of the AFL-CIO's union label and services trades department.

Ernest Lee, husband of Meany's daughter Eileen, is executive assistant to the director of the international affairs department of the AFL-CIO.

Both Lutz and Lee have been put on the union payroll since Meany became AFL-CIO president.

Few union officials will acknowledge publicly that their leadership is too old or out of touch or that a pattern of nepotism exists. Age alone, they will say, is not the criterion; ability is the only meaningful measurement of the leader. They insist they have strong and able leaders.

A rare word of open criticism from within labor's hierarchy came from Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the fastest-growing union in America.

"I think it has to be said," Wurf said. "The problem is this. When you think that at 52 I'm one of the youngest men who occupies a position of substance in the national union structure—and I think I'm the youngest vice president on the AFL-CIO, although Lane Kirkland's probably younger than I am—but between the two of us we have a monopoly on youth, which is kind of ridiculous. A lot of my colleagues are products of an era and an environment that is no longer in existence."

Wurf went on to say:

"One of the things that troubles me in my own union is that our older staff guys tend to talk to the workers with a dialogue that was created during the depression, or created by the generation that immediately followed the depression and was seriously affected by it."

"The common American worker doesn't know what the hell we're talking about and has given up trying to understand. He does not relate to us and we don't relate to him, and we've got to be very careful about this."

"In essence, the kind of complaint I have heard is simply the inability of leadership—some leadership, not all—to communicate and relate to those who are their constituencies. And this is a process that's not related to labor. As somebody who's interested in the political processes in this country, I see the same thing going on. I see the same thing going on in the academic community."

"In 1936, the fathers of most workers were terribly grateful for a union official telling them where a job is. In 1972, an American worker likes to think that he's paying and that the union official has a responsibility for delivering pork chops. Instead of relating to him or serving him or being responsible to him, he's not sure the union official isn't patronizing him. And if he thinks he's patronizing him, he resents it."

Many other criticisms are leveled at top union leadership. Some of the sharpest come from inside the union ranks. They range from charges that the AFL-CIO is sterile and stultified in its outlook to arguments that it is reactionary in positions on major national issues, particularly foreign affairs.

WHY THE UAW LEFT

Irving Bluestone, a top official of the United Auto Workers, the second largest union in the country, explained why the UAW broke with the AFL-CIO by saying: "The AFL-CIO in our judgment had become stultified. It was no longer a cause. It was a kind of business." Bluestone also said: "When you talk about the AFL-CIO, the things that you see are static, rigid."

Victor Reuther, brother of the late UAW President Walter Reuther and like him a leader on the union, was most critical of the AFL-CIO's foreign policy positions.

"George Meany has been to the right of every Secretary of State and every President from Foster Dulles and Eisenhower on. And that is very sad."

"I believe in the field of world affairs, the trade union movement ought to be the same forward-looking and progressive influence which it is on domestic policy. But that tragically has not been the case with the AFL-CIO.

"I think there are several reasons for this. One is that foreign affairs has long been treated as very personal prerogative of the AFL-CIO president and his advisor [Jay Lovestone].

"I found, for instance, this particularly pointed at a time when Nixon at long last recognizes there are 800 million Chinese who are in existence on the mainland. This is perhaps the only positive thing I know of that Mr. Nixon's done in recent years in the field of foreign affairs.

"To have the AFL-CIO condemn him for it is appalling to me."

Herbert Hill, labor director of the NAACP, raised another critical area—the problem of union democracy and the strong internal control exercised by Meany.

"Local union autonomy is a phony sacred cow in the AFL-CIO," Hill said. "When they don't want to do something, they invoke the notion of local union autonomy. And you can quote me on this point. But when Meany wants to act, he doesn't know anything about local union autonomy, or autonomy with international unions."

GEORGE MEANY ON YOUTH

Perhaps the most common criticism of union leaders, though, concerns their age and attitudes. As in other critical areas, George Meany figures as the largest target. Most of the labor leaders we interviewed praised Meany as vigorous and in touch with—if not actually ahead of—rank and file union members. But Meany does have his union critics. Some are willing to speak publicly.

Victor Gotbaum, who heads the New York operation of Jerry Wurf's union, was talking about this in his office. "Have you seen Meany's Labor Day statement two years ago about American youth?" he asked. "It's a classic." Gotbaum reached into his desk drawer, pulled out a copy of Meany's statement, and began quoting it aloud.

"By what stretch of imagination can you say that a 20-year-old kid knows what is wrong with the world and what should be done about it. . . ."

Gotbaum interrupted his reading to say, "It gets worse," and then continued quoting Meany.

"Especially when you see the behavior of the kids. There is more venereal disease among them than there was in my time, and it's going up all the time. There are more of them smoking pot and to say that they have long beards and look dirty and smell dirty, that they are better qualified to run the world than the older generation, that to me is a lot of baloney."

Gotbaum stopped, and gave his own response. "Is he that bad? No. But the extent of animosity, the lack of understanding of what is hitting the kids, is so acute here. How the hell are they going to understand the kids' restlessness? How are they going to understand the feeling that an affluent society doesn't seem to be paying off enough for them in the belt-line process that they inherited? Well, the job isn't that important. You can't do this to them."

The differences between those attitudes of the older union leader and the young workers we described yesterday are immense. The young workers often express strong disagreement with the policies of their international union presidents on everything from Vietnam to politics and progressive social legislation.

Take the question of the war. While George Meany has been stoutly defending American involvement in Vietnam under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the rank and file is by no means solidly behind him.

"I don't believe in giving anything to North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or nobody," said Rick Foshia, in Detroit. "I don't believe in being over there in the first place because they ain't done nothing to me. Them South Vietnamese ain't done nothing to me. The * * * done nothing to me. Leave them people alone. If they want to fight a war, let them fight it."

MEAT-AND-POTATOES REVOLT

Discontent in the ranks poses difficult problems for all labor leaders. It is common to hear leaders complaining that they find it increasingly hard to control their men.

"There is a real generational upsurge among business agents, local union officers," says AFL-CIO research director Nat Goldfinger. "Part of the somewhat wild and weird wage movements in the building trades in the past three or four years is related to this. It's an upsurge of meat-and-potatoes kids who are coming in and upsetting the old leadership and tossing out contracts."

"The emphasis is on now—on 'We want whatever we can get right now'—and no concern for cost or other things like that."

His comment points up two other significant things about union leadership. The unions are far from being static. Even if the young workers are frustrated about taking over the top positions, there are ferment and aggressive action throughout the ranks. It is, of course, a healthy sign of vitality.

But even that raises another dilemma for present top union leaders. Ideologically, there is solid evidence that many young workers do not agree with continuing pressures for much domestic social legislation of the type for which the unions have fought so long and so hard.

Nothing bothers the old-time unionist more than the belief that today's young worker may not support the liberal causes which the older man regards as perhaps the union's finest achievements—not only for the trade union movement, but for the country.

"There's never been any question in my mind that on something like integrated housing I, for example, didn't reflect the views of a majority of our members," said Doug Fraser, who was narrowly defeated by Leonard Woodcock for the UAW presidency. "I happen to be for busing. I suppose if you took a vote of my constituents I'd probably lose by about 90 per cent on that."

"Then that poses a philosophical question: what is the role of a leader? Is the role of a leader to echo the opinions or the prejudices of his constituents? I don't think so. I think the role of a leader is to lead—and you do it at your own peril. It's like the language of the United States Constitution. You govern with the consent of the governed, and if they are too unhappy with you on too many issues, I suppose they throw you out."

Fraser perhaps touched on a fundamental point about union leadership. For all the criticisms and all the animosities aroused merely by the word "unions," organized labor in America represents a unique force in America, and indeed the world.

Jerry Wurf put it best.

"You've got to understand something fundamental about the American labor movement," he said. "Every labor movement in and economic philosophy. Some of them are Socialist. Some of them are Christian Socialist. In many societies there's a competition between Communist unions and socialistic unions."

"In the United States, you've got something else. It's obvious and everybody takes it for granted. You have a labor movement that ideologically buys capitalism, that ideologically buys the system. That makes our labor movement different."

Unless you understand that, Wurf added, you cannot possibly understand Meany. In fact, he said, "George Meany is one of the most understood men in America."

Virtually everyone who has been close to

Meany makes the same point. In his strengths and weaknesses, Meany personifies the labor movement. Stubborn, proud, vain, at times arrogant, Meany represents an older period in American life. The young people who attack him so bitterly for his anti-Communist stands or his unceasing support for the President—of whatever name or party—in a time of national crisis do him a disservice. George Meany believes in the system, in the flag and in the country.

The forces that shaped him—an alltime successful lobbyist in New York State during a period when he successfully fought a Communist attempt to take over the unions, the threat of fascism in Germany, the necessity to stand behind the Chief Executive on an issue of war and peace—are all present in his outlook today.

Meany can reminisce with touching eloquence about the pride of being a working man, and how that seems to have changed today.

"There's such a thing as a worker's pride in his work," he said in an interview, "which I know quite a bit about. To me as a young fellow this was all-important. This was *really*—well, you almost worshipped the skilled mechanic. I mean, you'd look at an older man as if he were almost God because of his tremendous skill."

"And there was one thing I recall in my younger days—you never wanted to be disgraced. If you were fired for doing shoddy work, you were disgraced. If you got fired for being unable to produce the proper type of installation or do it properly, boy, that was a disgrace!"

"Around the trade, a fellow who got into that situation was dubbed a boot. Nobody ever wanted to be called a boot."

A MEMORABLE TOAST

The same kind of unquestionable conviction comes through when he talks about Vietnam. He was speaking critically about Richard Nixon, when he brought up Vietnam and said: "I think he wants to end the war, I don't think there's any question. I think he wants to end it honorably. I don't think he wants to bug out and run, and as far as I'm concerned he's right."

Those who know him best say one trait characterizes George Meany. He likes a man who is "regular"—in other words, who is dependable. Only if you understand that, his closest associates insist, can you put the historic open break between Meany and President Nixon in perspective. Meany privately believes, these men say, that Mr. Nixon did not treat him "straight."

They say the first of a series of events that affected their relationship came on a Labor Day celebration two years ago when the President invited the heads of organized labor and their wives to the White House. It was supposedly the first time in history that such a Labor Day event had been held in the White House.

In a long toast to the President, spoken in his familiar Bronx accent, Meany reviewed his personal acquaintances with every President since Franklin D. Roosevelt. As he reached the end of his toast, Meany referred to President Nixon in these words: "FDR was just as tricky a politician as anyone who bore the name of Tricky Dick. And let me tell you about Lyndon, who was no slouch as a politician."

He closed by saying: "They all had one thing in common. They wanted to be the best President possible for the American people."

Meany was infuriated to learn that the White House had made a verbatim transcript of his toast that was circulated widely throughout the country. He felt it was an attempt to demean him and a betrayal on the part of the administration.

NIXON'S AFL-CIO APPEARANCE

Over the months, as the economic situation worsened nationally, Meany and the

President drew farther apart. One of his aides describes what was happening this way.

"Meany was furious about a number of things. He felt Nixon hadn't leveled with him. He had invited him two months before [to attend the AFL-CIO's convention in Miami Beach last fall] and never heard from him. Then a flunky called and wanted an appearance the next day."

That was the famous meeting where Meany appeared to slight the President, and labor leaders firmly believe they had been "set up" to appear bad by the White House.

"Meany was also sore that the wage-price freeze was sprung on him. A [White House] flunky called up an hour before Nixon announced the freeze and said 'You ought to watch the speech on TV.'"

Next came word that Federal Judge George Boldt was under consideration to head the Pay Board. "Someone told Meany, 'You don't have to worry. He's not qualified and won't be appointed,'" the Meany aide recalls.

"The next thing you know he was appointed. George was mad."

The final break when Meany led other union leaders off the Pay Board last month was inevitable. At 78, after a lifetime of battles, George Meany was heading into what could well be the greatest political fight of his life.

But political battles are nothing new in the House of Labor. If anything, the unions are preeminent practitioners of the art of politics. Politics is where they all live.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1972]

POLITICS AND LABOR'S "MACHINE"—IV

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

The meeting took place, as many of them do, in a private room of the Sheraton Carlton Hotel two blocks from the White House. Present were a senator and his assistants and the principal political operatives of the major unions.

"Al had called the meeting," said one of the union representatives present that day, referring to Alexander E. Barkan, director of the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education. "And Al said, as he usually does, 'We all know why we're here. Sen. (Lee) Metcalf (D-Mont.) is here and I've pledged the senator \$10,000 to give him an indication of how we feel about his campaign. He knows if we collect more than that we'll try to do better, but we have a lot of other senators, too.'"

"Senator, will you tell the fellows what committee is set up that can appropriately take money for your campaign?"

Reports of this meeting came from a number of sources. James O'Brien, the political director of the United Steelworkers' Union, with offices in Washington, was present and confirmed that the meeting was typical of sessions between the unions and political candidates. The AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE), of which he is a member, meets regularly to discuss campaign strategy and financing with candidates seeking their support.

In the case of Sen. Metcalf, O'Brien's own union, the Steelworkers, was an important factor because, as O'Brien says, "we are the largest union in the West and in Montana." And Metcalf, O'Brien went on, was especially deserving of organized labor's support because "he has championed the cause of the small farmer and of the consumer, and has fought the big utilities. The utility companies will be pouring money from all over the country to try to beat him. He's the kind of senator who requires special help in running against the special interests."

The meeting wasn't just an AFL-CIO private affair. Political representatives of the two largest unions in the country—the Teamsters and the United Auto Workers—also were present, although the unions are not members of the AFL-CIO. When it comes to politics, the big unions usually work together.

Also present at the meeting were representatives of rural electric cooperatives, the National Farmer's Union, the National Farmer's Organization and several consumer groups.

After Al Barkan made his initial comments to the group, representatives of the co-ops and farmers' organizations spoke up. They told Metcalf that although they couldn't make a special commitment that day they would do their best to give him maximum support in money and manpower. An REA representative said his group would help pay the cost of polls.

Sen. Metcalf responded.

"I'm grateful to you fellows," O'Brien remembers him as saying. "For a fellow who lives on a Senate salary—and I mean lives on his salary—you can imagine what I have left over to finance a campaign."

"I think I can run a good campaign for \$300,000. There aren't many big contributors. There are no \$100 dinners in Montana we're lucky if we get \$10 or \$15 a plate. I have some friends. There'll be some five and ten thousand dollar contributors, but most of this is going to have to be raised by your work."

"I've never made any secret about it. They can say Lee Metcalf's campaigns are financed by organized labor, that I'm too close to organized labor. Well I'm as close as I can get and if I can get any closer or if I start straying away, you guys better come around and tell me. Nobody has to come to my office to tell me what to do on a bill. In fact, I think I've been ahead of you guys on a number of pieces of legislation."

THE BEST POLITICAL OPERATION

The scene described wasn't a page out of the smoke-filled Washington rooms of the past. It is but one of countless examples of how deeply involved the unions are in national politics on a day-to-day basis.

Organized labor does not run the country politically, but it mounts what is probably the single best political operation in the nation. Without the power of union money, manpower and know-how, for instance, the Democratic Party today would come close to being impotent. And in this presidential year the unions are girding for what many of their key leaders see as their most critical election. The unions this year are determined to do more than they ever have in electing a President.

But as that meeting with Sen. Metcalf shows, labor's political role is not confined to making—or breaking—a President. The unions are intimately involved in politics from the grassroots level on up to congressional races and to helping decide who occupies the White House. To a striking degree, politics permeates the labor union movement. The way to rise in a union itself, whether business agent or local president or international officer, is through elections. Whatever else they might be, the unions thus are the most pre-eminent political institution in America.

There is nothing new about the relationship between the unions and politics, of course. Ever since the early days of the New Deal, organized labor has been keenly aware of the need for political actions.

But it has only been in the last decade that the unions have refined and perfected their political activities and put them on a day-to-day professional basis.

Many involved in labor's political operation say the real growth and consolidation of power date from the 1960 presidential campaign. That was the first time the unions raised money on a large scale for voter registration. The late Roy Reuther, brother of the then United Auto Workers president, was assigned to the campaign to run the registration drive for the Democrats. Today, roughly \$1 million a year is spent on voter registration alone from national COPE

money. Present plans call for doubling that sum on a permanent basis.

The COPE money comes from a variety of sources, and is spent in varying ways. The \$1-million-a-year spent on voter registration drives comes from dues paid into the AFL-CIO by union members through their international unions. Union dues legally can be used because voter registration efforts are classified as an "educational" expense.

COPE money that goes directly to candidates comes from "voluntary" contributions solicited from union members by the various internationals. This money is divided 50-50 between national COPE and state and local AFL-CIO campaign organizations. In the 1968 and 1970 election years, unions were urged to collect \$1 per member. This year COPE director Al Barkan has asked unions to seek \$2 contributions from each member. In addition to COPE, the largest international unions conduct their own separate campaign fund operations. But none of this activity begins to tell the whole story of labor's contributions to campaigns across the country.

Labor's money, like that of big business, often does not show up in reports to Congress. No one knows exactly how much is spent or to whom it goes. Just on what's on the record alone, it becomes obvious that the AFL-CIO spent nearly \$3 million on politics in the year ending June 30, 1971—a non-presidential year.

Only a few union leaders will speak on the record about their political contributions. One is Victor Gotbaum, head of the New York district of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, who told us his union was the chief financier of Arthur Goldberg's gubernatorial campaign in 1970. "This union was the biggest contributor," Gotbaum said. "When we go in, we go all out. I think in terms of printing and money, we spent about \$250,000 before it was over."

Asked whether the money for Goldberg was raised through voluntary contributions, Gotbaum replied, "No, this was legal union money. It came right out of the treasury, you know. It's the difference between soft money and hard money. On state campaigns you can use union treasury money. On federal campaigns, you can't."

Although Gotbaum didn't say so, the "soft" money in federal elections is generally understood to involve such things as supplying campaign workers and money charged for "educational endeavors" and union business.

Although labor unions are forbidden from using union dues to finance federal election campaigns, there is no such provision in many states. Union dues, it is also said, are funneled to independent organizations, such as the Americans for Democratic Action, which in turn can make a contribution to a national candidate.

Over the years, the unions have grown more sophisticated politically. Today you can go into a key industrial state like Pennsylvania, sit down with Mike Johnson, vice president of the State AFL-CIO, and get 900,000 names of workers, their wives, their children of voting age and other vital political statistics broken down accurately in terms of Democrats, Republicans, independents—all complete with latest home addresses.

For \$35,000 a month, Vic Gotbaum's union in New York City rents an IBM 2314 computer. In addition to using that computer for union business, another union official there proudly said, "we can use it to canvass the whole city, organize letter writing for candidates, and break the whole thing down into assembly districts."

THE LIMITS OF POWER

The unions are far from the sole or decisive political force in every area of the country, but they do wield immense power in enough major states as to be a critical factor in any presidential election.

"We are," one COPE member in Washington said, "the kingpin of any possible presidential election for a Democrat, and very likely the only cohesive force that can assure relatively progressive majorities in the House and Senate."

That doesn't mean all of labor's efforts automatically pay off in certain votes among those they have supported on Capitol Hill. Listen, for example, to the bitter words voiced by one union operative about a certain senator whose seat labor helped retain in 1970. One of the first matters to come before the Senate in 1971 was the Democratic whip contest between Sen. Robert Byrd (W. Va.) and the labor-backed Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (Mass.).

"I called [the senator] up one day to say, 'Now if Bobby Byrd has a fight with Teddy Kennedy, what are you going to do?' 'I resent your question,' he said. And I said, 'Yeah, you didn't resent questions for the last 18 months, you know'."

"He said, 'I don't know where people get the idea that my victory was in any way dependent on labor. Labor's not that strong.' I said, 'Yeah, they were just stronger than anything else you had going for you, Senator.'"

"And he said, 'Well, anyway, if you want to know, I'll vote for Bob Byrd.' A great reward from that son of a bitch."

Neither do the unions reflect only one political view, either at the top or among their rank-and-file members.

The day long since has passed, if indeed it ever existed, when union leaders can impose their political preferences on their members. Union members, like Americans at large, increasingly are exercising independence when they vote. The appeal of George Wallace to many blue-collar workers is the most dramatic manifestation of this attitude.

Along with the strong sense of discontent among working men already described in these articles, we found deep currents of resentment about the way union leaders in Washington are involved in politics. What many workers particularly expressed is a belief they have no say in what union leaders are doing with their money—and that the working man's views are often being ignored.

"Rather than just go out and say we're going to back Muskie, why not ask all the rank-and-file members at meetings?" said Fred DiSisto, a sewage treatment worker in New York City. "Filter it down to the various locals and say we'd like to get a consensus of opinion as to who we should back in this coming election, which is a big one. Instead, they get together themselves. The general executive boards have a pow-wow someplace and come back and say 'We're backing Muskie,' or whoever."

"It just may happen that I go along with it but on the other hand maybe I don't. But I never had a say one way or the other. I didn't get a chance to say, 'O.K., I'm for it—or against it.'"

"Let's face it. I'm supporting them with my \$1.75 a week."

At a New York district council meeting after this worker's union already formally had announced support for Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), it became clear that local union officials had not been consulted. A few even protested that their locals hadn't had a chance to meet on it yet.

Out in Detroit, a United Auto Workers' local official himself was expressing much the same thought, and this in a union that probably has as democratic heritage and tradition as any.

"The guys talk about the union being no good," said Fred O'Brien, "that the leadership makes decisions without referring back to the people they represent. O.K. It's like congressmen and senators, the same way. We elect them but they never come back and say, 'What do you think about this thing?' This

is the same way with our union leaders, and I think we have good unions."

"The only thing is I feel that when they go to decide who they're going to support as a candidate for president, they should go back to the people they represent. They should find out what those people feel. Give them the choice of a candidate. This is where you determine who your candidate for president is, not [Leonard] Woodcock [UAW president] saying we're going to support Muskie."

THE HIGH-WATER MARKS 1968

Such attitudes clearly make it more difficult for the unions to present a solid political front backed up by the support of their members. But if the unions face problems in that area, as in others, they still retain considerable political power.

The result of the last presidential campaign shows what labor can do when faced with a twin threat of a presidential candidate they cannot support, Richard Nixon, and the serious drift among their own members toward another man they oppose, George Wallace. In the 1968 campaign, labor worked as never before—and came within a eyelash of turning almost certain defeat into victory for Democratic candidate Hubert H. Humphrey.

"After the shambles of the Democratic convention," said George Meany in an interview, "we were all Humphrey had."

While Meany would not elaborate on his personal role in that campaign, another union official who worked closely inside the Democratic presidential effort said: "At the most in a period of three weeks, Meany and his guys got together after the convention and decided to turn it around. More than any campaign I ever saw, Meany was personally asking executive council members to go out into the field."

In other words, Meany was assigning international union presidents to do grassroots political chores. The AFL-CIO president also was meeting personally and regularly with Hubert Humphrey about top-level strategy. It is reliably reported. Eventually, the union leaders were able to convince their members that Wallace was not a friend of the working man and that Humphrey merited their support. The persuasion was not accomplished by words alone; it took hard, grueling, intensive work. By election day, 1968, organized labor could tote up these tangible statistics of what they had achieved:

They had registered 4.6 million voters; national COPE had distributed 55 million pieces of literature and another 60 million pieces were passed out through local unions; the unions had established 638 city phone banks with 8,055 phones and 24,611 people manning them. Before election day, the number of union members involved in canvassing potential voters numbered 72,255. On election day itself, the unions turned out 94,457 precinct workers from within their ranks. And those figures are for the AFL-CIO alone; they do not include the political activities of the two largest American unions, the United Auto Workers and the Teamsters, neither of which is a member of the federation.

One figure out of that mass of statistics—the nearly 100,000 union members who turned out to work in precincts on election day—is particularly important. Supposedly, those workers leave their jobs voluntarily without pay for political action. In reality, their presence turns out to be something else.

"We have a provision in our contract that an employee can request a leave for union business," said William O'Brien, Chrysler Corp. vice president in charge of labor relations, who deals with the UAW. "It just happens that on election day there's an awful lot of leave for union business. It was appreciable numbers of people."

Perhaps even more than money, manpower is the ingredient that makes labor's political endeavors so formidable. No other group in society can put so many people into a political campaign. Probably no one ever did more than labor in 1968.

Even if Nixon was narrowly elected, he became the first President since 1848 to enter the White House without control of either house of the Congress. Unquestionably, organized labor helped turn the balance.

Small wonder that key union political directors refer to that election as their finest effort. "The best single thing the American trade union movement ever did was 1968," one of them said. "That was the epitome; that was the summit. That was the maximum money, maximum manpower, maximum everything. From everything I can put together, it cost about \$5 million real dollars."

This year, the unions are talking about doubling their financial efforts. They already have begun the presidential year far ahead of the pace set in any previous election.

The unions' political strategy this year differs from the past. One of labor's political weaknesses before was that it had only 4 per cent of the delegates to the last Democratic convention. To remedy that, the unions have been concentrating on getting additional delegate strength through state presidential primaries.

The strategy was for labor to have a large, uncommitted block of delegates, or, where not possible for labor to get delegates by backing likely winners in state contests.

Labor wants to be in a position to exercise maximum influence not only in determining who will run against Nixon but also on platform positions, composition of the credentials committee—and, as one person said, "everything else."

Part of labor's intense attention to the convention this year stems from a new political factor: the party reforms instituted to make the delegate selection more democratic and representative of society at large.

Politically, organized labor is establishment oriented. At the top, Meany sets the tone and Meany has been a staunch advocate of the status quo on such critical questions as the war in Vietnam and relations with Communist nations. Political reform and sudden changes are anathema to the unions. They want no part of a Democratic convention dominated by what Al Barkan, the national COPE director, privately and disparagingly regards as kids, kooks, Communists and other far-out "kinky" left liberals.

THE INFLUENCE OF AL BARKAN

Barkan is a central figure in the trade union movement. As Meany's right-hand man on politics, he is the chief strategist for the political approach the unions take. He exerts great influence and power.

Barkan, a controversial, blunt and bluff former high school teacher, a loyalist in politics, is credited with doing more than any other person to perfect organized labor's political machinery from the 1960 campaign to the present. "Al's mind lacks sweep and it lacks breadth," a close associate says. "But it doesn't lack a certain amount of commitment to some very fine ideals, and his underlying philosophical premises are very good. Al has this great vision in some areas and this tremendous myopia in others. On some things he's grown tremendously, and some things he's stood still. He's been standing still on that terrible war."

Barkan, by the way, is the only union figure, from the highest international officer to the man on the job, who refused to be interviewed—on or off the record—during research for these articles. And it is Barkan, operating with Meany's personal approval, who is the chief architect of labor's 1972

campaign strategy. Already, the solid, uncommitted-to-any candidate stand that Barakan seeks has been broken from within labor's top echelon.

Privately, the union leaders have their own personal preferences: Meany is said to be for Sen. Henry (Scoop) Jackson (D-Wash.), I. W. Abel of the Steelworkers and others are for Humphrey. But publicly they are all "neutral."

A BREAK IN THE RANKS

The first break in labor's ranks came earlier this year from Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Ideologically, this union represents significantly different approaches to both national problems and trade union action, from many old-line craft unions. Wurf came out for Muskie at a time when he was the Democratic front-runner.

How Wurf's decision was reached and implemented provides a footnote to the making of the President in 1972. It also shows how union leaders operate personally at the highest political levels. Wurf had concluded that only Muskie had the best chance to defeat President Nixon this year. He was disturbed by growing Humphrey sentiment inside the union movement.

When word leaked out early in January, as it inevitably does, of Wurf's impending endorsement, a number of political developments were set in motion. First, Wurf paid a personal visit to another Democratic contender, Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota.

Wurf went to McGovern's home in Northwest Washington and told him of his decision. He had the difficult role of telling a leading politician he thought he couldn't win.

In the meantime, Humphrey personally tried to convince Wurf not to come out for Muskie. The Democratic presidential candidate of four years ago sent Wurf a letter and a telegram urgently asking him not to make the move. He asked for a personal meeting.

On the night of Monday, Jan. 17, Wurf flew from Washington to Columbus, Ohio, to see Humphrey alone in a hotel room. The two men talked until well after midnight, Wurf praising Humphrey for all he had done in the past, Humphrey saying he was the working man's best friend and the best candidate. "I've given service," Humphrey is reported to have told him. "What kind of service has your union ever got from Ed Muskie?"

Two days later, nonetheless, Wurf appeared at a Washington news conference wearing a Muskie-for-President button. With Muskie at his side, he announced his support of the Maine senator.

The incident was another indication of how vital the unions think it is for the Democrats to regain control of the White House. But their political influence and power does not rest solely with the chief executive. The unions also have their friends in high places on Capitol Hill and in the executive branch.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1972]
PRESIDENTS COME AND GO, BUT LABOR'S MIGHT STAYS—V

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

From his paneled office on the top floor of AFL-CIO headquarters George Meany can swing around in his swivel chair to look out across Lafayette Park and down on the White House. Some labor officials say irreverently that Meany not only can look but walk, from his building through a mythical tunnel under the park and into the President's Oval Office.

Whether underground or across the table, the connection is real.

AFL-CIO President Meany and organized labor exercise widespread power in Washington, regardless of who is President of the

United States. Labor's influence within the federal government is the ultimate payoff for tireless years of organizing workers, financing and staffing political campaigns and building its own sophisticated Washington apparatus. Take, for example, the freeing of Jimmy Hoffa.

One episode in the story of how former Teamsters Union President James R. Hoffa received a presidential commutation of his prison sentence began late last year when Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers Union, paid a quiet visit to the White House.

At the time, organized labor was loudly denouncing President Nixon's economic controls. But Woodcock came on a different mission. He urged that the President free Hoffa, who was in Lewisburg, Pa., federal penitentiary on charges of union pension fund fraud and jury rigging.

Meeting privately with presidential adviser George Shultz, Woodcock found that the White House wanted ironclad assurances that Meany and other top labor leaders would praise such a presidential action—or at the very least, would not publicly criticize it. Woodcock obtained the requested pledges. Hoffa soon was a free man.

Woodcock's intervention was not the only one from a high union official. Teamsters President Frank E. Fitzsimmons has told other union leaders that he personally talked to President Nixon on Hoffa's behalf.

These are examples of how organized labor wields influence with its friends, and even with its sometime enemies in the highest seats of power. No other segment of American life brings its organized collective power to bear on so many aspects of government—in the White House, on Capitol Hill and in the executive agencies.

Labor has a permanent power base in the executive branch. The U.S. Department of Labor serves unions much as Commerce services businessmen and Agriculture tends to farmers.

But the heart of labor's power, especially during Republican administrations, is on Capitol Hill, where a disciplined corps of labor lobbyists daily attempts to persuade the Congress. Their effort is by all accounts the best single lobbying operation in Washington.

Labor is not only competent and powerful. It is feared. We found that some of the most respected members of the Senate were unwilling to talk "on the record" about how they candidly view the House of Labor. Even in the privacy of their offices, with assurances that their identities would remain confidential, these senators became nervous at the tape recording of their views. The reluctant senators are all considered "reform liberals" and friends of organized labor.

Labor's lobbying operation is directed by a stocky, rumped-looking, bespectacled man who is probably Washington's single most influential lobbyist, Andrew J. Blemiller is respected by friend and foe alike as a superb legislative craftsman. Attesting to his influence, one liberal senator says: "When Andy comes lumbering up here, you know they are really serious."

Blemiller's credentials as AFL-CIO director of legislation include varied careers as Congressman, state legislator, labor organizer, labor lobbyist at the state and local level and college professor. His personal power is based on an intimate allegiance to George Meany, who appointed him 20 years ago as his chief emissary to Congress.

Blemiller boasts that he knows everyone worth knowing in Washington, including old and warm friendships with Lyndon Baines Johnson, Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.), and Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Me.).

The AFL-CIO lobbying process begins with a weekly strategy meeting in Blemiller's conference room. At 10 a.m. each Monday morn-

ing, he meets with six AFL-CIO staff lobbyists and 5 to 10 others from major international unions. Each reports on the status of legislation he is watching. Assignments are made for the corraling of votes, with each lobbyist concentrating on congressmen with whom he has particular personal rapport.

Many of these lobbying efforts never receive public attention. For example, labor has amended virtually every new federal assistance program to require that work be performed at union-scale wages. In some cases, the labor lobby has suffered crushing public defeats, as in its failure to ban state right-to-work laws. But it has also scored spectacular victories, including its role in defeating two Supreme Court nominations.

The defeat of two Nixon nominees to the court provides case studies of how labor seeks to take charge of vital issues affecting not only the present but the future for every American citizen.

Blemiller takes credit for launching and directing the fight to defeat the nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the Supreme Court. Many liberals opposed Haynsworth primarily because of his civil rights record. But labor was just as concerned, explains Blemiller, "that he had all kinds of bad verdicts on labor issues." Haynsworth's "anti-labor" rulings involved the bitter battles to unionize Southern textile mills.

Furthermore, AFL-CIO counsel Tom Harris already knew about Haynsworth's part ownership of a vending machine company that enjoyed business with these mills. Thus labor could quickly develop the conflict-of-interest charges which eventually brought down the nominee.

"Early in the game we enlisted Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) who became the key guy," Blemiller recalls. "I went to Birch with the thing because, in looking over the Democratic side of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I felt that Phil Hart (D-Mich.) had been too closely identified with defending Abe Fortas. And as far as Ted Kennedy was concerned, it was awfully close to Chappaquiddick."

"So then Birch became the logical person if we could persuade him. Well, we dug up enough material so that Birch agreed to do it."

"Another important thing in the Haynsworth fight was getting senators to lobby other senators. In one case, we persuaded Senator X to lobby Senator Y and Senator Y in turn persuaded Senator Z. Now, when you get that kind of thing, you've really got your lobby going."

Influencing national government policy is really the central activity of AFL-CIO. The federation's distinct role is often confused with the roles of individual international unions. The 130 unions, which voluntarily join together to comprise the labor federation, concentrate mainly on collective bargaining, organizing workers, and protecting their jurisdictions from rival unions.

But for the Washington-based federation, the name of the game is politics—and its payoff in tangible legislation and executive policy. Prior to the formation of the AFL-CIO in 1955, its predecessors had not developed the sophisticated lobbying resources of today. "The old AFL did practically nothing," says AFL-CIO Research Director Nat Goldfinger, adding that "The federation's present comprehensive, day-by-day attention to national policy" has developed over the last 10 years. Of the AFL-CIO's 1971 budget, \$2.5 million was spent on politics, lobbying and related research.

Just how powerful is labor? Does it run the country?

The extent of labor's power to influence legislation and the sources of that power are issues about which there is strong disagreement. Business groups tend to overstate the actual power of their labor opponents, at the same time conveniently ignoring their own considerable influence—superior to la-

bor's in such a vital area as federal tax policy. And labor's own sense of self-importance and pride of accomplishment may color its assessment. Listen to George Meany:

"We go far beyond the questions of wages and hours. We're into everything. You could not have passed the civil rights bills of the 1960s without us. You could not have passed the tremendously important education bills—Lyndon Johnson's so-called program. He'd be the first to admit that if he didn't have labor over there, he wouldn't have passed it."

President Johnson did indeed publicly praise labor's legislative efforts for doing "more good for more people than any other group in America."

Beyond question, labor lobbying helped win crucially needed moderate and conservative votes for major social legislation, including a multitude of laws in the mid-1960s. "When you have a tough fight on any issue like day care or legal services," says Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), "it's nice to say your bill has the support of the AFL-CIO. That support wraps the bill in a warm blanket of respectability."

But the legislative prowess attributed to labor in the 1960s was also the product of a unique blend of a liberal Congress, closely coordinated White House-labor alliance, and a coalition effort among labor, civil rights, education, religious and civic groups.

"We were in agreement with the White House on almost every piece of legislation," Biemiller recalls. "At least once a week I would compare notes with Larry O'Brien, when he was in charge of congressional relations, and then with Barefoot Sanders, who succeeded him. And of course the phones were always busy. Occasionally, we would sit in on the White House legislative meetings and vote-counting operations. It was amazing how often we had information they did not have."

During the five years of his Presidency, Lyndon Johnson has said, he conferred personally with Meany 49 times, and on the telephone 82 times.

Since Richard Nixon became President, however, joint labor-White House efforts have been limited to a few issues; support of the Vietnam war, the SST, the Lockheed loan and the administration's version of welfare reform. None has been marked by great success.

Aside from having allies and friends in the White House, Biemiller would ascribe labor's day-to-day lobbying successes to meticulous hard work blended with a touch of political influence. "We can't direct our members how to vote," he says. "My God, that's nonsense."

Yet Biemiller readily acknowledges the effectiveness of combining his group's lobbying skill with the political clout of Alexander Barkan, the AFL-CIO political director. For example, Biemiller called on Barkan to contact vitally needed senators for their votes during labor's drive to defeat the Haynsworth and Carswell nominations.

And Biemiller concedes that he occasionally pleads the political merits of a congressman who has been helpful to him on legislation. As he explains it: "I may go over to Al Barkan from time to time and say, 'Look. Why don't you lay off that guy's district. That guy isn't so bad. Why the hell do you waste the money? You can't beat him anyway.'"

Numerous legislative experts stress the labor's victories in Congress depend considerably on its joining in coalition efforts with liberal groups. The so called "liberal-labor" coalition functions most often through the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which is composed of 125 labor, religious, civic, and civil rights organizations.

"Labor has power when it joins together in coalitions," says Ken Young, Biemiller's chief deputy and a respected lobbyist on civil rights and social legislation. "Labor has more power than anyone else in the coalition and

I think we are very effective. But labor standing alone does not have that much power. Labor alone damn well can't pick up those 30 or so Republicans it takes to win a major social issue in the House."

Another assessment of labor's legislative power can be made from its almost total failure to win legislation on strictly labor issues. "We can't get situs picketing legislation through Congress," says Sheet Metal Workers President Edward Carluough.

Carluough's frustrations typify a growing debate within organized labor about where it should direct its legislative energies. Some leaders, particularly from the building trades, want the federation to concentrate more on strictly trade-union issues. Other leaders, notably from the United Auto Workers (which is not an AFL-CIO member) and the government employee unions, stress that labor must recharge its social idealism or risk being isolated as an unpopular, selfish special interest.

This disagreement between the older craft unions and the more socially conscious industrial unions is not a new one. What is new is that today's workers are increasingly disenchanted about legislative policies on which they have not been consulted and with which they often strongly disagree.

Today's worker was not part of the union-building, crusading depression era. He may differ sharply with labor's legislative policies, particularly on welfare and civil rights. He may want to support George Wallace with his "voluntary" union funds, not Edmund Muskie or Hubert Humphrey. He may want a militant protectionist trade policy to protect his job from foreign competition.

Young workers resent the emphasis on Social Security and pensions. Many workers feel their leaders are even out of touch on what they consider the new "bread and butter" issues.

Take work safety, for example. At the mention of the safety issue, Detroit auto worker Fred O'Brien angrily pulled off his shirt to show us his scars from welding-spark burns. He doesn't think either the company or the union is responsive enough to conditions in the workplace.

Some labor leaders we interviewed seemed blissfully unaware of discontent among members. Several scorned the thought of taking polls to find out how their members felt on legislative issues. "We took a poll once," said one labor lobbyist, "and it showed what we expected. Our members disagreed with us on civil rights." Another lobbyist put it critically: "The leadership goes out of its way not to consult the members, figuring it will just complicate things."

Other leaders, however, are agonizing about how to bridge the gap to their membership; about how to supply leadership and to reconcile their own liberal idealism with the discontents of the troubled working man.

"It's just great for a bunch of us liberal lobbyists to sit around talking about how we are going to handle the busing issue," says AFL-CIO lobbyist Ken Young. "It's lovely for us to sit back and say, 'Those guys don't understand.' But I think that's absolutely wrong."

"I'm not convinced that our members are bigots or a damn bit different than anyone else. But I'm also sure that the Detroit worker who has finally gotten out of the city damn well doesn't want his kids bused back in. He's scared to death of violence. He knows he now has better schools. And I think he has a case to say who the hell are we to tell him he has to send his kids back in there."

Yet Young, a dedicated civil rights advocate, is also convinced "that as long as the suburbs can do what they want with total impunity, as long as the tax money is outside the city, we are going to have a worsening problem for the minority kids and for the country, and no way to solve it."

"So I sort of rationalize," says Young, "be-

lieving we have to provide leadership. Busing itself is not the answer, but we shouldn't deny federal aid to communities which are voluntarily trying to solve their problems and to comply with the courts. We've got a problem and we have to keep working on it."

The liberal community and labor face another dilemma. There are growing signs of tension and a rending apart on both sides of the "liberal-labor" coalition. Civil rights leaders complain that labor dominates the Leadership Conference and arrogantly refuses to cooperate unless it gets its own way. Labor finds the liberal organizations unrealistic, too radical and ungrateful for labor's past help.

A few examples illustrate the complaints of liberals about their labor allies:

The AFL-CIO supported the recent effort to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, but only in return for the Leadership Conference's agreement that enforcement powers should be transferred from the more effective Justice and Labor Departments to the understaffed, overworked and relatively impotent EEOC.

The AFL-CIO blocked the Leadership Conference from supporting a more generous welfare reform bill. At a meeting on this issue, Biemiller acknowledges that he paralyzed the coalition effort with a negative shake of his head and the words, "We can't go along with that."

The AFL-CIO sought through its beholden allies in the Leadership Conference to discourage a U.S. Civil Rights Commission study of racism in the unions.

"I know some of the red-hots get mad at me," commented Biemiller, "but they forget that the Leadership Conference doesn't move without a consensus. The other side of the coin is—who really operates on the Hill besides us? We do the work."

Tensions in the "liberal-labor" alliance are not confined to disagreements over civil rights and social welfare. The major issue dividing and embittering old allies has been the Vietnam war, which has produced a violent mutual antagonism between George Meany's hawks and liberal doves.

Another source of conflict involves clashes between the AFL-CIO's perception of special labor interests and other leaders' ideas about meeting the broader problems of a troubled society. For example, the UAW supported and the AFL-CIO opposed legislation to encourage industrialized housing to meet the nation's housing needs. The UAW supports and AFL-CIO opposes legislation to insure all worker pension funds. The building trades believe such insurance would be needlessly expensive to meet their special needs.

With criticism mounting from local leaders and the rank-and-file, the AFL-CIO is starting to give more attention to issues with worker appeal. Its three primary legislative objectives this year are: trade legislation to protect American jobs, national health insurance, and a plan to finance social security partly from the Treasury rather than taking a bigger bite from worker's paychecks.

Labor also feels that it faces a crisis in defending the working man's interests in the new era of government economic controls. Economic policy is a legislative area in which labor has been weak, particularly in the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, which decide tax policies and therefore exercise considerable control over how American wealth is distributed.

The AFL-CIO believes that the economic policies of President Nixon and Congress are shifting the tax burden from investors and property owners toward the working man. Labor has unsuccessfully argued that more citizens would benefit if the economy was stimulated by increased investment in needed public services, rather than by giving tax concessions to big business.

In the recent legislative battle over President Nixon's economic control policies, both

labor and business claim that the other side won.

One fact is clear: Labor seeks more power and big business is mounting a campaign to stop it.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1972]
BUSINESS TAKES AIM AT LABOR'S POWER—VI
(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

Early last December, some 35 businessmen, chairmen of the boards or presidents of a cross-section of America's largest corporations, accompanied by about 50 of their vice presidents for industrial relations, attended a private dinner meeting in New York City. They had assembled as members of something called the Labor Law Study Group.

"The fact that those kinds of people came to a meeting like that from across the country is an indication of the interest of the guys who pay the bills," said a business lobbyist on Capitol Hill.

His point was that the cream of big business—big oil, big steel, big auto—had gathered privately in an unusual show of unanimity about a subject that concerns them all. They were meeting at the Union League Club to discuss further steps to curb what they regard as abuses of union power.

For the last six years, the Labor Law Study Group, comprised of more than 50 companies representing a broad cross-section of private industry and backed up by approximately 40 trade associations including the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has been operating quietly behind the scenes. The goal, as one of the members describes it, is to "restore the balance to the collective bargaining process and the conduct of labor relations."

To businessmen, the excesses of union power have been mounting for 5 years. If the balance of power once was weighted in favor of business, the businessman now thinks unions have excessive power both through government and through the collective bargaining arena.

Businessmen say federal law has granted unions special privileges and immunities, such as protection of union-scale wages, unlimited protection from the antitrust laws, and permission to use certain union funds in political campaigns. Another complaint is that federal agencies such as the National Labor Relations Board and the Labor Department have favored unions with partisan administration of labor laws. (The unions, however, claim the NLRB is biased against them during Republican administrations.)

Businessmen list a number of complaints which they say are inimical to the public interest, as well as to business. These include:

Strikes, in which the public is virtually held captive by the power of unions to cripple vital industries and services.

Restrictive work practices that make American industry inefficient.

Resistance to automation that would increase efficiency.

Exorbitant salary demands that far exceed gains in productivity.

Restrictions on the job market, which hurt minority workers and deny management in such industries as construction the manpower they need to function efficiently.

To combat this, their behind-the-scenes work has led them into many fields. They have been instrumental in introducing 24 "labor law reform" bills now pending before Congress. They have met privately with senators and congressmen, Cabinet officers and key White House officials. They have commissioned a series of lengthy polls dealing with public attitudes toward unions, and especially focusing on how rank-and-file union members themselves feel.

Their latest poll, for instance, concludes that there is a growing national feeling that strikes and labor problems have seriously

hurt the country and that criticism of union leadership is rising.

FEW TANGIBLE RESULTS

Over the years, their goals have broadened. They are now more involved in the lobbying process, in influencing presidential appointments, in legal cases, going as high as the Supreme Court and in the entire wage-stabilization issue. And today, as they read the public opinion surveys about the unions, some of these big businessmen think they have the greatest chance to cut down union power since passage of the Taft-Hartley bill 25 years ago. Internally, some members of the group want to proceed vigorously to capitalize on these conditions.

Yet for all their collective power and all their efforts, the businessmen have little to show in the way of tangible results. Neither are their immediate prospects promising. Part of the reason, as will be seen, lies within business itself.

"The simple fact is that if this entire package of bills now before Congress were passed overnight, it would simply improve some of our running rules of the game," says Virgil Day, a vice president of General Electric and until recently a business member of President Nixon's Pay Board. "It would not get us to where we need to be."

The labor reform bills Day referred to would do such things as assure employees freedom of choice on whether or not to join a union, tighten secret ballot rules, require an employee strike vote, and grant protection of employees against union fines. They also cover such issues as boycotts, picketing, jurisdictional disputes and the arbitration of disputes.

Day, a key business figure involved in union questions, was one of the original members of the Labor Law Study Group. He says the group first grew out of a casual luncheon with two other businessmen in New York, Fred Atkinson of R. H. Macy & Co. and Doug Soutar of American Smelting & Refining Co. Atkinson now is a principal figure in the group's work. Day describes how they first organized this way:

"The inception was actually a kind of defensive false alarm that came about a number of years ago. Our union friends were about to push through some changes in the basic law on the theory that the NLRB was too favorable to management. So the alarm bell rang. This particular fire was not too difficult to put out.

"But some of us were sitting around wondering why we even had this problem, and it occurred to us that it might be useful to see if it wouldn't be possible to reverse the process of always waiting until we had to meet some union pressure. So we decided it would be worth a try.

"We tapped the three leading labor lawyers in the country [Guy Farmer, former NLRB chairman under President Eisenhower, now in private practice in Washington; Gerard Reilly, also formerly on the NLRB and now a federal judge in Washington, and Theodore Iserman, a Wall Street lawyer] and turned them loose and told them we wanted to have an analysis of the labor problem from the standpoint of potential legislative remedies.

"We had just several ground rules. No. 1, no antitrust approach, No. 2, no baying at the moon in terms of unrealistic, theoretical conclusions. And No. 3, we wanted to have something that was completely researched and could withstand any hostile or friendly scrutiny."

The lawyers came up with an extensive study proposing specific amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act. After their findings were circulated and approved by a committee consisting of some 150 other leading specialists in labor law around the country, the work was debated internally throughout the business community.

Out of that came the formation of the Labor Law Study Group, now headed by a

steering committee composed of high officers of the following 16 companies: American Smelting & Refining Co.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Columbia Gas System, Inc.; First National City Bank; Ford Motor Co.; General Dynamics Corp.; General Electric; B. F. Goodrich Co.; Humble Oil & Refining Co.; R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.; 3M Co.; Olin Corp.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Union Carbide, and United States Steel.

Among the other 40 firms in the group are such corporate giants as the Aluminum Co. of America, Chase Manhattan Bank, Chrysler Corp., duPont, General Motors, International Harvester, Shell Oil and Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.

Privately the group succeeded, as one of them said, in "stirring up the business community about union abuses in a way that hasn't happened before." Publicly, they got nowhere. Indeed, the general public knows virtually nothing of their efforts.

When Richard Nixon was elected President, some of the businessmen thought their quiet campaign would be crowned with success. They were naive, and wrong. One man active in the group tells of a meeting with Arthur Burns, then the President's chief economics adviser. It followed similar sessions with such key White House aides as John Ehrlichman and Bryce Harlow.

After the group had outlined its program and made an appeal for assistance, this participant recalls, Burns looked down his glasses and said, "I can't do this. There aren't any heroes in this administration on this subject."

But their real problem involves much more than lack of powerful political pledges. After talking with a number of these corporation executives, we came away with several strong impressions.

Although they may grouse among themselves about union abuses, they are extremely reluctant to take their case to the public. They talk, essentially, to each other. Businessmen still seem to favor operating behind the scenes. It is impossible to say whether this stems from the old pattern of exerting influence or from business fears of a public impression of big corporate power and exploitation.

Businessmen say the antitrust laws and the appearance of collusion prevent them from organizing effectively on a united front, but that is only part of their problem. The companies operate in their own self-interest—and those interests often collide.

"If you're in the rubber industry, you're not going to get too all fired up about some pollution legislation that's going to affect the copper industry," a business lobbyist said. "Industry lobbies with a real rifle shot to protect their own individual interests once every couple of years, but the unions do it once a week. They're realists. They understand what they're doing."

Malcolm Denise, vice president of labor relations for Ford, gave another example of why business is unable to compete with labor in a general lobbying operation.

"The fundamental answer," he said, "is that organized labor is organized in a sense to react to one aspect of business activities—the labor input. But businesses are not organized per se to do battle with labor, they're not organized per se to hire people but to serve customers and to make a profit. Much of their success depends on not how well they battle labor but serve the public. Business is not class-oriented—an employer association versus a union association. The concept of us being a class against a class doesn't exist."

"The practical problem of a Macy's, a Union Carbide, and a Ford are so different that you can't say there is one unified answer that will help all of us. For example, local bargaining would work for some but not for others."

"Without discounting the value of public sympathy, public victories are not what we are after. Unions are striving as political institutions. Union officials don't get elected unless they produce. Business has a different constituency—the consumer and what he buys. We can't go on a big crusade against the unions. We are going to have to live with them after this fight is over."

An executive of one of America's most powerful corporations, one that is also a member of the Labor Law Study Group, described the basic dilemma in more personal terms.

"I'm a practitioner in this business," he said. "My job is to represent the corporation with the unions that represent our people. We don't need any assistance in developing an area of conflict with them. They are already there. This is an adversary life in which I live."

"So to antagonize these people by getting into a public debate about what should be done to the unions is not in my interest. It doesn't help me in carrying out my responsibility with the corporation."

"I don't think there is any question that the unions are too damn powerful. We have all the evidence that we could possibly need. But I'm not going, on or off the record, to express my feelings of the specific proposals [of the Labor Law Study Group]."

WEAKNESS IN TWO AREAS

He also said this:

"I don't think, and they would be unhappy if they heard it, that they are too damn realistic in their optimism today. They seem to think that the environment today is the greatest from their viewpoint since Taft-Hartley. I'm not one, and this is off the record, who shares this view. I think that, yes, the climate is better from the standpoint of labor law reform than it was a few years ago, but I don't think it's any climate in which they can expect to be successful in the terms and to the extent they visualize they can."

This much is clear: business at this point does not operate with anything like the effectiveness of the unions in two critical areas—political action and political legislative lobbying.

Andrew J. Biemiller, the AFL-CIO's chief lobbyist on Capitol Hill, summed up the situation as many see it:

"As far as the Hill is concerned, I suppose the business people think they are making some headway with their right-to-work operation. And they're now filing a case trying to take away our tax exemption. Tom Harris [AFL-CIO counsel] is so busy on that I can hardly get him to think about anything else these days. It's evidently serious enough that he's damned worried about it."

"But business has never been very successful on the Hill in curbing us. Now there have been attempts in the past to pass compulsory arbitration legislation, but big business doesn't want compulsory arbitration any more than we do."

"It's an interesting phenomenon. I think the situation on labor legislation is about a draw at the moment. Nobody can win."

Both of Biemiller's points about the real power of big business and big labor, and the general opposition of each to compulsory arbitration, go to the heart of a more serious question. Who represents the public interest?

A case can be made that both big unions and big business represent special interests. The unions exert powerful, if not decisive, influence on the congressional labor committees. Big business does the same on the committees dealing with the basic tax structure.

Critics of unions have been arguing that organized labor really hasn't tried to alter the distribution of wealth between capital and labor. It tries instead to get more of the pie for its members. No one, it is argued, truly represents the citizen consumer on those key committees.

ISSUE OF COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Compulsory arbitration is another issue in which the public interest can come into conflict with big business and big labor's position.

Virgil Ray, for instance, recalls there was "a very strong difference of opinion within the business community" on what to do about emergency disputes at the time the Labor Law Study Group was formed.

"Almost all the business community other than the transportation industry, which now includes the airlines and trucking as well as the railroads and shipping, were very strongly opposed to compulsory arbitration in any manner, shape or form," he says.

"The transportation people were very, very strongly of the theory that they were powerless—the airlines are the latest ones who feel this way—and they would say, 'We're just helpless, they have a shotgun at us, we have no effective economic response and some of us believe compulsory arbitration is a way out.'"

But the rest of big business did not agree. Compulsory arbitration was not adopted as one of the labor reform group's basic goals.

That isn't the only area where the individual citizen's desires may run into conflict with those of business and organized labor. We already have described, for example, the intense frustrations and job dissatisfactions expressed by many workers, particularly those in mass-production factory jobs. Our impression is that management either is not entirely aware of these feelings, doesn't believe they exist or doesn't want to acknowledge them publicly.

THE AFFLUENT WORKER

Take the picture painted by one business-man of a factory worker who makes about \$10,000 a year. George B. Morris, Jr., director of labor relations for General Motors, told why he would characterize the auto worker he employs as an affluent American.

"I'll tell you why. Because he lives in Flint, or one of the communities around Flint, he's got a hell of a nice home, two-car garage. He has two cars."

"He's got a trailer that he hooks on the back of one of those and he hauls his boat up north and he's got a hell of a big outboard motor on the back of that and does that on the weekend in the summer. And he probably has a summer place up north, too, on one of the fine lakes in northern Michigan."

"In the wintertime, he puts a couple of snowmobiles on that trailer and hauls them up there. He leaves Friday night while you and I work."

"I guess I'm not affluent by my definitions here. But this fellow has everything you could aspire to. You come to our plants and look in our parking lots on Friday and see how many of them—even second shift people—will be there with their trailers and their campers and have them all loaded."

Morris was asked if he thought his employees were able to live that way on \$10,000 a year. "You're damn right I do," he said sharply, adding:

"Do you think all the people that are driving up I-75 are corporation presidents and bankers and stock brokers and lawyers? The hell they are. They're hourly rated people that work in these plants. What more do you want? If affluence is too strong a word, this is certainly not a pauper society we're talking about. This is a fellow that has aspired to material things and has them."

That may all have been true several years ago when wages were rising, overtime work booming and the inflationary spiral had not cut so severely into the pay check. But without exception, the only workers we found able to afford the boat, the camper, the country place or what ever else had a wife who worked fulltime, and often he himself took on another job. They are not living the soft life.

Just as we found union leaders in the rarefied air of Washington or Miami Beach often

not seeming to know how their rank-and-file members think about many things, so we found business apparently unaware of new currents flowing through the work force, particularly affecting the young factory employee.

If your reporting of the anger, the rising use of drugs and even the willingness to sabotage equipment on the assembly line is in any way an accurate reflection of young workers, it leads to a serious conclusion. It could well be that business—and American society—face a greater crisis involving dissatisfaction of work than merely worrying about the power of labor unions across the bargaining table and in the halls of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1972]

BUILDING TRADES: FUELING INFLATION—VII

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

"We built this nation," said one building trades official. And indeed the history of construction in America is distinguished by the fierce pride of skilled craftsmen, the rugged daring of rags-to-riches contractors and the solid structural accomplishments of 200 years.

Now, however, the construction industry is suffering. It is beset by grave internal illnesses that threaten to poison the entire economy.

"We may have killed the goose that laid the golden egg," admits Martin Ward, president of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Union, one of the 17 unions in the building trades.

For construction today is crippled by antiquated building codes, bloated by labor union featherbedding, ripped apart by violent union and nonunion struggles or disputes over job jurisdictions, constricted by union hiring hall monopolies and caught in a pervasive, inflationary web of greed.

These are stark assessments. But they come from labor union leaders, building contractors and captains of the biggest industries—men who admit contributing to the problems themselves.

Labor leaders, contractors and corporate executives now all say that the magic bubble has burst, exposing an inflationary, inefficient industry.

Listen to the insiders:

Robert Georgine, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO building trades department: "We've got a serious problem of featherbedding, where two guys are assigned to a piece of equipment that only needs one. We have 'nail keg' jobs where a guy just sits on a nail keg and watches the work. We have 'bull stewards' who do nothing but walk around."

Joseph Valdastris, business agent for Local 223 of the Sheet Metal Workers Union: "The biggest problem in the building trades today is unions fighting each other in jurisdictional disputes. The carpenters, for instance, take the attitude that Jesus Christ was a carpenter and that they were here first, so the rest of you guys stand in line."

"Contractors must share the blame," says the executive director of a Miami, Fla., contractors association. "As long as the contractor was making a buck, everything was fine. He just passed along the extra labor costs and made even more money himself in the process."

Virgil Day, vice president of General Electric Corp. and until recently a business member of President Nixon's Pay Board: "The corporate construction users are part of the problem. A corporation executive is told to get his new plant on line by some impossible date. So if there is a strike, he says: 'Hell, don't fight it, I've got to have my building. I've got to have my overtime. I've got to have anything it takes to get that building up.'"

And finally there is the affluent consumer who wants his new recreation room built this month, not next month, and the wealthy couple who want to move into their Florida condominium apartment this winter, not

next winter. They also help drive up construction costs.

RESENTMENT AMONG THE PUBLIC

The construction industry has stirred resentment in the rest of society among consumers who can't afford housing or a repairman, workers envious of the far higher wages paid construction tradesmen, and other union and business executives who feel that construction provides most of the gasoline for an inflationary engine which hurts everyone.

Again, listen to their complaints:

Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees: "An unreasonable relationship exists between the contractors and the building trade unions. They continue to have those big fat settlements that force inflated prices so that the pay raises we get are not catching up."

Richard Foshia, a young Detroit auto worker: "I make \$4.20 an hour. A laborer in the construction industry here starts out at \$5.50, and he doesn't do anything but carry bricks or whatever he carries. I don't go along with that at all. He doesn't have any more know-how than I do. I can't afford to buy a house or rent an apartment, and I want those prices to come down."

Malcom Denise, vice president for labor relations of Ford Motor Co.: "We have to be concerned about the relative costs of making things here and in the rest of the world. Construction and trucking don't seem to feel that they are in competition with overseas markets. But they are, because they're part of our costs and we have growing foreign competition."

A WORLD UNTO ITSELF

The actual work of the construction industry is probably more visible than any other. We all watch with wonder as skyscrapers, highways and bridges rise from the ground. Yet the inner workings of this largest American industry—its \$100 billion annual business is greater than automobiles and steel combined—is little understood and seldom examined by outsiders. "Unfortunately, the building trades are kind of a world unto themselves, and the industry is a world unto itself," says AFL-CIO Research Director Nat Goldfinger.

Inside that world, 10,000 local unions representing about 3 million workers bargain with a majority of the nation's 870,000 contractors. Another 500,000 construction workers are not members of labor unions.

Most of the local unions are small but powerful independent baronies which take only minimum direction in collective bargaining from their international unions. Most contractors are small businessmen, with only 1,200 firms hiring more than 100 workers each, and the four largest firms controlling less than 1 per cent of American construction.

The industry is marked by seasonal fluctuations and considerable uncertainty. Thousands of contractors go in and out of business every year. Workers' loyalties and their livelihoods are tied to their union hiring hall, as most contractors don't employ many year-round employees.

The unions exert power by controlling many of the functions normally reserved to management in other industries. For example, building trade unions not only supply manpower to the job but even appoint foremen and general foremen. Although contractors finance them, the unions administer various health, welfare, pension and vacation benefits.

The construction union work force is old and highly organized with the national federation of American building craft unions dating from 1908. Those early unions drew strength from the rich traditions of far older European craft guilds. The unionized

work force is divided into 17 building crafts, which compete against one another and tightly resist entry from outsiders.

And these building trades collectively comprise the center core of power in the AFL-CIO. It is no accident that a former plumber, George Meany, runs the federation. The AFL-CIO's pecking order of power is readily discernable at the Miami labor conventions, where Meany and his favorite building trade presidents occupy the most prestigious row of hotel suites.

The AFL-CIO's political power has been applied most consistently and successfully to protect union wages in the construction industry. Construction wages have risen three times more than those in other industries in the last 10 years.

The industry itself has been undergoing revolutionary changes, with new equipment and materials pushing historic handcraft construction methods towards a factory production system. Reacting to this process, the unions have fiercely opposed change or demanded special compensation before permitting efficiencies that sharply reduce the need for skilled manpower.

THE DECISION TO INTERVENE

What is new today is that the federal government and big business—both alarmed by runaway inflation and foreign competition—have decided to intervene in the clannish workings of the construction industry.

The nation's largest corporations several years ago quietly formed the Construction Users Anti-Inflation Roundtable—to seek government controls, to help contractors strengthen their management and resist demands for wage increases, and to persuade each other that corporate industry should avoid crash building schedules which raise construction costs for everyone.

The Roundtable members were motivated by concern over their own skyrocketing costs for new factories and by the "rippling effect" of construction salary raises on their own workers' salary demands.

"Prior to our auto negotiations in 1970, the construction industry got extravagant salary increases," says George Morris, a General Motors Corp. vice president and Roundtable member. "There's no damn way we can afford to raise salaries 18 per cent for construction or any other group and remain competitive."

"We have building trade union members rubbing shoulders with our own auto worker union skilled mechanics who perform the same jobs. The building trade people are not above saying: 'Hey, buddy. If you were a member of the electrical workers union instead of the auto workers, you'd have this kind of check.' They jab them and they irritate them, so that our electrician goes down to his UAW local and says, 'God damn. How come that guy gets \$8.50 an hour and I get \$5.80?'"

"So we have a hell of a lot of pressure inside the union from the skilled trades group and the UAW has to reflect that when they sit down to bargain with us."

"If I may use a Chinese expression, construction wages took a great leap forward about 1966," says Roger Blough, retired board chairman of U.S. Steel Corp. and chairman of the Roundtable. "I think it's really one of the most uneconomic and inflationary types of workmanship—if you can call it workmanship—that we have anywhere in the country."

The unions also acknowledge the problem. "I'm not concerned where construction has come the last six years with respect to wage rates," says John Lyons, president of the International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers. "My concern—and many in the industry share this—is where are we going. The industry cannot maintain these 17-19-22 percent annual wage increases."

"A TERRIBLE CONSPIRACY"

Yet the building trade unions regard the behind-the-scenes Roundtable effort as a dangerous threat, particularly when they discover corporation presidents working inside the Nixon administration to control construction wages and open the industry to more nonunion workers. The administration established the Construction Industry Stabilization Committee last year, responding to inflation and to endless entreaties from the Roundtable, which met regularly with Cabinet members and White House officials.

"This is probably the most critical time the building trades have had in their history," says AFL-CIO official Georgine, referring to the Roundtable, government and growing nonunion competition. "I think it's an out-and-out effort to break the unions. If you want to get melodramatic, you could say it's a terrible conspiracy."

Sheet Metal Workers President Edward Carlough, however, brushes off the Roundtable threat. "It's been an old ladies' coffee table so far," he said.

And George Meany reacts angrily: "Let me tell you about this Roger Blough, the man who is dedicated to keeping wages down. He drew \$916,000 in wages his last three years at U.S. Steel. Are we going to pay any attention to him?"

"If he were to succeed, America would become a low-wage country. The progress of America has been made on high wages. Now, as far as I'm concerned, I'd rather have inflation than deflation because I know the difference between the evils."

Virtually all the building trade presidents we interviewed insisted that the public does not understand the nature of the industry or its \$5 to \$12 an hour building-trade wages—which have been rising at rates far in excess of rises in the cost of living.

They stress that most construction workers still don't work the full year, even though in prosperous times there are far fewer seasonal layoffs. They point out that construction salaries are not directly comparable to those in other industries, because fringe benefits are included. For example, an \$8 an hour building trade salary might include \$1.50 which the union keeps for the worker's health, welfare, pension and vacation funds. In most other industries, such fringe benefits are calculated separately and not listed as a part of hourly salaries.

Building trade officials are not cooperative in supplying statistics about the estimated "annual wages" of their members, but Labor Department statistics indicate these salaries, although higher than factory workers', are not anywhere near as high as the hourly rates would imply.

Building trade officials argue that their unions' large wage increases have been justified to permit workers to share the increased productivity of new equipment and materials which cut down on needed manpower. (The Roundtable argues, however, that worker productivity has fallen.)

"An operating engineer may make \$8 or \$9 an hour," says S. Frank Raftery, president of the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, "but you've got one operating engineer grading thousands of yards of road where you used to have hundreds of workers with picks and shovels. One man can paint an apartment in the same time it used to take three or four. In 10 minutes we can do an apartment ceiling."

Raftery also contends that giant-size construction wage increases were taken as defensive measures, and that the inflationary problems could have been avoided if President Nixon had taken the AFL-CIO's advice to impose controls earlier.

"It's Nixon's own damn fault," Raftery said. "Everybody was trying to get what they could bargain for against the day when con-

trols would be imposed. There was 'I don't give a damn' attitude."

"THE WORK RULES LIVE ON"

Despite all these explanations and rationalizations, few labor leaders we interviewed denied that there are serious inefficiencies in construction for which unions are mainly responsible.

Of all the labor union officials we interviewed, only George Meany denied any union-caused problems in construction. "I don't know of any restrictive practices, any featherbedding, that creates useless jobs or provide pay for doing no work," said Meany, repeating this point several times in a lengthy interview.

In contrast, Ironworkers President Lyons said his local unions often improperly require unneeded men in work crews.

"The work rules live on," he said. "It's one thing when wage rates are low, but if you get the wage rates up to where they are satisfactory, these work practices don't make sense. It's very difficult to get people to recognize the fact that they can't continue doing something they have been doing for years."

Meany also refused to accept as featherbedding the numerous jurisdictional disputes that are settled by requiring two men for one job.

A Miami general contractor describes a common practice: "You install the elevators in a multistory building and start using them to lift both personnel and materials. Once you use the inside elevator, you must have an operating engineer and an elevator constructor sitting there side by side. If a passenger comes up, the elevator constructor pushes the button. If material comes up, the operating engineer pushes the button." Another common practice requiring even less work is one in which an electrician's sole job is to flip a switch turning an engine on at the beginning of the work day and off at the end.

Meany concedes that many building codes are outdated but claims "we don't make the building codes." Other labor leaders disagree.

Robert Connerton, general counsel of the Laborers' International Union, describes a common building code requirement involving Meany's own trade: "Plumbing codes are supposedly for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of all citizens. But they often are an illegal conspiracy in restraint of trade. The plumbers and plumbing contractors get together and pass those codes defining what is plumbing work that can be done only by plumbers."

"The law will say that plumbing work includes all pipe that is laid within property lines. Well, our laborers have been laying pipe within property lines all their lives and these codes prevent them from working. So we're trying to tear down these codes."

BENEFITS FOR THE CONTRACTOR

Building trade officials stress that the "industry club" very much includes the contractors, who benefit also from their unique clannish relationship with unions.

The coziness of the contractor-union relationship is illustrated by one common industry practice: Contractor associations often are partially financed by assessments to all builders, which are required by union collective bargaining agreements.

Union contractors also have benefited from the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires the payment of "prevailing wages" on most federally assisted projects. In practice, the Labor Department usually has accepted union scale as the prevailing wage. Union contractors therefore are given some protection in bidding government contracts against nonunion competition.

EFFECTS ON THE POOR

Ironically, the AFL-CIO's success in adding Davis-Bacon to most new social legislation often defeats or limits the principal purpose

CXVIII—993—Part 12

of the legislation, which is often supported by the AFL-CIO in its social lobbying role. For example, the union-scale provision raises the cost of "low-cost housing" for the poor and often blocks the poor from getting construction training jobs in such programs as Model Cities, where their participation is an integral part of the intended program.

A special labor-contractor relationship exists even in the administration of government wage controls, critics contend. While all other wages were controlled by a board equally divided among public, business and labor members until labor walked out recently, the special Construction Industry Stabilization Committee consists only of the building trades, contractors and John Dunlop, a Harvard University professor regarded as a friend by the building trades.

"While the Pay Board was rejecting deferred wage increases of less than 8 per cent," says I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, "the building trade board was still approving agreements for 10 to 15 per cent wage increases right now. It just doesn't make sense to me."

"I'm not going to quarrel with what the construction worker gets, but if they are entitled to it so are the steelworkers. If construction can have its own special board, I want the same thing for steel. I'll find a few employers I get along with too, you know."

Union leaders complain bitterly that building trade wage increases are given the entire blame for construction inflation, when soaring interest and land costs are equally to blame and these costs are not controlled at all. Labor leaders stress—and here the Roundtable agrees—that a major part of the construction industry's problem is weak management, not all of which results from excessive labor power.

Labor leaders claim they also are wrongly given full responsibility for "scheduled overtime"—that is, a construction project on which the work is regularly scheduled in advance to include extra hours at doubletime pay. "The Blough Roundtable keeps yapping about overtime," says union official Carlough, "but we have these overtime problems because industry doesn't schedule its job properly. When General Motors wants to build an extension, it's 'Hurry up, hurry up. Get the model changes out. Get this. Get that.'"

GM'S ROCHE APOLOGIZES

As a matter of fact, GM board chairman James Roche sheepishly apologized to his fellow Roundtable members for ordering a crash factory construction project in Lordsburg, Ohio, as GM raced to get its compact Vega into the field against Ford's Pinto. GM's haste and disregard for construction costs is said to have escalated wages and costs throughout Ohio. "Look fellows, I know what you are trying to do, but we have our problems, too," Roche reportedly explained at a Roundtable meeting.

Building trade officials especially resent being criticized for rises in the cost of homes, since most individual homes are built by non-union contractors.

Sheet Metal Workers President Carlough admits: "The nonunion competition is devastating to us and anyone who doesn't think so is a total idiot. Jurisdictional disputes, work stoppages, paying guys for not working—these practices are hurting us severely. We have flabby muscles, and if we don't adapt to change, we're in serious trouble."

Disagreeing with—or taking advantage of—the "flabby muscle" theory, the Construction Users Roundtable aims to help builders regain management control of their industry. The Roundtable wants contractors to develop full-time work forces and get needed men through a new national manpower referral service.

Management loses control, the Roundtable

contends, because unions dictate employment through union hiring halls. For example:

"I needed plasterers," Miami contractor John Scott complains. "The union didn't have any to supply me, yet they wouldn't accept qualified people as members. They were harassing me because I was doing dry-wall work rather than the plastering work they wanted."

"Their theory is to keep only the maximum number of members in the union that can fill the minimum amount of work that might be available. Their theory is fine for their people, but can throw a contractor into ruinous situations."

Other contractors complained to us that if they reject workers as unqualified, the union hiring hall often insists on sending the same men back to the job site on a "take it or leave it" basis.

On the other hand, hiring halls have provided valuable service to contractors as well as workers. Painters Union President Raftery says:

"What is the alternative to the hiring hall? Is it profitable to go down on the corner and have a shape-up like they used to have on the waterfront? Have 500 workers show up at some candy store or something? And then have the employers go down in their trucks and say, 'You, you, you, you and you are carpenters. Hop in the truck!'"

"The hiring hall provides the people with the competency and skills to perform a certain type of work. It brings them together, so that a contractor can grab a phone and say, 'Hey I, need 40 guys on my job tomorrow.'"

The hiring hall system also lies at the heart of another problem in the building trades—the power of the labor union officers, and the dependence on them by workers.

Many national building trade leaders insist there is too much local autonomy in their local unions, with local leaders—nervous about their own re-election—giving in too easily to a new breed of construction worker who wants "more now." These leaders say larger-size bargaining units are needed to bring stability to the industry. Others say an annual wage is needed to promote stability.

Roundtable members tend to agree with the suggestion for larger bargaining units, since they place more confidence in the "reasonableness" of the international presidents than in the rank and file.

The construction industry also is affected by another problem—growing violence between competing unions and against non-union contractors. When nonunion contractors have tried to move into the bigger jobs until now "reserved" for the unions, they have encountered threats, sabotage of equipment, illegal mass picketing and violence.

Violence has almost reached epidemic proportions in South Florida, as nonunion contractors have pushed to participate in a building boom. For example, R. D. Hall, 38, a nonunion Miami contractor, told us he has been repeatedly threatened and had his equipment damaged. Describing one incident where his company was laying pipe on an otherwise unionized project, Hall said:

"About 200 men swarmed in and hit my crew. We had eight men working with three trucks, an equipment trailer, a ditching machine and a back-loader. These men split into groups with each taking a truck or a piece of equipment like it was all planned. They broke up the trucks, shooting bullet holes through the engines."

"They set one trenching machine on fire, broke windshields and slashed tires. They were throwing rocks and were armed with pick handles, crow bars, and two guys had pistols. And all of this took place in the mat-

ter of three to four minutes and they were back in their cars and taking off."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1972]

LABOR'S VIOLENT WORLD: BIG MONEY,
CORRUPTION—VIII

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

Richard Nell and his family are in the labor union business. It is a life of big money surrounded by violence.

Nell is president of Local 675, International Union of Operating Engineers in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Last year the 60-year-old labor official received a salary of \$41,056 and allowances of \$6,232. He drives a Cadillac, paid for by the union. He owns two acres of land in a booming Florida development; the union sold him the land for \$1 per acre and "good and valuable services." He took his wife on a European vacation financed by the union.

His entire family profits from his union business. Nell's son, William, earned at least \$8,893 in commissions last year selling insurance to Local 675's various health and welfare plans, of which President Nell is trustee. Son William has a second business, renting heavy construction equipment. His customers include contractors hoping to avoid labor trouble with his father's union. President Nell's daughter has also served the family business, working in the union hall as a paid secretary.

Richard Nell and his 1,899-member union are deeply involved in the violent world of Florida construction, where union fights union to control job turf—and where unions employ guerrilla warfare to stop projects manned by nonunion workers.

Five times in the last two years, Florida courts have ordered Nell's union to abstain from further labor violence—to stop destroying construction equipment and beating up other workers. A jury declared that Local 675 and its international union shared responsibility for the beating that a Local 675 member gave one union member. The jury awarded the man \$1.2 million in damages after hearing testimony that Nell had ordered his men "to tear 'em up" and that the international union failed to intervene to prevent a well-planned construction site riot.

Nell recently was convicted of trying to bribe a Florida county official. He assessed union members to pay his attorney's fees.

Within his own union Nell wields a heavy hand. Some members of Local 675 have complained to federal authorities that they are discriminated against in work referrals by the union hiring hall because they are in disfavor with the union leadership. One member who testified in the damage suit was fined \$450 by the union for refusing to discuss his testimony beforehand with Nell and the union's lawyer.

We started looking into Richard Nell's private and public life because his name was brought up by virtually every person we interviewed in the Florida construction industry. We found that the activities of Nell and his union serve to illustrate fundamental concerns about the state of the unions today—concerns about the misuse of union power and about the imperfect processes of union democracy.

The ethical atmosphere in some union and the status of union democracy cannot be judged fairly in a moralistic vacuum or from a comfortable perch in the white-collar world. Abuses of raw union power come out of a relatively recent and violent history in which unions fought their way into existence and still struggle against their enemies. Violence wasn't invented by the labor unions; it is only 35 years since Henry Ford's thugs pummeled workers in Detroit's battle of the Rouge.

Big, tough Richard Nell, who grew up in the depression in West Virginia coal mine country, built his Florida union almost from scratch—starting from a time when most

Florida construction workers were unorganized and poorly paid. Now Nell and other Florida building tradesmen see a revival of nonunion construction as threatening the gains they have won. Nell shows visitors photos of the battered faces of his own members to illustrate that they have taken punishment as well as given it.

Nell believes thousands of low-paid Cuban workers provide unfair competition to union construction workers and should be relocated around the country rather than concentrated in south Florida.

In an interview, Nell responded to various criticisms against him: His conviction for attempting to bribe a county official was "a frame up." The union members paid his attorney fees in the case "because we ball each other out of problems." He buys the union's insurance from his son "because he knows the business and helps us buy good policies." He doesn't help his son get crane rental business from union contractors. The union gave him two acres of land, which he says is worth more than \$20,000 today, because he had discovered a choice 15-acre resort site, but let the union buy it rather than just buying it for himself.

Violence in the blue-collar workplace is largely shielded from much of a nation that only rarely sees it described in the news media.

The nation did get a rare look inside the seamy, brutal world of some unions 15 years ago, courtesy of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

With the glare of television cameras focused on union hoodlums and their partners from organized crime, the AFL-CIO expelled the Teamsters, the International Longshoremen's Association and several other unions. In the wake of the Senate hearings, Congress in 1959 passed the Landrum-Griffin Act, designed to expose union corruption and to protect the rights of individual labor union members.

The law required unions to file a public record of their finances. It prohibited persons found guilty of certain crimes from holding union office. And it sought, in a worker bill of rights, to prevent union leaders from taking arbitrary actions against their members.

Today, most labor leaders angrily protest that labor crime is judged more critically than similar business crime. At least six international union presidents, in addition to AFL-CIO President George Meany, told us the same story: that more bank employees annually are convicted of robbing the till than are union employees. Union leaders, they also say, are unfairly criticized for enjoying life styles that are publicly accepted as the fruits of accomplishment for their counterparts in business.

"A DEAD LETTER NOW"

Whatever the extent of corruption and undemocratic rule in unions, it is clear that labor's leadership has little inclination to deal with them.

Meany and most of his ranking international presidents who sit on the AFL-CIO Executive Council disclaim any responsibility for dealing with dishonest or undemocratic unionism. They contend (although others strongly disagree) that the Landrum-Griffin Act relieved them of the authority to maintain union integrity.

Furthermore, Meany and the others argue that demands for union democracy have been carried too far, making it impossible for national labor leaders to discipline rebellious or dishonest local leaders.

Officially, the labor federation now plays no role at all in maintaining union integrity. The AFL-CIO's Ethical Practices Committee, created when widespread publicity caused a furor about corruption in the 1950s, has not held a meeting in years.

Here is what the labor leaders told us in

tape-recorded interviews about union responsibility:

Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers: "The instinctive tradition of the labor movement is that it's not our job to clean up corruption. It's sort of traditional that we don't cooperate with government on those things, because government to some extent is the perennial enemy . . .

"The union most charged with corruption is the strongest in terms of numbers—the Teamsters—and it certainly has been no handicap to them in their effective functioning as a trade union force. The fact that, in 'influential ruling circles,' the UAW is given a clean bill of health doesn't help us when it comes down to a crunch over some basic matter."

Edward Carrough, president of the Sheet Metal Workers Union: "I don't want anybody interfering in my union and I'm not going to interfere in anyone else's."

AFL-CIO President Meany: "We had this ethics committee. It's more or less a dead letter now. Landrum-Griffin practically rendered our machinery obsolete."

"Now, to think we could police the unions is absolute nonsense. We don't have a police force. I don't suppose you'll ever eliminate crime or corruption, but you try to keep your standards high. And I think, by and large, the trade union movement is better now than it was 5, 10 or 15 years ago."

Joseph Beirne, president, Communication Workers of America: "I'm certain the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee would meet if somebody brought up an ethical question. Now, when no questions arise, the committee doesn't meet."

"TO ME, HE WAS JUST A CROOK"

With very few exceptions, organized labor's top leaders either defend or refuse to criticize those few confederates who have been found guilty of betraying their own members.

We interviewed the labor union presidents at a time when James R. Hoffa dropped in to pay them visits during an AFL-CIO Executive Committee meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla. The former Teamsters president had just been released from prison, where he served terms for attempted jury rigging and mail fraud in connection with misuse of his members' pension funds.

Sheet Metal Workers President Carrough exclaimed: "Did you see Jimmy in the lobby this morning? Didn't he look great? From all that I know about it, Jim Hoffa shouldn't have spent that time in the pen."

Of the leaders we interviewed, only Communications Workers President Beirne criticized Hoffa, saying: "To me he was just a crook who got caught and went to jail."

Most AFL-CIO board members also were warm in their praise for the United Mine Workers President W. A. (Tony) Boyle, who was having his troubles with the law. Boyle's union has been found guilty of improperly failing to invest its pensions' funds and of making illegal contributions to the 1968 presidential campaign. It still faces charges of union election fraud and of dictatorially holding most UMW districts in trusteeship. Two local UMW officials are among those charged with the murder of Boyle opponent Joseph Yablonski.

Of the presidents we interviewed, only John Lyons, president of the Iron Workers, would criticize Boyle and his union. "Continuing all those trusteeships was wrong," he said. "The system of using retired people to vote is wrong. Keeping that pension money in the bank without drawing interest is outrageous."

The solidarity of labor's top leaders with the embattled Boyle was symbolized in recent weeks when Teamsters President Frank Fitzsimmons and AFL-CIO Counsel Robert Mayer (a Meany son-in-law) both went on the board of the UMW-owned National Bank of Washington.

SUSPICION OF OUTSIDERS

In praising Boyle and dismissing his critics, Steel Workers President I. W. Abel expressed attitudes held by many labor leaders. "I don't buy it when a lot of outsiders get a sudden great interest in the activities of the labor movement," said Abel.

If labor's top national leaders are suspicious of "outsiders" who crusade critical of some insiders: those in the ranks who rebel against their leaders. Again, Abel expresses a commonly held viewpoint:

"I think Landrum-Griffin makes it most difficult to do an effective job of leadership. It encourages irresponsible dissidents to shoot everything down . . .

"I'd like to see democracy exercised to the fullest in our union or any other union, but democracy in the labor movement, as in various segments of life, can be carried to an extreme."

Executives from big business tend to agree about "too much" union democracy. Officials of General Electric, the three major auto manufacturers, American Telephone and Telegraph and other major corporations also complained about how local leaders and rank-and-file members exercise their voice in union affairs. That voice has been increasingly used to reject contracts or to express strong resentment of national labor union leaders, as well as management.

In contrast to these views from big labor and big management, we heard different protests from rank-and-file workers and from those who seek labor union reform. They contend that the Landrum-Griffin law, guaranteeing freedom from labor bossism, is not enforced by the Labor Department, that the AFL-CIO's leadership has "copped out" on its responsibilities maintain union integrity and that the rights of the individual working man are infringed upon by both management and labor.

"NO SIGNS OF CHANGE"

These are some of the general complaints we heard:

Clarice Feldman, an attorney for Miners for Democracy, which is challenging the United Mine Workers leadership: "Big labor and big business have identical interests in preventing union democracy. Democracy takes time to work its will. It's simpler to work it out at the top."

Sen. Robert Griffin (R-Mich.), coauthor of the Landrum-Griffin Act: "This law in no way relieves the unions of any responsibilities to keep their houses in order. We have lacked cooperation by the unions and enforcement by the Labor Department. Every administration, including this one, has been timid and reluctant to enforce the law. They have very carefully selected people to administer the law that labor is not going to be unhappy with."

H. W. Benson, a worker and editor of Union Democracy in Action: "I would say that things are no better today in the labor movement than they were at the time of the McClellan hearings. There are absolutely no signs of change."

Herbert Hill, labor director of the NAACP: "With a few exceptions, you have a systematic pattern where the leadership of unions violates the democratic rights of union members that are supposed to be guaranteed by law."

"Payoffs are epidemic and a way of life," said a career Justice Department attorney, describing collusive arrangements between labor officials and contractors in the construction industry. "Contractors just write them off as a normal cost of doing business."

Justice Department officials agree, however, with the complaint of union leaders that the illegal participation of the businessman in union corruption too often goes unnoticed.

"I'm troubled about whether there is equity in the way we treat certain practices

in business or in the unions," says one Justice Department official.

"We make virtually all our bribery cases against the union official, not the businessman who handed out the bribe. That's the way we get our cases. The employer comes in after he gets scared or tired of paying off. In the course of the investigation, he acquires immunity, but the union guy goes to jail. . . . And it's usually very difficult to distinguish between a bribe being offered by the contractor or extorted by the union official."

The bitterness of labor officials about one-way justice is reflected by President Abel: "It gripes me that the poor — of a — who accepts the bribe is always the one who goes to jail. How can a guy accept a bribe unless some — of a — offers to bribe him?"

But a Labor Department investigator who keeps track of violence in the construction industry says: "I don't blame the contractors for paying off. We can't protect their equipment from being destroyed."

"NOBODY WILL ADMIT IT"

In investigating problems in the Florida construction industry, we found few unionized contractors who were willing to be interviewed "on the record." An exception was P. A. Prendergast, a Fort Lauderdale contractor who employs union labor and for years has been battling with Richard Nell's Local 675.

"All the contractors are having difficulties," says Prendergast, "but most of them are afraid to stand up and fight. There are a lot of payoffs going on in this industry but nobody will admit it except to his fellow contractors. The FBI has been investigating and they can't get anybody to talk."

The Florida contractor told us that some of his fellow contractors rent equipment from Nell's son in order to avoid labor trouble. It was Prendergast's general superintendent who was beaten up, and who won the \$1.25 million jury award from the local and international union.

"They've threatened to run us out of business," says Prendergast, who complains that Nell has refused to supply him with equipment operators to do work on jobs opposed by the union.

"We have armed guards on our projects because we keep getting threatened," Prendergast said. "I've had five equipment rigs 'sanded' within the last year and a half. They pour sand into the place where you put the oil. It just freezes the engine and ruins it so you have to pull it out and have it overhauled. It costs \$5,000 apiece to repair them, plus delay to the job. There has been nothing but grief down here."

Nell said in an interview: "We never bombed his machines. I don't say there aren't things done, but we didn't bother his machines, because we knew we would be fingered for it."

A Justice Department attorney said a grand jury investigation into violence involving Local 675 collapsed because witnesses refused to testify. One woman told investigators she wouldn't testify "because they would shoot my eyes out at 300 yards."

Robert Georgine, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO building trades department, described for us various forms of corruption in the construction industry, which he says become important only when they threaten the union's ability to compete:

"They're just payoff-type things. In other words, you have a big job and you don't want union problems so you say you're going to put this steward on that's got nothing to do. He's a relative of the business agent or a friend or something like that. So he goes on a job and just walks around and is being paid \$300 or \$400 a week. These are some of the things we have to eliminate."

"You talk about corruption. Take some of

those missile sites and things that have been built over the last 10 or 15 years, where the business agent has supposedly been holding up the contractor. Well, it never would have happened if the contractor didn't let them do it in the first place . . . It was allowed to happen and it mushroomed."

"Well, in order to change it, you have got to have a need for change. If nobody was getting hurt and everybody was doing fine you wouldn't even worry about it. But it's not that way today. Nonunion people are moving in and taking jobs that were always union before. They're coming in on sacred ground. Now, you've got to show your people if they don't straighten up, they are not going to have a job."

Carried to extremes, corrupt power in the building trades costs consumers dearly. Veteran Justice Department lawyers say they have wrestled for years with family dynasties in the building trades that dominate construction in entire states.

Peter Weber, former business manager of New Jersey Local 825 of the Operating Engineers, for example, was convicted of accepting bribes from contractors and forcing them to subcontract work to his friends. Justice Department officials say Weber doubled the cost of pipeline over that in surrounding states—a cost ultimately passed on to consumers of natural gas. Weber went to prison. His brother now runs the union.

"The guy fighting for democracy in a union has enormous odds against him," says a Justice Department lawyer specializing in union problems. "The guys who come in here for help usually walk out disappointed. The federal government doesn't have the tools. The individual union member doesn't have the money to get a lawyer. Anyway, most labor law specialists work either for the unions or management."

"People in the union are afraid to join him. He really has very few remedies. It is very infrequent that a well-entrenched incumbent gets turned out of office."

Within the labor union movement, there is continuous debate about how much democracy can be permitted and still allow the union to achieve its purpose. For example, Steelworkers President Abel argues that John L. Lewis needed to put virtually all the local United Mine Workers district under trusteeships years ago to prevent weak and unstable unions from being destroyed by their enemies. Yet, reform factions in the UMW contend that the continuation of these trusteeships over many years gradually snuffed out democracy in the union.

The fight for union democracy is heated today in another historic old union, the International Ladies Garment Workers. Members of the union are mostly women, blacks and Puerto Ricans, yet virtually all the officers are white men who built the union years ago.

AFL-President Meany told us he had inquired into this situation and satisfied himself that the women don't want to run for office and "the blacks are not represented because they don't get the votes—they don't try or anything else." But recent Labor Department decisions tell another story.

The Labor Department recently overturned one ILGWU election on grounds that members were denied their democratic rights.

In another ILGWU case, the Labor Department ruled that the union's constitution prevented democratic election contests and that the union illegally prevented a group of black challengers from appearing on the ballot, distributing campaign literature and exercising other political rights.

Labor editor Benson contends that liberal Democrats' dependency upon organized labor robs the union reformer of his best potential ally. "A couple of guys go to a liberal senator and tell him they're getting —," says Benson. "He listens to them, and says 'you're

right. This is terrible. But he weighs their problem against all the good work labor does on legislation and in helping elect liberals like himself. He balances the two factors and does nothing.

"I don't care where a labor leader stands on Martin Luther King or the United Nations. The acid test of that leader is what happens when someone gets up to oppose him. What he does when he is challenged determines whether honesty and democracy prevail for the working man. It's crucially important for that working man and it should be for all of us. The labor movement plays a special role in our society as a defender of democracy. If that institution itself can't maintain democracy, we are in rough shape."

In the final analysis, Unions are what their members make of them.

Members of Local 675 of the Operating Engineers voted Richard Neil his sizeable salary, his free land, his fancy car, his European vacation and his legal defense fees. "Neil has a sizeable hard core of followers that will vote him anything he wants," says a federal investigator. "Most members of most unions don't attend the meetings where decisions are made that affect their lives."

But it takes a brave man to fight a hiring-hall system in which the union boss may decide who works and does not work. Many would-be labor reformers have found that the price for union democracy is high, and it may be too high for a man trying to support his family.

Take Frank Schonfeld, a New York official in the Painters Union. Schonfeld became secretary-treasurer of District Council 9 of the Painters Union after a long fight with his predecessor who was accused, but not convicted of, accepting \$800,000 in bribes from painting contractors. The contractors pleaded guilty to the charges. Schonfeld and his fellows also had to wrest control of the union district from its international President S. Frank Raftery, who placed the district under trusteeship.

In dissolving the trusteeship and ordering a federally supervised election of union officers, U.S. District Judge Marvin Frankel painted a classic picture of union corruption.

Judge Frankel ruled that Schonfeld's predecessor, Martin Rarbach, had betrayed the membership, governed repressively, ignored democratic procedures, perpetuated his dynasty by illegal election practices, engaged in election fraud, illegally used union-discipline machinery to punish Schonfeld and other opponents, blacklisted opponents from employment and permitted employers to violate the union contract.

Judge Frankel ruled further that international President Raftery had improperly dismissed complaints against Rarbach without granting Schonfeld and other opponents a hearing. The judge ruled that the trustee appointed by Raftery had taken no action to stop corruption and restore democracy in the union. He criticized Raftery and the trustee for installing Rarbach, then under indictment, back in a position of union authority.

Although that court opinion was issued five years ago and Schonfeld was elected, many of the same issues are still unresolved. Raftery still seeks to put the district under trusteeship.

We visited with Schonfeld and a group of his supporters as they prepared to exercise a newly won right—the election of officers to administer the union's vast pension fund.

The pension fund issue has become a crucial one in union reform. Thousands of workers have lost their pensions because pension funds have been mishandled by union officials, and legislation has been introduced in Congress to better protect workers' benefits.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1972]

UNION RATIO OF WORKERS FALLS AS ECONOMY RISES—IX

(By Haynes Johnson and Nick Kotz)

From the back alleys of Memphis garbage routes to the back wards of New York public hospitals, a new kind of union militancy is reaching a responsive audience.

Thousands of public employees, many of them poor, are joining labor unions for the first time.

"Black people wouldn't be anywhere if it wasn't for this union," says Mrs. Edward Butler, 65, a nurse's aide at New York's Bellevue Hospital. "We now get a lunch hour, a decent white uniform, a raise in pay, a chance for professional advancement. We are treated like human beings. We are really working for a living instead of starving."

Mrs. Butler is a member of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO), the fastest-growing union in the country. This union has doubled in size the last six years to 525,000 members, moving it from 18th to 6th largest of all AFL-CIO unions.

Its growth is not typical of the labor union movement today, for the AFSCME is growing by 1,000 members a week at a time when organized labor's total membership is virtually stagnant and unions represent an ever declining minority of the work force. Fewer than one in four American workers belong to unions.

Many of the largest old-line unions such as the Steel Workers and Machinists are losing members, and small unions are faced with threats of insolvency. With new members hard to find, as many as four or five international unions are seeking—in bitter and sometimes bloody jurisdictional warfare—to organize the same worker.

Organized labor is painfully aware that its membership is weak in the fastest growing parts of the economy—wholesale and retail sales, government, services of all kinds and the insurance, financial and real estate fields. Labor's strength has been concentrated in areas of the economy that are not growing rapidly or are actually declining—mining, transportation, manufacturing and construction.

Furthermore, labor leaders are concerned that 75 per cent of their membership is concentrated in 10 large industrial states, while their membership is weak in fast-growing areas of the South and Southwest. There are more labor union members in New York State, for example, than in 11 Southern states, including Texas.

Union leaders disagree strongly about whether the labor union movement is endangered by its failure to keep pace with growth in the work force.

Some leaders see the entire future of unions threatened. They see organizing as the cornerstone to labor's vitality, sense of purpose and political power.

Labor leaders also are aware that their increasing minority status in the work force makes them vulnerable to charges that labor has too much power for the numbers it represents.

"IT DOESN'T MEAN A THING"

But concern about organizing new workers is not expressed in the executive offices of the AFL-CIO. George Meany told us in an interview that he is not worried about the declining percentage of union members.

"To me, it doesn't mean a thing," Meany said. "I have no concern about it, because the history of the trade union movement has shown that when organized workers were a very, very tiny percentage of the work force, they still accomplished and did things that were important for the entire work force. The unorganized portion of the work force has no power for the simple reason that they're not organized."

Lane Kirkland, AFL-CIO secretary-treasurer and a likely successor to Meany, echoed his leader's sentiments: "I've never been very concerned about what proportion of the working force is organized at any given time..."

"In many industries, there has been a declining percentage of production workers and increased percentage of people employed in sales, advertising, clerical, managerial and research. Well, those haven't been areas we've found particularly responsive to organizational appeals. Nor have we felt much compulsion to make a major effort at it."

"Frankly, I don't care whether the salesmen are organized. If they want to be organized, fine. If they don't, I don't feel any ideological compulsion to organize them. I don't feel any compulsion to organize foremen, plant managers; advertising men, hustlers, what have you."

These attitudes are not shared by some other labor leaders, who see organizing as holding the key to labor's future.

"I disagree with George Meany and Lane Kirkland," said S. Frank Raftery, president of the Painters and Allied Trades Union. "My big concern is the constant erosion of the organized percentage of the work force."

"Many unions have lost a helluva lot of members, and maybe we're organizing five or six people just to keep one nowadays. In that sense, the health, the financial strength, and the viability of individual unions are being challenged. You can't have the power and the influence and the drive and the virility that you have to have as a good hustling labor organization if you're going to have a constantly declining percentage of the whole."

BOTTOM OF THE LADDER

The dispute over organizing goes deeper than a mere numbers game. At its heart, the disagreement involves how much effort, money and trouble should be invested to bring union benefits to those workers furthest down the economic ladder—the poor and minority workers. One problem is that such an effort would challenge many unions to organize or admit blacks they have historically excluded. Another problem is that even if there is a willingness to organize the low-paid worker, the expense is heavy.

Herbert Hill, national labor director of the NAACP, expresses the view of many critics who contend labor's unwillingness to mount such organizing drives indicates that labor has lost its sense of purpose and become another narrow special interest. Says Hill:

"The unions have long ceased to be a social movement. Most have degenerated into narrow protective service agencies for their dues payers. They have carved out certain areas of the economy where they have established a decisive role."

"They have retreated to a narrow view of organized labor as business unionism. They collaborate with employers to maintain the status quo. They have no vision of organizing the great mass of unorganized workers in the cities, which today, in large part, means the black, Puerto Rican and Chicano worker."

AFL-CIO official Kirkland believes that such comments ignore realities. He believes various unions basically will grow or decline depending on how their members' jobs fare in a rapidly changing economy. Forty years of organizing work in the textile mills of the South, he points out, largely failed because of massive resistance by business and the entrenched power structure of local communities. Referring to companies like Stevens Mills, which have fought unionization for years in the courts and continue to resist even after court defeats, Kirkland said:

"As long as they're willing to spend that kind of money and pay those fines, as long as they'd rather do that than pay the wages

and accept the unions, and as long as we're still of the disposition to use legal, orderly processes in organizing these people rather than violence and terrorism, it's going to be very difficult." The resistance is so severe and laws so insufficient in certain areas, said Kirkland, that "you could organize yourself right into bankruptcy."

A very different view of organizing is taken by leaders of the expanding American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Leaders ranging from President Jerry Wurf to rank-and-file organizers pursue their goals with a militant spirit reminiscent of the 1930s.

"The greatest weakness of lots of unions comes when they start looking at the balance sheets and accumulating large amounts of money," said Wurf. "We think it's more important to collect members than dollars, and to play a meaningful role in society."

The AFSCME is capitalizing on the huge growth in public employment—an increase from 6 million to 13 million workers in 20 years—and on the general and longtime neglect of many state and local employees.

During a period when the salaries and benefits of unionized workers in the private sector rose steadily hundreds of thousands of blue-collar public employees continued to work for less than the minimum wage. These hospital workers, garbage collectors and sanitation workers often were not covered by such other basic benefits as unemployment compensation or workmen's compensation, much less health care or pension benefits. Most important, public employees are not covered by the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which means that a public employer does not have to recognize or bargain with a union even though the entire work force belongs to the union.

"We've got no law," says Wurf. "Everything is against us. We pull a strike and they take away our paychecks and send our leaders to jail, penalize our members."

Nevertheless, Wurf's union has used the strike—which is illegal for virtually all public employees—as a weapon to force a community to meet the issues being raised. Strikes or work stoppages by public employees increased from 36 in 1960 to 410 in 1970.

Case studies in New York and Memphis illustrate the vitality involved in this revolt of the civil servant.

Until six years ago, most of the 14,000 orderlies, nurse's aides, food handlers, and cleaning help in New York's public hospitals worked for less than \$3,500 a year. The AFSCME organized these workers with a program to give their jobs more dignity and to provide chances for advancement from deadend jobs.

Lester Wright, a black who heads the New York hospital division of the union, started working in the hospital after the war for \$37 a week. Twenty years later he was making \$90. He describes the changed situation:

"People were given some dignity and patients have reaped benefits from the greater pride of the workers. A person used to come in here as a porter, and that was it until he died. Now he can upgrade himself through a series of promotions and become an executive housekeeper."

Similarly, nurse's aides have signed up by the hundreds for training opportunities to become licensed practical nurses, and even registered nurses.

AN EVIDENT PRIDE

Problems are still severe in New York's public hospitals and the newly won base pay of \$6,300 provides only the barest subsistence income in that city. Yet the spirit of the new union was apparent as we visited with workers in the huge Bellevue Hospital.

"Things have changed tremendously," says Bertram Bolt, 50, an oxygen technician, who was wearing the new uniform of white clini-

cal jacket, white shirt and necktie. "There is more dignity to our jobs."

"I like my new job and hope to go as far as I can. My salary has increased in a few years from \$2,500 to almost \$8,000."

N. H. Bridges, a \$6,900 nurse's aide in the Bellevue ward handling skin diseases, talked about work attitudes with a fierce pride that demands respect: "Somebody's got to give a damn, and we do. Working with some of the diseases I do, you just have to be dedicated."

"Let me give you an example. A woman was visiting her father at lunch time, and I said to her, 'Madam, would you please feed your father?' She cringed, looked disgusted and left the room. Yet we have to feed them, bathe them, cuddle them. And we have to work on alternate weekends. You can't take the patients home with you."

The same spirit can be found among Charleston, S.C., hospital workers who withstood a community riot to win union recognition, and Memphis garbage handlers who won improved conditions only after the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was murdered in their midst. Dr. King had gone to Memphis to march with the garbage workers.

"We've come a long way," says Nelson Jones, a 64-year-old black garbage worker. "It's like a difference of night and day. The night before Dr. King was killed I heard him speak, and I knew we were going to win. I believed in it. I trusted the Lord."

The battle cry of the Memphis strike was "I Am A Man," still more evidence that the issues for most workers were far broader than wages and hours.

"The trouble with many unions," says William Lucey, a national AFSCME official who directed the Memphis effort, "is that they're organizing around the nickel or dime wage increase. But people join us as a means to focus their views and aspirations, which are not just confined to economic well-being."

"Poor workers are interested in dignity and decency in the workplace. They're concerned about the services in their city, because these people don't commute to the suburbs. They have to use the inner city schools and hospitals. They are interested, in the broadest sense, in civil rights. They are trying to overcome their sense of powerlessness in the community."

Whatever progress AFSCME has brought to the worst-paid public employees, the potential force of this and similar unions is a hotly debated issue in and out of government. For the public employee unions, as they grow stronger, have the power to deny vitally needed public services.

Many public employees feel that the public looks down on them. "Scratch an American and you'll find a person who has utter disdain for the public servant," says Victor Gotbaum, executive director of the AFSCME district in New York City.

"We're a democracy with contempt for the public servant. A guy gets mugged on the street and you want a hundred more cops. If your car hits a rut in the road you curse the city laborer for not paving it. If Willie isn't learning to read rapidly enough, you scream for more teachers and paraprofessionals—and then you hate the bastards because you need them."

The bitterness against strikes by public service employees extends to the union movement itself and can have racial overtones. When striking black Memphis laborers, including street cleaners, appealed to the local building trades for help, an AFSCME official said, he was told: "You owe the people of Memphis an apology. Those niggers didn't work. Someone might have slipped on the ice and gotten hurt."

ORGANIZING OTHER POOR WORKERS

There are many poor workers outside the ranks of public employees, of course, and some unions are making slow strides in organizing them.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union has

grown the last 10 years as it organizes low paid workers in fish canneries and other food processing plants. "The lowest paid workers are so depressed that they are difficult to organize," said Leon Schachter, a vice president of the union. "And if we organize one plant, it's not going to be able to stay in business unless we also can then organize its competitors."

Although the general record of the AFL-CIO in recent years has been to avoid trying to organize the lowest paid workers, a major exception has been the federation's considerable efforts to help Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers Union. But even here, as George Meany revealed to us in an interview, traditional trade unionists are troubled.

"We have poured into California since 1959 close to \$3 million to try to develop a farm-workers union that would be effective," said Meany. "Now, we haven't succeeded."

"We've got a union out there that makes a lot of noise, but in my book it's not what I would call an effective, solid union. That union is not a union in the sense that it makes contributions to the working of this organization. In other words, it's a union that gets funds from us that are given to us by other unions."

Chavez and his followers bitterly resent what they consider to be this attitude of "business unionism." In their view, the union's success should be measured not only in the benefits won for some California farm workers, but in the union's catalytic effect in raising the pride and hopes of poor Mexican Americans throughout the country.

The AFL-CIO has argued for years over whether the national labor federation should play a more active role in union organizing rather than leaving the task almost entirely to the individual international unions. In leaving the AFL-CIO, the United Auto Workers listed as a major reason the unwillingness of the federation to engage in a massive coordinated organizing effort.

A superficial glance at the AFL-CIO's payroll would indicate it is in organizing in a big way, since 140 persons are listed as organizers. However, it is an open secret that the majority of these "organizers" spend a great deal of their time, particularly in election years, working on political campaigns. "All our people will work some in politics this year," said William Kircher, Meany's director of organization.

If the AFL-CIO were more interested in organizing, there are various groups of poor workers interested in being organized.

The National Committee on Household Employment has repeatedly and unsuccessfully sought help from the AFL-CIO and individual unions in its efforts to help organize and establish basic benefits for the nation's 2 million domestic servants.

"We get a lot of words from the unions but absolutely no help," said Edith Sloan, executive director of the Household Workers Committee.

"If I was with the AFL-CIO I don't think I'd be highly motivated to help us. Our people have traditionally been ignored. It would be a very difficult and expensive job to help them. It's a very altruistic step. It takes a very high level of commitment which we don't find exists even among very liberal people today."

AFL-CIO leaders dismiss the effort, saying household workers would be too difficult to organize because each works for a separate employer.

Another group which the AFL-CIO has refused to help is pulpwood cutters of the Southeast who have organized themselves into a group called the Gulf Coast Wood Haulers Association.

"The AFL-CIO and its unions just don't seem interested in helping a bunch of poor Southern people who are just fighting to stay alive and are up against the power of the big paper companies," said Jim Simmons, presi-

dent of the association. AFSCME did contribute \$1,000, he said.

Kircher said the AFL-CIO couldn't help the organization of pulpwood cutters because many of them might be legally classified as independent businessmen.

Ironically, unions are not expanding in size and power in part because the building trades still vigorously resist attempts to open up their membership, particularly to black workers.

The federal courts have ruled repeatedly in recent years that building trade unions continue to bar black workers despite court orders, despite the qualifications of the workers and despite a shortage of workers in skilled trades.

A Federal Court of Appeals in New York, for example, ruled that Local 638 of the Plumbers and Pipefitters had barred 169 fully qualified black plumbers. And the court noted: "There has been a shortage of construction steamfitters in the New York area in the post war era and as a result employers have had to spend substantial money for overtime."

In recent cases in Seattle, Chicago and New York, the federal courts have held various building trade unions in contempt of court for failure to carry out court-ordered desegregation plans. In holding the New York Lathers' Union in contempt, U.S. District Judge Marvin Frankel said:

"There is a deep-rooted and pervasive practice of handing out jobs on the basis of union membership, kinship, friendship and generally 'pull.' Numerous blacks, often with substantial, relevant work experience, vainly shape up at the union hall (waiting for job assignments) day after day during summer months at a time when inexperienced students and other inexperienced white men got jobs through people they knew."

Less well known are a series of federal court rulings holding that Northern industrial giants and their unions jointly discriminated against blacks. In a case against the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant in Lackawanna, N.Y., and the United Steel Workers, a federal court of appeals said of company and union practices:

"A microcosm of classic job discrimination in the North. Job assignment practices were reprehensible. Over 80 per cent of black workers were placed in 11 departments which contained the hotter and dirtier jobs in the plant. Blacks were excluded from higher paying and cleaner jobs. . . . The pervasiveness and longevity of the overt discriminatory hiring and job assignment practices are embodied in nationwide agreements negotiated between the company and union in 1963, 1965, and 1968."

Civil rights leaders say that the only change in the building trades in the last 20 years has been the names of the plaintiffs on the lawsuits. Many union officials still express unconcern.

Yet there are signs that the building trades may open their doors to ward off non-union competition.

"The building trades, by and large, have done very little organizing," said Robert Connerton, general counsel of the Laborers Union, which is one building trades union with substantial black membership. "They've been sitting on what they have. But they've really been shaken up by growing non union competition. They're talking to themselves for the first time in 10 years about organizing and a number of them are very intent to get out and organize."

Another phenomenon in the union organizing scene today is the growth of new unions, which organize very poor workers only for the mutual benefit of the union builder and the employer. Justice Department officials are attempting to keep track of a flurry of new unions whose officials have made large sums of money without providing any apparent services to their low-paid members.

Thoughtful critics point out that the unions would have trouble meeting the needs of the unorganized poor even if they mounted massive efforts and ended all discriminatory practices.

AFL-CIO Organizing Director Kircher described as typical a recent Arizona situation in which the federation tried to help organize laundry workers who are paid \$1.15 an hour and receive no other benefits except the right to one week's vacation after five years of service. The laundries fought against unionization in the courts and National Labor Relations Board for five years. The workers voted 10-1 in favor of a union but still don't have one.

As in other such lengthy legal struggles, Kircher said, many of the workers lost their jobs as well.

Kircher raises questions about the broad economic problems inherent in what University of Maryland economist Bennett Harrison calls the "secondary labor market," which is characterized by low pay, casual work and no union organization.

Harrison says 11½ million persons work full time in secondary market jobs which pay less than the minimum wage. "The employers don't mind the instability of their work force," Harrison said. "They encourage it. The jobs are simple. People don't stay around very long, and if they did they might get the idea to start a union."

Harrison and others say it is unfair to place the total blame for racial discrimination on blue collar union workers.

"The real problem is that there simply are not enough jobs that pay a living wage in this country," said Harrison.

"The classic strategy for political rape is to turn the blue-collar worker and the poor against each other. It is politically cruel and brutal to attack these fundamental structural problems in the economy as if they were just problems of blue-collar racism. We have to deal with the structure of the economy and that means create more jobs. Manpower training programs for the poor are worthless if we don't have more jobs."

Harrison and others believe that the private sector of the economy, even in the best of times, cannot produce enough jobs to provide a living to everyone in the work force. He believes that the country must provide more work by creating public service jobs, a concept supported by union leaders.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1972]

A BASIC PROBLEM: WORK ATTITUDES CHANGING—X

(By Haynes Johnson and Nic Kotz)

James Humphrey reports to work on the automobile assembly line at 6 o'clock every morning. For the next five hours he stands in place spotwelding nine rear seat bracket parts as the cars roll by 58 times an hour. At 11 o'clock he takes a 30-minute break for lunch gulping coffee and eating a prepackaged hamburger out of a vending machine.

"It's slop," he says, "it's bad food. They put that hamburger in the machine and if you don't buy it today it's still there tomorrow."

Then he returns to the line. For three more hours he continues spotwelding those cars 58 times an hour.

Humphrey is 26, black and unmarried. A shy, slender man, he is not given to emotional expressions of anger. When he speaks critically, he does so quietly.

"Sometimes you get the feeling you just want to stop this God-damned machinery," he says. "That happens all the time. You're nothing but a tool. But there's nothing you can do about it. Just keep pushing. Try to make it till 2:30. Keep on every day."

Some day Humphrey wants to get married and have children and some day he wants something better. "Right now I can't better myself," he says. "Maybe some day

I can work myself up." As far as the children he may have, "I want them to be anything but a factory worker," he says. "Any kind of a job except a factory worker."

In our experience, Humphrey's discontent is not unusual. His attitudes about his job add up to a problem for his union, his company and his country. Of all the problems we have explored over the past nine days in these articles, nothing is more fundamental than the changing attitudes about work in America. They pose perhaps the greatest challenge for the unions and for American society.

Thoughtful people representing labor, management and government are aware of the complexities and difficulties of this challenge, but the general public does not seem to recognize how serious it is. Perhaps America's preoccupation with its immediate problems—the war, the state of the economy, the spreading drug culture, the struggle of minorities to achieve a more equitable place in society, the lack of faith in established institutions—has obscured even more basic questions. These are how to make work itself more attractive and meaningful, and how to improve the quality of life—on and off the job.

"FEELING OF FRUSTRATION"

"We see a potential problem of vast significance to all industrial companies," said Walter Dance, senior vice president of General Electric, at a stockholders' meeting. "This involves the slowly rising feeling of frustration, irritation and alienation of the blue-collar worker, the 'hard hats,' if you will, but not just the activists in big cities. It involves a gut feeling on their part that industrial society has left them with the dull, hard, dirty jobs—and doesn't care."

From inside organized labor came another viewpoint.

"The reality is there is a system, and as long as the job controls the man rather than the worker controlling the job, I think you're going to have difficulty," said Doug Fraser, a top official of the United Auto Workers, the second largest union in America. "Some people could argue maybe we should change the system, that being the problem. We should have workers in groups of 20 rather than 60. Every hour they're doing the same thing, job after job. So restructure the whole work place. Put a team of 20 and build a car from the chassis up and thereby give the workers greater satisfaction and a greater sense of achievement."

"There are two problems connected with that. I don't think we actually have the floor space to have that kind of system. And I suspect if you assembled a car in that fashion the car would cost about \$25,000."

Some companies—notably Chrysler—are experimenting with new ways to combat the dehumanizing monotony of the factory job.

William O'Brien, Chrysler's vice president for personnel, says in some plants his company is applying a team-concept of letting a group of workers build an entire component rather than each man doing only a small part of the whole. "We've had some favorable results from that," he says, "but we've just started this really. We have done it on a small scale."

ABSENTEEISM A SERIOUS PROBLEM

O'Brien added:

"We start with the premise that the society in our plants is just the same as society in general. I think the problems with the young workers are the same problems with the students and the young militants. I think a lot of it comes from the fact that they are better educated than we were at the comparable age and the media have informed them more about what is going on in an industrial society. They don't like the routine, repetitive jobs. And money doesn't seem to have any impact. When we were working six days a week a few years ago our worst absentee day was Saturday. And Saturday was time and a

half. We think absenteeism is more prevalent among these younger people than the older. It's a serious problem."

Our experience of examining the labor unions these last three months leaves us convinced the problem is more serious than even he realizes. In these articles we have focused particularly on the attitudes of young workers—not because it is fashionable to look at the young, but because they seem to represent something significantly different.

Of a work force of some 80 million Americans, more than 22 million today are under 30. The number of these young workers is expected to increase in the years to come. Among that group we found the most striking evidence of frustration, anger, rebellion and disenchantment. The way they feel about their jobs—and their union and their company—goes far beyond their own personal satisfactions. It affects such basic questions as productivity, pride in craft, the ability to remain competitive and a willingness to accept the goals and standards set by both unions and companies.

Not surprisingly, the young workers we met were also the most afflicted by another American phenomenon. The desire for more—and more today, not tomorrow.

"WHY ARE THEY SO DISSATISFIED?"

"Why do our guys have to attain, attain and attain levels of living beyond anything dreamed of by their parents or grandparents" asked James O'Brien, the political director of the United Steelworkers of America. "Why are they so dissatisfied, unhappy, rebellious, and so on?"

There are, of course, no simple answers. More than one person pointed to what they believe is a general downgrading of the worth of the skilled worker in America. The worker, they say, is made to feel that manual labor is demeaning. He aspires to achieve what he thinks is a more respectable and rewarding white-collar professional job. In that sense, perhaps the dynamics of the American system have had unfortunate effects that no one ever intended.

"We are guilty of this," said Joe Valdastrì, business agent of a Sheet Metal Workers union local in Florida, "because we have built a fat cat over the last six to eight or 10 years."

"The worker goes in over his head. He moves into a neighborhood where he has accountants, attorneys, professional and semi-professional people living beside him. He's a little bit ashamed to be a sheet metal worker. He leaves his home in dungarees and he sees the others coming out in a white shirt and tie. And he kind of disassociates himself from his union."

"He goes to a cocktail party and he meets a journalist, an attorney, a dentist, and they say, 'What do you do?' and he says, 'Oh, I'm a sheet metal worker,' and they say, 'A sheet metal worker?' He's ashamed to be a sheet metal worker. But he's earning just as much as these people, and in a lot of cases like teachers and accountants he's making a helluva lot more. But it's the old white-collar syndrome, you know."

The result, as Valdastrì says, is "we've built a middle-class snob."

UNION LEADERS SHOW CONCERN

Among union leaders, there is no lack of concern or vision about these problems. To a man, they speak of the need to be more creative and imaginative in the future.

Lane Kirkland, the No. 2 man in the AFL-CIO and most likely successor to George Meany, recalled an incident involving Sen. Edmund S. Muskie and the frustration of one worker. Muskie told Kirkland he had stopped to chat with a girl working in a shoe factory while campaigning recently. The senator asked what she did on the job. All day long, she said, all she did was put a drop of glue on the heel of a shoe and then apply patent

leather. Muskie asked how she liked her work. She hated it, she replied.

"Well, of course she hated it," Kirkland said. "We have to pay more attention to the fact that people have got to do something more with their lives outside of their jobs. A man's life is becoming less and less a totally job-centered thing."

"But the job is still the secret to a guy's general happiness and attitude. If you like your work, you're happy. If you don't, you're miserable."

What complicates the situation is that both labor and management today are faced with a number of critical and complex problems—and the anti-establishment, the I'm-out-for-my-own attitudes and the new values about the worth of work compound these difficulties. There exists among labor and management today a sobering recognition that they are all facing some new and hard realities, that America's resources and its capacity for affluence are not unlimited, that the uncontrolled appetites of big business, big labor and the rest of us consumers have led the nation into hard times.

One corporation executive, who did not want to be identified, posed the problem this way.

"THE 'PASS THROUGH' THEORY

"Big business could accommodate a lot of stupidity at a time of great prosperity," he said. "But now the mistakes we made in the past are coming back to haunt us. We came to believe during a period of boom that we could do no wrong. In the short run, we couldn't. Everybody operated on the 'pass through' theory. So what if wages went up? We could always pass it through to the consumer."

"Both big labor and big business in effect knowingly did this without too much reflection that they eventually were going to hurt 200 million people as consumers. Now let's look at the new power conglomerations in this country and the effect they've had on everyone. We've had three major strikes the last five years with enormous disruptive effects on the economy. Consider them: Ford, the nation's second largest company, 49 days in 1967; GE, the fourth largest, 101 days in 1969 and 1970, and GM, the largest, 67 days in 1970."

"The country has never had these massive kinds of confrontations which get more massive as the companies and the union grow and become more important to the economy. The same thing could happen with public employees as these unions continue to grow. The GM strike, for instance, affected many different parts of the country and many different groups of employees. Its GNP is larger than that of many countries, and the effect would be that of a general strike in a Latin American nation."

Business executive and union official alike are puzzled about what satisfactory device could replace, modify or improve the present system of collective bargaining. Aside from the transportation industry, neither big business nor big labor wants a system of mandatory arbitration. Neither side wants to place that much power in the hand of either the government or an outside arbitrator.

AFL-CIO President George Meany and I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, are among those who think America may have reached the point where the day of major strikes is ending. Abel also thinks the unions and management inevitably are moving closer toward accepting the idea of some kind of binding arbitration, in whatever form that may finally take.

Indeed, in talking to both labor and management officials one comes away with a feeling that they have far more in common on most issues than in conflict.

"SENSE OF SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS"

Again, to quote the UAW's Doug Fraser: "Management has developed a sense of so-

cial consciousness that they never had before. Even 10 years ago, the traditional position was that the problems of society were none of their concern. Well, that's changed. And that's to the good."

Neither is it unusual to hear top management express respect for the unions. "I think unions serve a necessary function," says Chrysler's William O'Brien. "They came into being because of management abuses, and I don't think a man in industry dealing with the unions could last if he's antilabor. He couldn't be at all effective."

Top labor and top management face similar problems in another respect: the increasing demands for more from the workers they represent and employ. As a distinguished Washington economist said, that situation raises another paradox. He senses structural changes in the labor movement, with weakened national leadership and stronger rank-and-file membership producing a trend without parallel in American history—high wage demands coming at a time of high unemployment.

Part of the reasons for this, he suggested, are rooted in larger changes taking place in American society. We live in a time when people at the grass roots are demanding more power and greater participation. The unions are affected by these conditions in two ways. Both the ability of workers to approve or disapprove their leaders' collective bargaining agreements and the I-want-mine-now attitude of members have weakened the ability of national union leaders to moderate wage demands and strategy.

No advanced industrial society, he went on, has been able to reconcile three fundamental areas: full employment, price stability and free institutions.

"PERMANENT INCOMES POLICY"

"You can pick any two of those and achieve them," he said, "but not all of them together. We're going to be forced, whether we like it or not, into some kind of permanent incomes policy in America. The unions haven't faced it."

The country, in fact, hasn't faced it.

At the heart of labor-management questions are fundamental disagreements about how the American economic system should function—about how the pie should be divided and how capitalism should operate. Business argues that labor has crippled the American free enterprise system by demanding and getting more than is rightfully its productive share of new wealth. Labor argues that business seeks to shift more of the total wealth away from workers' salaries and toward dividends, capital gains and property.

While they are debating those questions, other critics of the economic system are making a different kind of argument. Neither business nor labor, they say, has paid sufficient attention to other inadequacies. The system clearly isn't working perfectly if 11½ million full-time workers—one-seventh of the total workforce—are earning less than the minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour.

That is not the only unanswered question involving American workers.

Business and labor leaders recognize that society must also come to grips with the enormous displacement of manpower caused by constantly changing technology and automation. Business, to be more efficient and meet increasing competition, needs to employ more advanced techniques of increasing production. But it is only natural that labor unions and their members will vigorously resist innovations which they see as displacing their jobs. Such has been the case, for instance, in the construction and newspaper industries.

In construction, the failure to resolve differences over new production techniques and business modernization in part have resulted in runaway costs. Everyone has been hurt. Faced with similar problems, many newspa-

pers have gone out of business. Others have sought to break unions.

These are not economic questions alone. As we have reported, something needs to be done to make the assembly line production job more attractive—some process that makes work more satisfying and also increases productivity. Today, as the level of expectations of American workers continues to rise, there is an inevitable collision between rising educational attainments and rising technological changes. To put it simply, better educated workers are being asked to do simpler and less challenging work.

All these are among the dilemmas facing the country and the unions.

In the past 10 days we have reported criticisms of union leadership and union practices, union democracy and union power. But let this also be said: the unions do not have a single problem that cannot be found in virtually every other area of American life, whether politics or business or in the labor relations of *The Washington Post*, including the newsroom of this newspaper.

The unions, like the country, are in a period of great change and challenge from within and without. Within labor's ranks there is no shortage of ideas about what is needed to meet these challenges.

Some say the unions must revitalize themselves and recapture the sense of idealism and adventure that, supposedly, characterized the early trade union movement days. They see this occurring only after the present top leadership changes.

Some say organized labor must reduce the number of international unions down from 130 or more to 10 or 15 big unions. This, they say, will permit the unions to save energy and money and stop the bitter jurisdictional struggles among themselves. It will enable labor to concentrate on much broader aspects of trade union work in education, in organizing the unorganized, in political and legislative work that affects every American.

Some say the unions must take the lead in the next stage on the road to industrial democracy. They mean that all the unions have accomplished in the past for the American working man—better wages, better working conditions, better benefits—have not been enough. The next stage, as Irving Bluestone of the UAW envisions it, "is going to move in the direction that society is moving. And that is more and more people are insisting to be part and parcel of the decision-making process which affects their welfare."

He thinks that the next step inevitably will come in the desire of workers to participate in the employer-employee relationships that determine the nature and conditions of their jobs.

"WE STILL HAVE POVERTY"

Some say unions must also guarantee more participation of their rank-and-file in the decision-making of their own unions. But they say the larger question involves giving citizens a greater voice in shaping the massive economic forces that affect their lives, whether unions or corporations.

"If you want to talk about the future of the labor movement, you've got to talk about the future of America," said Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America. "The labor movement is but an instrument in our society. Every society may not need a labor movement. In a totalitarian one they don't have it. But in a society like ours, the labor movement is the only private organization in American life that's dedicated to the best interests of all the American people. And we still have a lop-sided society."

"We still have poverty. We still have discrimination. We still have inequality. We still have dirty, filthy cities. And we still have lousy services given to the people of this country. So you start making changes as best you can."

Beirne was expressing the best sentiments

of organized labor's historic tradition—to improve American society. The early labor movement, as the present one, was marred by imperfections, by excesses and by positions over which honest men can disagree in a democracy. The American Federation of Labor of the 1890s had narrow and selfish interests, as do most American institutions. But it also had idealism.

"We want more schoolhouses and less jails, more books and less arsenals, more learning and less vice, more constant work and less crime, more leisure and less greed, more justice and less revenge," said Samuel Gompers, the first AFL president, nearly 80 years ago.

His kind of vision lives on in the labor movement today. Jerry Wurf, president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers, spelled out the imperfections and promises of organized labor.

As we have already said, Wurf's union is a model of vitality and democracy. Membership in Wurf's union is voluntary; you do not have to pay dues or receive the union's permission to work. It is also a union that works incessantly at communicating with its members and in espousing causes that many other unions shun.

"The sorriest thing that ever happened to some unions was when they started looking at their balance sheets," Wurf says, "when they began accumulating large amounts of dollars. Some unions can accumulate members and dollars, some unions can accumulate members, dollars and good conditions of employment. Some unions can indulge in pure trade union responsibility, which means narrow economic needs for its members. And some unions really understand the role of a trade union as an institution in a society."

Then Wurf said:

"The litmus test of a free society is a vital labor movement. Sorry as our labor movement has been at times in its history, I think you'll find that the vigor of a society is closely related to the vigor of the trade union movement."

"And I would say to you that if you have a dull, meaningless, unconcerned labor movement, you'll find there's a very important lack in the society in its narrowest and broadest sense."

The American labor movement is neither dull nor meaningless. Its problems are serious, its potential great. It can and should be better. Its future is uncertain.

In all of its strengths and weaknesses, it is a reflection of the country itself.

BUSING, THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, few Americans realize that the key issue in the busing question is the source of authority in our constitutional structure.

The constitutional crisis threatened by the busing issue is who governs America—the Congress which expresses the deliberate sense of the people, or the judges presently sitting on the Federal bench.

The Constitution is quite clear on this in the supremacy clause:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall

be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Furthermore, the Constitution clearly establishes the power of the Congress over appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court by giving the representatives of the people the power to determine what class of cases the Supreme Court can and cannot hear. In other words, the Congress has the power to give or revoke or regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Professor Jeffery Hart of Dartmouth points out quite clearly that:

Too many heavy investments have been made in government by judicial fiat.

Thus, as Professor Hart points out:

The "deliberate sense" of the people has been clearly outraged.

The true answer to the busing issue and other problems of Federal intervention into the lives of our people lies in the restriction of the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Such an act would restore supremacy to the true representatives of the people—the Congress—and would enable us to return to a government representing the "deliberate sense of the people."

The bill H.R. 390, reintroduced in 1971, would accomplish this purpose by requiring the concurrence of the full membership of the Court to decide that any provision of a statute of the United States, a State statute, or a State constitution, is invalid because it is in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States, or reverse, alter, or modify any decision or rule of law made by the Court.

This country's greatness lies in the fact that ours is a system of government in which change is possible under the law, yet our system is so constructed with its checks and balances as to protect itself from the destructive whims of the people as well as political expediency by those temporarily entrusted with power. In other words, our constitutional Republic insists that any change be made through a reasoned, deliberate process so that the people truly realize what is happening in their society and can, therefore, exercise some degree of control.

This is the constitutional crisis facing America. The Supreme Court, assuming the role of the great arbiter of American life, has become but a doting mother whose spoiled child gets exactly what he thinks he wants, whether it is good for him or not. My bill, H.R. 390, would restore sanity and reason to the appellate role of the Supreme Court and obviate the constitutional crisis now threatening America.

I insert a copy of my bill and related newscippings to follow my remarks:

[From the Manchester Union Leader, May 2, 1972]

COURTS AGAINST PEOPLE

Professor Jeffrey Hart of Dartmouth, one of the most profound thinkers among the national columnists of this day, points out that when President Nixon asked Congress to take action against the senseless busing of black and white students out of their neighborhoods into distant schools just for the sake of achieving some sort of racial balance, he put the Congress, expressing the will of

the people, in direct conflict with the courts. Congress has the power, given by the U.S. Constitution, to actually determine what class of cases the Supreme Court can hear and what it cannot hear. The exact words of the Constitution, Article III, are:

"In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned (the list appears in the preceding section), the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

For some time now the federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have been operating as if they were under divine instruction as to what is best for the rest of the nation and with no regard to the "deliberate sense" of the people. The arrogance of the federal judiciary has become so overbearing that at least, on the specific issue of busing, there is a revolt on the part of the people and the determination that this type of government by unelected judges must come to an end.

As Professor Hart points out in his brilliant column at the top of our back page today, Congress and the courts have been behaving as if a tacit agreement existed not to have a head-on collision. Professor Hart says they may find a way this time to avoid it, but he doubts it. As he says, and as this newspaper sees it, the "deliberate sense" of the people has been outraged in this busing situation.

This newspaper feels such a confrontation would be a healthy situation—that it is high time some members of the federal judiciary be made to realize they are NOT God Almighty's anointed representatives on this earth, but are very much subject to restraint by the "deliberate sense" of the people.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

[From The Manchester Union Leader, May 2, 1972]

CONFRONTATION OF CONGRESS AND SUPREME COURT ON CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS LOOMS—
BUSING QUESTION: WHO GOVERNS AMERICA?

(By Jeffrey Hart)

Wherever you stand on the merits of busing, the issue as it is now shaping up is of the most intense interest to the political philosopher, for what is in question, finally, is the source of authority in our constitutional structure.

At present, there are two theories of government virtually at war in the United States. According to the first theory, we are governed by the "deliberate sense" of the people. To be sure, the "sense" must indeed be "deliberate." A carefully designed system of buffers and filters guards against major change at the hands of temporary emotional majorities.

We have a separation of powers, the Presidential veto, judicial review, the filibuster, and so on. Nevertheless, according to the first theory, we are governed, finally, by the deliberate sense of the people as reflected in Congress and the Presidency.

According to the second theory, on the other hand, we are governed, finally, by the courts, and, ultimately, by the Supreme Court. In this theory, the authority of the courts is grounded on the "all men are created equal" clause of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights—especially the First Amendment—and the "equal protection clause" of the Fourteenth Amendment.

At present, according to the second theory of government, these texts are to be understood as enjoining the government, state and Federal, to proceed as expeditiously as possible to the establishment of general equality. This, indeed, is the major priority of government.

CXVIII—994—Part 12

Profound issues are at stake here, indeed the ultimate issue of politics: Who governs?

Whether in fact those texts really do mean that the American system is dedicated to the achievement of equality is a fascinating argument. It has been demonstrated to my satisfaction that they do not. But, at this point, it scarcely matters—for the issue has been joined with President Nixon's recommendation that the Legislative branch take on the courts.

Is our system one of judicial supremacy? The Constitution gives a clear answer. The pertinent language is in Article III, which gives Congress the power to remove a wide range of matters from the purview of the Supreme Court: "In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned (the list appears in the preceding section), the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

FINAL AUTHORITY

This is unequivocal. Congress can make "exceptions" to the "appellate jurisdiction" of the Court. It is clear that the framers of the Constitution meant to lodge final authority in the Congress.

The fact that head-on collision between Congress and the courts has been infrequent is beside the point. Historically, Congress and the courts have behaved as if a tacit agreement existed not to have a head-on collision. This prudential restraint has even been given mythic express: in the assertion that we have three separate and equal branches of government.

It may be that Congress and the courts will, as often in the past, find a way to shy away from the present confrontation. But it does not look that way. Too many heavy investments have been made in government by judicial fiat. And the "deliberate sense" of the people has clearly been outraged.

H.R. 390

A bill to impose certain restrictions upon the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1259. Appellate jurisdiction; limitations

"The Supreme Court shall not have appellate jurisdiction to—

"(1) decide that any provision of a statute of the United States, a State statute, or a State constitution, is invalid because it is in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States, or

"(2) reverse, alter, or modify any decision or rule of law made by the Court, except upon the concurrence of the full membership of the Court."

(b) The section analysis at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1259. Appellate jurisdiction; limitation."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 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?

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY ONCE
AGAIN SAD

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the national holiday of free Poland—the 181st anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. Unfortunately, Polish Constitution Day will once again be a sad and silent holiday. Poland is not free and the principles contained within the Constitution are not recognized by the rulers of that proud people.

During the 18th century, Poland was the pawn in the political games of its powerful neighbors. Cognizant of their weakness, the Poles sought an opportunity to exercise their rights as a people and a state. Finally, in early 1791, circumstances throughout Europe allowed them the chance to again grasp the reins controlling their destiny.

Influenced by the philosophies which contributed to the American and French Revolutions, members of the Polish Diet overcame their differences and drafted a document of monumental importance on May 3. People throughout the land cheered the dawning of a new age. The reforms of this document brilliantly shone through the darkness of political tyranny in Eastern Europe. Poland had inaugurated a bloodless revolution which eliminated the vestiges of a system greatly responsible for the political weakness of the country.

Unfortunately for Poland and the people of the world, her neighbors had no desire to allow the seed of constitutional monarchy the opportunity to bear fruit on their borders. They invaded Poland, and even the gallant struggles of men such as Prince Joseph Poniatowski and General Thaddeus Kosciuszko could not halt the relentless drive of the invaders. The Constitution was overthrown, and within 4 years, Poland disappeared from the map of Europe.

Despite the merciless demise of the Constitution, the Poles remained steadfast in their will. The spirit of liberty and national independence which inspired the Constitution remained their treasured hope. In succeeding generations, wherever they migrated, Poles held dear the basic principles behind the Constitution of 1791.

As the descendants of a people who saw their freedom crushed under the heels of despotism, Polish-Americans have jealously guarded their freedom and have bravely fought to preserve it. Their boundless energy, industry, love of family, and devotion to duty are inspiration to those who still struggle for the right to determine their own fate.

The Polish national anthem begins: "Poland is not lost forever..." The principles of the Polish Constitution will not be lost so long as men strive for liberty anywhere in the world.

INCREASE OF FOREIGN FISHING
OFF U.S. COASTS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, many Alaskan villages and communities are dependent to an exceptional degree upon the economic benefits directly or indirectly derived from the fishing industry. Fishing provides an estimated 30,000 seasonal jobs to Alaskans, most of whom are Natives, and the Alaskan fishery catch of 1970 ranked first in value and fourth in volume among the 50 States.

I have recently received the March 1972 Report on Foreign Fishing off U.S. Coasts published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. According to that report, the number of foreign fishing and fishery support vessels sighted off the U.S. coasts in March 1972 increased for the fifth consecutive month.

Since the Alaskan coastline comprises 53 percent of the total U.S. shoreline, it is not surprising the NOAA notes that most of the increase was due to increased Japanese fishing effort off Alaska, where a total of 330 Soviet and Japanese vessels now fish.

For too many years, fishermen in Alaska have suffered severe economic losses because of inadequate protection. I have continuously urged that three steps must be taken in order to protect our ocean resources and the economic stability of the State of Alaska.

First, the capabilities of the Coast Guard in Alaska must be increased to enable it to carry out the mission of protecting our marine resources. The Coast Guard does an excellent job of guarding our waters and resources, even with its very limited equipment and manpower. The tremendous task the Coast Guard faces in patrolling Alaskan waters and in

particular the Bering Sea is demonstrated by the continual growth of the numbers of foreign fishing vessels encroaching on Alaskan territorial waters. Manpower must be increased in Kodiak and other areas of southeast Alaska.

Second, the establishment of a helicopter detachment in Cordova is vitally needed. Due to the rapidly increasing fishing activity in the Prince William Sound, such a detachment would significantly facilitate the protection of Alaskan fishing rights.

Third, the establishment of a Coast Guard station in Cordova, Alaska, is very badly needed for the adequate conservation of fishing resources.

As you can see, the encroachment of foreign fishing vessels in Alaskan waters is one of the most important problems facing the State of Alaska. Increased protection of the Alaskan coastline is absolutely essential to the growth and stability of Alaska.

I have brought the number of fishing violations off the coast of Alaska to the attention of my colleagues before, and, on a monthly basis, I will continue to keep the Members of Congress abreast of fishing activities in Alaskan waters.

I now include in the RECORD the Department of Commerce's Report on Foreign Fishing off U.S. Coasts, and I believe it deserves your careful consideration:

REPORT ON FOREIGN FISHING OFF U.S. COASTS,
MARCH 1972

(Maps mentioned are not printed in RECORD)

The number of foreign fishing and fishery support vessels sighted off the U.S. coasts in March 1972 increased for the fifth consecutive month to over 650, or 100 vessels more than in February 1972. Most of the increase was due to increased Japanese fishing effort off Alaska, where a total of 330 Soviet and Japanese vessels now fish. About 300 foreign vessels fished off the Atlantic coast. Foreign fishing off the Pacific Northwest and California was still negligible; a dozen Cuban vessels fished off Florida in the Gulf of Mexico. Table 1 shows the composition of foreign fleets by country and type of vessel.

The largest concentration of foreign vessels in March was off Alaska where the Japanese increased their effort to over 170 vessels

(from over 80 vessels in February 1972), while the Soviet Union's fleet decreased slightly in number (from 170 in February to 160 vessels in March). The Japanese abandoned herring fishing in the central Bering Sea in March and began fishing for king and tanner crabs 32 vessels on the U.S. Continental Shelf in the eastern Bering Sea. Under the bilateral agreement concluded with the United States in December 1970, Japan will be permitted to harvest 37,500 cases (1/2-lb. 48's) of king crab and 14.6 million tanner crab (with 10 percent allowance) in 1972. The Japanese also greatly increased their effort for Alaska pollock (from 9 to 81 vessels). Nine Japanese longliners fished for sablefish (blackcod) in the Gulf. Herring was sought only by the Soviet fishermen (62 vessels); however, their main target was Bering Sea flounders. Shrimp was caught by the Soviets only (19 vessels) in the Gulf of Alaska. Small fisheries for Pacific ocean perch and various groundfish species were also conducted by both countries.

Off the U.S. Atlantic coast, the Soviet Union had by far the largest number of vessels (190), followed by Poland and East Germany (63 and 27 vessels, respectively). All were fishing primarily for herring and mackerel. The fisheries of other European countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Spain, Norway) and Japan were minor. During the month, the Soviets reduced their effort in the Mid-Atlantic and concentrated their fleet on Georges Bank. Other countries, especially the Poles and East Germans, continued their fisheries in the Mid-Atlantic Bight, mostly for sea herring and mackerel. The Japanese fished for squid and butterfish, while the Norwegians longlined for sharks.

Foreign fishing activity off New England and in the Mid-Atlantic Bight showed a significant increase in March 1972 (20 percent above sightings made in March 1971). Many foreign vessels continued to fish in the "no-fishing zone" in the Mid-Atlantic established under bilateral agreements concluded with the Soviet Union and Poland to protect spawning concentrations of hakes between January and mid-April. The Soviets did not violate the "no-fishing zone". Several Polish vessels, however, were sighted fishing there. The Department of State made a strong protest to the Polish Government and temporarily suspended the entry of Polish vessels into U.S. ports. The entry of Polish fishing vessels into certain U.S. ports is permitted under the 1971 U.S.-Polish bilateral fisheries agreement, in effect until June 30, 1972.

FISHING VESSEL SIGHTINGS (EXCLUDING DUPLICATE SIGHTINGS); BY TYPE OF VESSEL AND COUNTRY

Fishing grounds	Stern trawlers ¹	Medium trawlers ²	Other fishing vessels	Process and transport vessels	Support vessels ³	Research vessels ⁴	Total
OFF PACIFIC COASTS							
Off Alaska:							
Japan	31	115	9	17	2		174
Soviet Union	29	99		26	6		160
Republic of Korea							
Total	60	214	9	43	8		334
Off Pacific Northwest:							
Japan			1				1
Soviet Union							
Other							
Total			1				1
Off California:							
Soviet Union							
Japan							
Total							
IN GULF OF MEXICO							
Mexican							
Cuban			12				12
Soviet							
Japanese							
Other							
Total			12				12

Footnotes at end of table.

Fishing grounds	Stern trawlers ¹	Medium trawlers ²	Other fishing vessels	Process and transport vessels	Support vessels ³	Research vessels ⁴	Total
OFF ATLANTIC COASTS							
Soviet Union	39	136		10	3	2	190
Poland	23	37		3			63
East Germany	10	15		2			27
Federal Republic of Germany							
Bulgaria	8						8
Romania	1						1
Spain	2						2
Japan	7	6					13
Italy							
Norway			2				2
Canada	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Other							
Total	90	194	2	15	3	2	306
Grand total	150	408	24	58	11	2	653

¹ Includes all classes of stern factory and stern freezer trawlers.

² Includes all classes of medium size trawlers (nonrefrigerated, refrigerated, and freezer trawlers).

³ Includes fuel and water carriers, tugs, cargo vessels, etc.

⁴ Includes exploratory, research, and enforcement (E) vessels.

⁵ Longliners.

⁶ Vessels using handline gear.

⁷ Not available.

OFF ALASKA

Soviet: Approximately 160 Soviet vessels were engaged in fisheries off Alaska in March. This was a decrease of about 15 vessels from the previous month, but was about the same number of vessels that operated in March 1971.

The trawl fishery for groundfish along the Continental Shelf edge in the eastern Bering Sea, north of the Fox Islands, was continued by 6 medium trawlers until mid-month when the fishery was terminated. It is believed that the trawlers moved into the central Bering Sea flounder and pollock fisheries (see Map 1).

The Soviet shrimp fleet in the Gulf of Alaska remained at 17 medium trawlers, joined by a factoryship late in the month. The factoryship is processing the raw shrimp delivered by the trawlers. Before its arrival, the trawlers were freezing the shrimp and periodically delivering their catches to a refrigerated transport vessel. Late in the month, one of the trawlers began exploratory operations east of Kodiak Island on Portlock Bank; the remainder of the fleet, however, remained east of the Shumagin Islands in the western Gulf of Alaska. The whale killer/patrol vessel continues to remain with the fleet on enforcement duty.

Soviet fishing in the northern central Bering Sea continued throughout the month with emphasis on herring and pollock. By month's end, the fleet was composed of 10 stern trawlers, 37 medium trawlers, and 15 support vessels. The center of fishing continues to be on the Continental Shelf edge, southwest of St. Matthew Island.

The eastern Bering Sea flounder fleet increased from 70 to 77 vessels. Included in the fleet were 17 stern trawlers, 45 medium trawlers, and 15 support vessels. The fishery was centered on the Continental Shelf edge from the Pribilof Islands southward to Unimak Island. Many vessels (about one-half) in this fleet were fishing Alaska pollock.

The Soviet fishery for ocean perch continued throughout the month with 2 stern trawlers operating on Albatross Bank, south of Kodiak Island, in the central Gulf of Alaska.

Japanese: Approximately 174 Japanese vessels were engaged in fisheries off Alaska in March. This was an increase of about 90 vessels that were in this area in March 1971.

The number of independent stern trawlers fishing for ocean perch in the Gulf of Alaska decreased from 8 to 6 early in the month and remained at that level throughout the remainder of March, supported by 1 refrigerated transport vessel. The vessels were scattered in the eastern and central Gulf ranging from off Kodiak Island eastward to southeastern Alaska (see Map 1).

Early in March, 4 Japanese factoryships,

accompanied by a total of 77 trawlers, arrived in the eastern Bering Sea and commenced fishing for pollock along the Continental Shelf edge, northwest of Unimak Island. This brought the total of factoryship fleets fishing for pollock to 5, but by mid-month 1 fleet that had been fishing throughout the winter months departed for Japan. Each fleet is supported by 1 refrigerated transport vessel.

The Japanese winter flounder fishery (2 fleets with 17 trawlers) on the Continental Shelf edge in the eastern Bering Sea was terminated during the month. One fleet departed early in March, the other by month's end.

The number of independent stern trawlers fishing for groundfish along the Continental Shelf edge in the Bering Sea increased from 20 to 25. This fleet was supported by 2 refrigerated transport vessels and fished between Unimak Pass and Pribilof Islands.

The Japanese herring fishery in the central Bering Sea was abandoned mid-month. The stern trawlers fishing herring shifted to groundfish trawling along the Continental Shelf in the eastern Bering Sea.

The annual Japanese king and tanner crab fishery on the Continental Shelf in the eastern Bering Sea began early in the month with the arrival of 2 factoryships accompanied by a total of 30 crab pot and tangle net vessels. Initial reports indicate the fleet is fishing only crab pots at this time and is taking principally tanner crab, and that the use of tangle nets for king crab will be limited to 2 one-month periods later in the season.

The number of longliners fishing for sablefish in the Gulf of Alaska varied between 8 and 9 throughout the month. The fishery remained centered in the eastern Gulf of Alaska, with 7 vessels fishing there, 2 fishing off the Kakutak grounds, and (at month's end) one fishing near the Shumagin Islands.

Japanese vessels seized for violation of U.S. contiguous fishery zone

On April 3, a joint U.S. Coast Guard-National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) aerial fisheries patrol sighted, 9.1 miles south of Sitkalidak Island, the Japanese stern trawler *Ryuyo Maru*, moored alongside the cargo vessel *Kohoku Maru No. 31*, conducting fishery support operations in violation of U.S. law. The aircraft advised the vessels, via message block, to remain there and await the arrival of a Coast Guard cutter. The CGC *Mellon* with an NMFS agent aboard was dispatched from Kodiak and, upon arrival approximately 4½ hours later, seized both vessels. The ships were escorted to Kodiak without incident. The District Court at Anchorage assessed fines totaling \$180,000. In January 1972, two Soviet vessels were seized for a similar violation which resulted in total penalties of \$250,000.

OFF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Japanese: One Japanese longliner was fishing the entire month near the La Perouse Bank. By comparison, 2 longliners were observed during the month of March in 1971 and 5 in 1970.

Soviet: No Soviet fishing was observed in March of 1972 or 1971.

OFF CALIFORNIA

Soviet: No fishing vessels were observed during March. One Soviet research vessel from the Pacific Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (TINRO) received permission to enter U.S. waters at Drake's Bay, north of San Francisco, to exchange scientists with a research vessel of the National Marine Fisheries Service. Both vessels then jointly conducted studies of spawning Pacific hake off the California coast. This research project is provided by the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Pacific fisheries agreement. The joint cruise lasted from March 3 to March 15; two weeks later the Soviet vessel (the *Alba*) was sighted off northern California conducting her own research.

OFF SOUTHERN U.S. COASTS

Twelve Cuban fishing vessels were sighted fishing off the southern U.S. coast in March. A number of Soviet fishing vessels transited the Florida Straits.

OFF THE WEST COAST OF FLORIDA

Cuban: Ten Cuban *Lambda* class vessels and two *Sondero* class vessels were observed about 60 miles west of Cape Romano (see Map 2). Approximately 70 motor dories carried by the *Lambda* vessels were handling and bottom longlining for snappers, groupers, and possibly king mackerel. The *Sondero* class vessels are used to transport catches back to Cuba, allowing the *Lambda* vessels in the flotilla to remain on the fishing grounds for longer periods.

IN NORTHWEST ATLANTIC

A total of 306 individual foreign fishing and support vessels from the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria, Romania, Japan, Spain, and Norway was sighted off the New England and Middle Atlantic coasts during March 1972.

The number of Soviet vessels sighted was the largest; weekly concentrations were estimated to average between 140 and 150 vessels. Of the 190 individual vessels recorded, 39 were freezer and factory stern trawlers, 136 medium side trawlers, 3 factory base ships, 7 refrigerated fish carriers and supply vessels, 2 tankers, 1 tug, 1 scientific research vessel, and 1 fisheries enforcement vessel.

In addition to the Soviet vessels, 63 Polish, 27 East German, 8 Bulgarian, 1 Romanian, 8 Spanish, 7 Japanese, and 2 Norwegian vessels were sighted in March.

OFF SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND AND GEORGES BANK

Soviet: Early in March, most Soviet vessels shifted unexpectedly from the mid-Atlantic northward to waters off Southern New England and eventually along the eastern slope of Georges Bank and the Gulf of Maine (see Maps 3 and 4).

During the first 3 weeks of the month, the heaviest Soviet fishing (75 to 80 vessels) occurred along the 50 and 100 fathom curves 55-75 miles south of Block and Nantucket Islands off Rhode Island. The fleet was within the IONAF Red Hake-Silver Hake Management Area (see Map 3). Moderate to heavy catches of fish were identified as red and silver hake, herring and mackerel. Most of the stern trawlers were using heavy bottom trawl gear and the bulk of their catch was seemingly hakes. The Soviet side trawlers, on the other hand, using the standard herring trawl, were seen catching herring, mackerel, and small amounts of red and silver hake.

By month's end, about 60 vessels moved slightly eastward to the southwest part of Georges Bank (see Map 3). Moderate and at times heavy catches were identified as red hake, silver hake, and herring.

At the same time and directly to the north, the Soviets conducted a substantial ocean perch (redfish) fishery with some 50 medium side trawlers (SRTs), 1 factory base ship, and several stern trawlers between 90-115 miles east northeast of Cape Cod (see Map 3). This area, known as the Fundian Channel, is a canal 100 to 190 fathom deep separating Georges and Browns Banks. Judging from the heavy deck loads on board most trawlers, including the factory base ship, these vessels were making excellent catches. (A similar fishery by 40 to 50 Soviet side trawlers occurred in May 1971 in the vicinity of Georges Basin, slightly south of the present Soviet fishery (see Map 3). Heavy ocean perch catches were observed also in 1971).

Spanish: A total of 8 vessels (2 stern trawlers and 6 side trawlers) was sighted in March. Heaviest fishing by 5-6 vessels occurred 65-75 miles south of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Island (within the Red Hake-Silver Hake Management Area). Several vessels also fished intermittently in the Mid-Atlantic "no fishing zone." (By agreement concluded with the United States, Soviet and Polish vessels are prohibited from fishing in this zone from January 1 through April 15).

Romanian: A single stern trawler was sighted at month's end fishing herring and mackerel 80 miles south of Martha's Vineyard.

Off Mid-Atlantic

Soviet: The Soviet fishing fleet withdrew from the Mid-Atlantic Bight early in the month (nearly two months ahead of their seasonal withdrawal in previous years). Poor catches are believed to be the main reason for this premature switch.

From 35 to 40 vessels remaining in the Mid-Atlantic area during the first half of the month fished along the northern shores of New Jersey and off Long Island (see Map 4). From mid-month, only a few scattered vessels were seen. Limited catches were identified as hakes and some herring.

Polish: A total of 63 vessels (23 stern trawlers, 37 large side trawlers, 1 factory base ship, and 2 transports) was sighted. The Polish fleets moved constantly between New York and North Carolina in search of fish. From 15 to 20 side trawlers fished consistently 15-30 miles off the North Carolina and Virginia coasts the entire month. Moderate and, at times, heavy catches of fish were identified as herring and mackerel. To the north, a larger fleet of 25 and 30 vessels was sighted at various points off Long Island and New Jersey (see Map 4). Moderate to heavy

catches were mostly herring and mackerel. At month's end about 20 vessels (mostly stern trawlers) began fishing 75-80 miles south of Block Island and Martha's Vineyard. Heavy catches appeared to be mostly mackerel.

East German: A total of 27 vessels (10 stern trawlers, 15 side trawlers, and 2 refrigerated fish carriers) was sighted. This fleet was dispersed over two distinct areas: 15 side trawlers and 1 refrigerated fish transport fished throughout the month 15-30 miles off the North Carolina and Virginia coasts. Consistently good to excellent catches were identified as herring and mackerel. To the north an average of 10 East German stern trawlers fished the entire month within the Mid-Atlantic "no fishing zone" (see Map 4). Moderate catches were identified occasionally as herring.

Bulgarian: A total of 8 stern trawlers was sighted. These vessels also fished consistently in the "no fishing zone" with the East German fleet. Moderate catches observed were mostly herring and some mackerel.

Japanese: A total of 7 freezer stern trawlers was sighted fishing mostly the Mid-Atlantic "no fishing zone." Catches were reported in Japanese trade periodicals to consist mostly of squid and butterfish.

Norwegian: Late in the month, a single Norwegian longliner was sighted about 80 miles southeast of Cape May, New Jersey (within the "no fishing zone"). No catch was visible on deck. (At least 2 Norwegian longliners will reportedly fish for porbeagle sharks starting off Virginia in March and working their way north to waters off Cape Cod by early June).

US/USSR-US/Polish Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Agreements

On March 9, eight Polish stern trawlers were sighted fishing inside the Mid-Atlantic "no fishing zone," 75-80 miles east of Cape May (New Jersey). Deck loads of fish were covered with ice preventing species identification. On March 31, one Polish stern trawler (repeater from March 9 sighting) was again fishing in the "no fishing zone." The Polish government was informed of these violations.

No Soviet vessels have been observed fishing in the "no fishing zone" in 1972.

NOTE:—During surveillance patrols the total number of vessels sighted is recorded; in addition, each vessel is identified as to type. At the end of the month all sighted vessels are counted but once, i.e., if a vessel was sighted more than once during the month it will be counted only as one vessel, thus excluding duplicate sightings. Since vessels continuously arrive at and depart from fishing areas, the total number of identified vessels for the month will always be larger than the actual size of the fishing fleets observed during surveillance patrols.

WILBUR WRIGHT COLLEGE ON VIETNAM

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the student governing body of Wilbur Wright College, 3400 North Austin Avenue, Chicago, Ill., has contacted me deploring the administration's decision to resume the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong.

In accordance with the request of Patrick M. Barton, president of the student governing body of Wilbur Wright College, I would like to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the letter

to me conveying the views of the Wilbur Wright College students regarding escalation of military action in Vietnam. The letter follows:

STUDENT GOVERNING BODY,
WILBUR WRIGHT COLLEGE,
Chicago, Ill., April 28, 1972.

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the Student Governing Body of Wilbur Wright College deplore the administration's decision to resume the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong and demand the immediate cessation of the military action in Indochina and the immediate withdrawal of U.S. land and air forces from South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand.

We request that this letter be read into the Congressional Record.

Yours truly,

PATRICK M. BARTON,
President.

REFUGEE REHABILITATION

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to focus on a praiseworthy activity of our State Department, about which the American public has far too little knowledge—namely, our refugee rehabilitation programs.

As every Member in this Chamber is well aware, the constant misfortunes of war, epidemic disease, and natural catastrophe force millions of people annually to rearrange their lives and to relocate in foreign lands.

I wish to insert into the RECORD a most informative speech recently delivered by Frank L. Kellogg, special assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs. With his accustomed directness and innate feel for quality analysis, the enormously capable Mr. Kellogg has succeeded in outlining the most salient aspects of the critical refugee problems with which our State Department is dealing.

This excellent address, Mr. Speaker, was delivered before the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference on April 28 in New York. I am sure its contents will prove most enlightening:

REMARKS OF FRANK L. KELLOGG

As I have often said, my long association with the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference has been among the rewarding experiences of my life. It was just a year ago Sunday, though, that I first appeared before you in the role of Government official.

The months since then have been eventful. There have been elements of high drama in refugee and migration affairs. And, I think there has been progress in our country's responses to the rights and the needs of people caught up in the conflicts and rivalries which continue to plague mankind.

Today, I want to share with you some of the highlights of the year—and briefly to discuss some of the milestones we have passed in Washington.

First, the drama:

To my best recollection, when we met last April, I made only a passing reference to what was beginning to develop in South Asia. The situation was young then. About 150,000

¹ Off Long Island and New Jersey.

persons had fled into India from violence-torn East Pakistan.

We were concerned, of course. But no one then anticipated the magnitude of the disaster which had begun to develop. Even now, it challenges comprehension. Before it was over, nearly 10 million men, women and children were huddled in more than a thousand crude camps, dependent on strangers for the barest necessities of life. I visited some of the more accessible camps in India. I moved among incredible crowds of refugees. And yet, those I saw were only the smallest fraction of the total number.

In the annals of refugee affairs, 1971 in the subcontinent made tragic history.

But the world's humanitarian response made history as well.

India's appeal to the United Nations triggered what was to become the largest single international emergency relief effort on record. It involved dozens of governments, and scores of voluntary agencies in many nations. It supplied veritable mountains of materials, foods measured in the thousands of tons, medicines in the millions of doses.

Logistical resources were primitive. Transport was difficult. Bottlenecks abounded. And yet, somehow, supplies were delivered to the camps on time. Shelter was provided. Epidemics were averted. And there was no famine.

But you know the basic story. I will take time only to cite some of the innovations of this vast relief operation. And to call attention to some outstanding performances.

Within the United Nations, there was no precedent for dealing with a disaster of this size. Secretary General U Thant found a solution. He established a *focal point* for international assistance, under direction of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. The High Commissioner, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, lost no time in organizing a staff whose subsequent performance I can only describe as superb. The UNHCR coordinated rather than directed. He mediated. He cut red tape. He saw to it that the job was done.

India's response was exemplary. From the beginning, the Government of India insisted that its own employees—and personnel of its own voluntary agencies—would handle all operations in the camps and centers, and the immense and complicated logistics as well. Many hundreds of paid and unpaid workers took part. Necessarily, they were organized in haste. Necessarily, there were severe problems. Here and there, there were shortcomings.

But overall, the quality of Indian management, the efficiency of ration and registration systems, the warm attitudes toward the refugees of those in charge at the camps, impressed all observers including me.

In Washington, the Administration's reaction combined humanitarian concern with a no-nonsense approach to U.S. participation.

U.S. Government assistance, it was determined, would be routed through the United Nations rather than bilaterally. The President appointed an Interagency Committee to coordinate support from throughout the Government. I served as chairman. The White House, State, Defense, Agriculture and A.I.D. all were represented. We had guidance and sound advice from a special group—also appointed by the White House—called the President's Advisory Panel on South Asian Relief. The panel's six distinguished members include our chairman today, Max Rabb.

The U.S. Government was the first and largest donor to the U.N. program. Our food fed millions of refugees. Our airlifts delivered emergency cholera vaccines. Our high-protein diet supplements saved thousands of children from death or deformity by malnutrition. Our polyethylene—used for the first time as mass emergency shelter—fended off the monsoon rains. Our blankets filled dozens of cargo jets to Calcutta, and an entire steamship as well.

The international community joined in

with unparalleled generosity. Seventy nations made contributions. All told—apart from India itself—the world's governments gave \$245 million in cash and kind. Our share was about 37 per cent.

But governments were not alone. National and international voluntary agencies gave an additional \$69 million. American organizations alone raised \$11 million. All over our country, concerned citizens conducted campaigns on behalf of the refugees.

In retrospect and in balance, I think this was a very successful relief operation. I use the word *was* because, as you know, with establishment of Bangladesh, the refugees have gone home. Their return migration, now virtually complete, will go down in history as an absolutely remarkable mass movement of people. Nearly 10 million human beings, many making long journeys, returned in only about three months, by every conceivable means of transportation including just walking.

I will leave the story here. For the issue now is refugee care no longer. It is rehabilitation within Bangladesh, with different U.S. and U.N. agencies involved.

That was the big drama of the refugee year. And now, another mass assistance program—although not nearly so large—looms on the horizon.

After years of civil strife in the Southern Sudan, an accord has just been reached between leaders of the government and the dissidents. It is hoped that the agreement will bring voluntary return to their homes of perhaps 200,000 people who have fled to neighboring nations—and reportedly as many as 500,000 more displaced within their own country.

The Government of the Sudan has made an appeal for resettlement help. The United Nations is assessing the situation, and the needs. So it is possible that the U.N. will be asking governments and voluntary agencies for assistance.

And with nearly 8 million persons in refugee status around the world, repatriation and resettlement of these large numbers of Sudanese would indeed be welcome.

Mass relief efforts aside, our other Government refugee programs continued throughout the year.

There was a spate of 20th anniversary observations. On the international scene, these involved both the UNHCR and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. I don't need to dwell here on the importance of these programs.

Only a month ago, in Washington, I was privileged to participate with Secretary Rogers at a ceremony during which the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service paid tribute to the United States Refugee Program on the occasion of USRP's 20th anniversary. A number of prominent people in this audience were there. In connection with USRP, a milestone of the year was our conclusion of an arrangement which permits Soviet emigres to enter the United States under the Attorney General's immigration parole authority. And under the parole authority, since the first of the year, about 60 of them have begun to reconstruct their lives in the United States, and an equal number are in the process of coming to this country. There will be more. About 14,000 Jews left the Soviet Union during 1971, most of them to resettle in Israel. The U.S. Refugee Program has supported these movements—both to Israel, and to the United States.

In 1970, we made it possible for eligible Chinese refugees in Hong Kong to enter the United States under 7th preference. Last November, we made another breakthrough of sorts. We began to make travel loans to these immigrants, under our Far East Refugee Program. The newly-arrived Chinese thus have the opportunity to become self-supporting and successfully integrated in a shorter period of time, without unnecessary burdens of unmanageable debt.

A widely publicized event during the year was our issuance of a new *General Policy for Dealing with Requests for Asylum by Foreign Nationals*.

This seven-page unclassified document sets forth no departures—for, in the words of Secretary Rogers, "the right of asylum is rooted in our history and our tradition." What the document does do is clarify beyond doubt the unflagging American beliefs in the right of asylum. It gives specific instructions to our authorities at all levels on how to handle requests for asylum in the U.S.

The document is a "best-seller." It has been distributed throughout the Government, to all our missions overseas, and to state and local police forces. Foreign governments, including the Soviet Union, have asked for and have received copies. Our object, of course, is to make sure that when a foreigner seeks asylum in the U.S., our authorities—wherever they may be—understand their responsibilities and what steps to take.

There is ample evidence, since we issued it, that the guidance has taken effect.

I would like to note here that there has been the fullest cooperation, during the year, among the organizations with primary interest in these areas. These, in addition to the voluntary agencies, are Barbara Watson's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and my own Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs. We have shared many mutual problems and concerns. We have dealt as partners in development of the asylum and parole procedures I have mentioned.

In the presence of Congressman Celler, I am happy to be able to report continued warm support on Capitol Hill for refugee and migration programs.

State Department budget requests now require authorization by Congress every year, as well as appropriations. This development puts us before four committees a year instead of two. And, of course, there are additional subcommittees which are interested in our work.

The record shows that when humanitarian needs are under consideration, our legislators usually are on the side of the angels. I have appeared during the year—sometimes backstopping Mr. Macomber—at six hearings of different committees of the two House of Congress. I found among the members, without exception, attitudes of sympathy and concern for human beings in trouble.

Beyond personal compassion, Congressional interest in these matters reflects, I think, the basic humanitarianism of Americans, and particularly the public-opinion weight of the more than 40 million voters who belong to or support our voluntary agencies engaged in refugee and immigration matters.

These operations are non-controversial for the most part, and they receive only passing attention from the news media. Yet they constitute an integral part of American foreign policy. And they command full support from Congress and the American people.

When I appeared here last April, as some of you may remember, I devoted my talk in part to the indispensable role of the voluntary agencies engaged with the Government in refugee service overseas.

I have had opportunities during the past year to see your selfless and dedicated workers assisting refugees abroad. And I have had almost every-day contact with voluntary-agency leaders, including many of you here in this room.

Our Government programs could not operate without you and your people, and the organizations which you represent. For it is the human, sympathetic, person-to-person counseling and service to refugees which makes these programs successful. And this, only the voluntary agencies can provide.

Thank you.

AUTISM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most overlooked, if not unknown, facts about mental illness in this country today is that mental illness touches one family in three. It is indeed alarming to learn that there are more than 10 million mentally ill children in America. More than 2 million of these are severely disturbed. Another 2 million are mentally retarded. These are very disconcerting facts.

Another disconcerting, even heart-breaking fact is that there are about four autistic children in every 10,000 live births. But this remains just a statistic to those who are unaware of what autism actually is. Autism is a mysterious, enigmatic language and behavior disorder that hinges on a child's inability to communicate with others. Mrs. Lois J. Blackwell, of the Judevine Center for Autistic Children at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., quite perceptibly defines the plight of an autistic child:

An autistic child is a child who appears to be living in a world of his own: a world in which love seems to be neither sought nor given, nor even accepted; a world in which fingers, mechanical devices, tiny objects of any sort, and bits of string take primary significance while parents, family members, and, in fact, all people are of little or no importance; a world in which no changes in the environment can be tolerated; in short, a world seemingly governed by rules totally alien to our own, making it a baffling and frightening place not only in the eyes of those who love him, but also to the child himself.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert the following articles on childhood autism:

[From the Globe Democrat, May 21, 1971]

TO REACH A CHILD: JUDEVINE FOUNDATION OFFERS NEW HOPE TO AUTISTIC BOYS AND GIRLS

(By Susan Croce Kelly)

"When Joey was three and a half our pediatrician finally admitted that something was wrong with him," said the young woman.

The boy hadn't learned to walk or talk as soon as the other children, and had never learned to play with them. Moreover, he threw temper tantrums and his bizarre behavior in public was enough to keep the whole family on edge all the time.

"We spent two years and nearly a thousand dollars going from doctors to special services to psychiatrists. Two of them did diagnose Joey as being autistic, but their only advice was that we'd eventually have to institutionalize him."

Joey, like thousands of other children in the U.S., is autistic—he lives in a world of his own, a world with no outlet into the common everyday world where most people live. He would talk without knowing what he was saying, repeating the same phrases over and over in a hollow monotone. Sometimes he'd have a temper tantrum, throwing himself against a wall with such force that his laced and tied shoes came off his feet. His family, from sheer frustration, had virtually stopped going anywhere.

But they persisted in trying to find help for their child. Finally, someone told them about the Social Exchange Laboratory on the

Washington University campus where an experimental program has been set up to work with autistic children, their parents and teachers.

The Social Exchange Laboratory has been supported for the last several years by the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory. This summer, the experimental program will be terminated, and a permanent Center For Autism will be established in St. Louis County under the direction of Mrs. Lois J. Blackwell, currently assistant director of the Washington University program.

"Our school will be a prototype," said Mrs. Blackwell recently. "Right now there are no schools specifically for autistic children in the U.S."

The new school, under the auspices of the Judevine Foundation, will provide teaching for children, and help for their parents.

Autism is an enigmatic language and behavior disorder that hinges on the child's inability to communicate with others.

"During infancy, when most children are involved in the eager acquisition of all those skills we call growing up, autistic children spend their days performing a small number of rituals—twirling matchsticks, rolling a ball, rocking back and forth, gesturing strangely with their hands and fingers, curling up under furniture, tearing bits of plaster or wallpaper from the wall, breaking crayons and so forth," says Mrs. Blackwell.

Even at the Social Exchange Lab, where parents can watch group sessions through darkened windows, the program is geared as much toward educating the mothers and fathers as it is toward helping the child himself.

It is also a place for mothers and fathers to compare notes, and to talk to other couples in their same situation.

"I used to lie in bed at night," said one young mother, "and I'd think, 'There's something I could do for my son if only somebody would tell me what to do.' Now Mrs. Blackwell is helping us. I don't know what we would have done if we couldn't have come here."

The children are given individual training every day until they're ready to join one of the small classes. In addition, every parent keeps a daily log of what goes on at home so the staff can help them solve their daily problems.

"We begin by rewarding the children with bites of their favorite food for even looking at us," explained Andrea Emrich, the program's head teacher. "Our object is to get the kids to accept rewards for jobs well done. We move them from gross rewards, like food, to socially accepted types of rewards—a hug, a pat on the shoulder, gold star. In the beginning, these things don't mean anything to our children."

From the darkened room where Miss Emrich sat with three mothers, watching the progress of a small class in the next room, they could see and hear the teachers talking to the children.

"Fingernails are to hands," said the teacher, "as toenails are to —"

"Feet," came the answer back. Since they were right, the children got to add another peg to the small pegboards they had in front of them. This is the advanced class. These children are almost ready to go to regular public schools: they've rejoined the world. One of the boys' attention had wandered, meanwhile, and he hadn't answered with the rest. "Jimmy," said the teacher, "look at me!" And Jimmy looked up.

Behind the screen his mother sighed happily. "Before he came here, he wouldn't pay any attention to anything, almost as though he was dead."

"You don't know what our life was like a year ago," added another young woman, one who has several more children at home. "I couldn't get through to my child. You learn quickly where you are and are not wanted—

which of your friends will still have you in their home. And you get to the place where you're unconsciously letting your child run your life.

"Our child had to put on his left shoe before his right shoe, or he'd dissolve into a temper tantrum. Or we'd have to go slide down a slide 10 times before we could go to the zoo. It wouldn't really change our life to go along, so we got so we'd just go along to keep peace. Now we're learning to break up these patterns, and he's so much happier."

Nearly all of the women and men who come to the school wear smiles and are eager to talk to others about their children's progress.

Their lives are still full of hassles, but for the first time in half a dozen years, they have hope again for the future.

"We never make a promise of how far a child can go in our program," cautioned Mrs. Blackwell. Even so, the parents note progress every day, seeing their children talk in sentences, smile and laugh. One "graduate" of the program is already making steady progress in public first grade. Another is entering regular school on a graduate basis—for a few hours every day and will begin full time next fall."

"My eight-year-old put it the best," laughed one young woman talking about the change that his brothers and sisters had noticed in her autistic son: "He sure has gotten decenter since he started going to that school."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 12, 1971]

LIVING WITH AUTISTIC CHILD IS BEING ON CONSTANT ALERT

(By Connie Rosenbaum)

Dr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Judy have a comfortable white brick home in Ferguson. Their gently sloping front yard is dotted with tall evergreens. A small lake sits across the road.

Four of their children live in the one-story house. Beth, 11 years old, shares a room with Lisa, 9. Amy, 8, shares a room with her father. Mrs. Judy stays with Amy's twin brother Jim.

"Jim used to have his own room, when he was staying up all night," Mrs. Judy said. "Thank goodness he is past that period now."

The wood around the window frames in Jim's room is eaten away. He used to chew on it when he was locked in. Pictures of children, flowers and animals are scratched into the piano. Orange and green crayon circles decorate the white living room walls.

"These are just a few examples of Jim's destructiveness," Mrs. Judy said. "We aren't going to redecorate the house until we are sure that it is all over."

Three years ago the Judys had little hope that their son would ever improve. He is not malicious or mentally retarded. Jim's condition has been diagnosed as autism, a disruptive and puzzling affliction for which the causes and cures are unknown.

His bizarre behavior was frustrating for his family because Jim seemed to shield himself behind an invisible barrier, a prisoner in his own private world. Today, however, the Judys are confident that Jim will eventually enroll in regular school and attend classes without tearing things apart and throwing temper tantrums.

"He was a fine baby," Mrs. Judy recalled. "Neither of the twins showed any signs of brain damage at birth. Jim didn't smile much or respond to affection, but we didn't worry then."

"He was late walking. When he finally did, he just stood up and started without ever crawling. He refused to chew his food so we gave him soft things. And we usually had to force him to eat."

"He didn't talk until he was 5. When we sent him to summer camp, he was forced to use words. But mostly he made strange squealing sounds."

"Jim always liked music and he would hum whole tunes. The record player and any other spinning object fascinated him. He used to sit in the middle of the living room floor and watch the pan lids rotate for hours. He slept with his favorite lid on his head.

"As soon as he learned to move around the house, he began breaking or shredding things. We had to lock the doors to all the rooms and watch him constantly."

The Judys sent Jim to a preschool for retarded children. He stayed there for three years, but Mrs. Judy is convinced that the last two terms were wasted.

"He was in a class for Mongoloid children and others with severe learning disabilities," she said. "Even though Jim wouldn't always respond, I never thought that he was retarded. We knew he was thinking, but we didn't know how to reach him."

Mrs. Judy and other mothers of autistic children have been aided by the Social Exchange Laboratory, a research and development project at Washington University, co-sponsored by the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (cemrel). The program accepts about 18 autistic students a year. Teachers use behavior modification techniques in which good actions are rewarded and reinforced with tokens.

The classroom exercises are designed to lengthen a child's attention span, calm his behavior and make him responsive to and communicative with others. Often the instructor will force eye contact in an attempt to draw him out of his private world. Teachers emphasize verbalizing and associating words with objects. Children are encouraged to play with mirrors so they become more aware of themselves.

Other treatment and education methods are being tried around the country. Some doctors prescribe drug supplements. Others prefer psychotherapy in conjunction with extensive home care.

Dr. Mary Stewart Goodwin initially used the "talking typewriter" as a diagnostic tool. Now she uses the computerized typewriter to instruct autistic students in speech and reading.

Bruno Bettelheim, psychologist and director of the University of Chicago Orthogenic School, provides a program of psychotherapy and permissive learning in a free environment. In his book, "The Empty Fortress," Bettelheim describes how young Joey, a boy who thought he was a machine, was transformed into a person again by loving and understanding care.

Bettelheim believes that autistic children withdraw because they need to escape from overwhelming pain. They carefully erect a shield to protect their hypersensitive feelings. This effectively inhibits emotional relationships with other people, he says.

A shift in a parent's attitude can change radically a child's behavior. The big danger is that a parent will pamper the child and over-respond to his demands for attention. A behavior pattern is established and the child gets worse. The Social Exchange Laboratory trains parents to assist therapists by rewarding well-behaved actions.

The arrival of an autistic child usually means confinement for the mothers. Babysitters who understand the problem are rare and young siblings cannot be trusted with total responsibility for his care.

"It was like being a prisoner in my own home," Mrs. Judy said. "We had to lock all the doors and watch him constantly. Our social life was nil because Jim couldn't be left unattended."

When the mother is trapped in the home all day, additional strain is placed on the marital relationship. Mrs. Judy said her family had been fortunate, however.

"My husband and I always agree when it

comes to handling Jim," she said. "Others aren't so lucky. They feel guilty and blame their partner for their misfortune."

Because autistic children rarely give or respond to affection, their parents continually feel rejected.

"If it hadn't been for the school, my son would have been in an institution . . . or I would have," said a mother of six whose youngest boy is autistic. "It isn't that you don't love the child. But after a while you can't do any more for him and he threatens to tear apart the rest of the family."

Sibling rivalry is intensified in most cases. Young children especially cannot understand why their brother or sister receives constant attention and lax discipline. However, with proper parental guidance they usually can make a good adjustment.

"Our girls are wonderful with Jim," Mrs. Judy said. "They spend lots of time with him and make him feel wanted."

The community's reaction is most disturbing to many parents of autistic youngsters. Because their children look normal, often beautiful, outsiders cannot understand their unruly behavior.

"I try to take Jim everywhere—the Zoo, grocery shopping, church," Mrs. Judy said. "Sometimes he starts making his funny noises or acting up. People say 'Why doesn't she control him?' but what can I do?"

For most parents such outbursts are frustrating. Only recently Mrs. Judy has developed a sense of humor about her situation.

"Three years ago I was terribly depressed," she recalled. "I couldn't see any future for Jim. But at the school he has improved steadily. Now I take things in stride and pray the progress will continue."

Mrs. Judy is also encouraged by the new local chapter of the National Society for Autistic Children. She estimates that the group can bring together the more than 200 area families with autistic children, plus friends and professionals.

"These families form an invisible population," she said. "Many of the mothers never go out and don't know where to turn for help."

Membership in the chapter is open to all area residents. For more information, write to the society in care of Mrs. Judy, 6 Lake Pembroke Drive, 63135.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 12, 1971]

HELP NEEDED FOR AUTISTIC CHILD (By Connie Rosenbaum)

Infantile autism was first identified in 1943, but only recently have parents and professionals organized to obtain better facilities and services for these children.

"There is little available in this area for the autistic child under the age of 12," said Dr. Thomas Bugger, director of the child psychiatric clinic at Barnes Hospital. "The best care seems to be a combination of intensive home care, psychotherapy and an ego-building experience such as nursery school."

Because autistic children exhibit many symptoms similar to children with brain damage or mental retardation, the diagnosis is often difficult. Indicative signs are how well a child gives and receives affection and how well he relates to his parents and playmates. The National Society for Autistic Children, formed in 1965, hopes to alert doctors and parents to the traits of autism so that children can receive proper treatment early.

Immediate attention is essential, say specialists. The sooner a child receives therapy, the better are his chances of learning to speak, read and take care of himself.

Members of the Society's local chapter are hopeful that a private school, currently in the planning stage, will open. Many have

made the rounds of psychiatrists, psychologists and other specialists seeking proper diagnosis and treatment recommendations.

"We tried getting Jim into the special district school but he acted up so badly that they couldn't test him," Mrs. Joseph D. Judy said. "These children are often excluded from a classroom because of their behavior, yet that is the reason that they need special schools."

It is estimated that there are more than 10,000,000 mentally ill children in America. More than 2,000,000 of these are severely disturbed. Another 2,000,000 are mentally retarded. There are about four autistic children in every 10,000 live births.

For their families, these children are more than statistics. The child seems to live in a private world of self-imposed isolation.

The word autism is derived from the Greek word for self, "autos." Specialists have attributed the affliction to a lack of parental affection, vitamin deficiencies, genetic imperfections or body chemistry disorders.

"So much more research is needed about the causes and cures," Mrs. Judy said. "The society distributes what information is available. Hopefully we can encourage support for more education facilities to enable these children to reenter the world instead of institutions."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Dispatch, July 29, 1971]

RESEARCH HERE PRODUCES PLANS FOR CENTER FOR AUTISM (By Ray Beaumont)

"Put him away and forget about him. There is no help and no hope."

This, in essence, has been the advice given to many parents when they have sought help—or at least hope—for their autistic child. The diagnosis of autism generally has placed the child under the classification "uneducable," with the consequence that no one attempts to educate him.

But research conducted over the past four years at the Social Exchange Laboratory at WU has convinced Lois Blackwell, laboratory director, that there is hope, that the autistic child should not be dismissed as uneducable. Sponsored under a research grant from Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory (CeMREL), this research project is being terminated this week.

As an outgrowth of the program, however, Mrs. Blackwell plans to establish a Center for Autism which "will replace and expand the program of the Social Exchange Laboratory." Target date for opening of the Center is September 1st, but a lease for the building being considered has not yet been finalized.

The Judevine Foundation, established to sponsor the Center, will be privately funded and operated, with the eventual aim of being self-supporting, Mrs. Blackwell explained. The Foundation is currently attempting to raise its initial goal of \$100,000, which is "our most pressing need."

"The Center For Autism will be a prototype," said Mrs. Blackwell, "new not only in the community but also in the nation." Its goals are: to demonstrate through a Center School an educational environment for autistic children; to provide a training center for parents, paraprofessionals, teachers, and others interested in the development of these children; and to provide a research center in which effective programs of educational techniques and curricula for these children, along with quick and efficient training of their parents, can be developed, documented, and marketed to those desiring such programs.

Currently, staff members at the Social Exchange Laboratory are putting together a "development kit" which they hope to complete and publish this fall. This kit will

help parents determine the various tasks or behaviors which their child can and cannot do, and will provide curricula which parents can use to teach their child. This method will enable parents to bring their child to a developmental level where he can meet the requirements of a school.

Though facilities have been provided for the learning disabled, the mentally retarded, and the emotionally disturbed, the only facilities now in existence for autistic children are those supported by research funds—which are dwindling. This has been due, at least in part, to the pessimistic attitude of hopelessness toward the treatment and prognosis of autism.

"An autistic child is a child who appears to be living in a world of his own: a world in which love seems to be neither sought nor given, nor even accepted; a world in which fingers, mechanical devices, tiny objects of any sort, and bits of string take primary significance while parents, family members, and, in fact, all people are of little or no importance; a world in which no changes in the environment can be tolerated; in short, a world seemingly governed by rules totally alien to our own, making it a baffling and frightening place not only in the eyes of those who love him, but also to the child himself," Mrs. Blackwell reports.

CeMREL's program at WU has been designed "to break down the resistance of autistic children to interaction with others at the behavioral level, and to make possible the growth of behaviors that never occurred spontaneously," she adds.

"Viewed in terms of behavior," the director notes, "autism is not the disintegration of the personality, but its total absence, and autistic children do not require the nursing of a damaged personality so much as the presence of experiences through which their personalities can find birth."

The approach used at the Laboratory has been to modify behavior through "social exchange." The child is taught to be aware of other persons, and to value his relationships—exchanges—with people. At this point the child will begin to learn to control his own behavior.

Success in this field is hard to measure, because one is never sure which yardstick to use. But Mrs. Blackwell notes that 42 percent of the children she has worked with at the laboratory have been placed in other facilities, including public school. The prognosis on several others is very good, she said.

On Saturday, August 14, the Judevine Foundation is sponsoring a "toll road" in order to raise funds. They are looking for volunteers who are willing to spend three hours that morning to help them. The Foundation can be contacted at 966-8935. Donations, which are tax deductible, can be sent to the Judevine Foundation, 14 Countryside Lane, St. Louis, Missouri 63131.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Review, Aug. 27, 1971]

AUTISTIC CHILDREN—OUT OF THEIR SHELL AND INTO THE WORLD

(By Robert J. Byrne)

There is an old empty school building near downtown St. Louis that is on the brink of becoming a Center for Autism, and that requires a bit of explanation.

What needs explanation is autism, and the first-in-the-United-States attempt to do something about it.

According to dictionaries, autism is "absorption in fantasy to the exclusion of reality," and that's about all that is said. Autism in children was described some 30 years ago, but little has happened since.

"Autistic behavior looks to the neurologist like the most patent brain damage; to the psychotherapist, like the severest of psychoses; to the special educator like obvious mental retardation."

That summary was offered by Mrs. Lois J. Blackwell, a cheerful and hardworking woman who is the leader in an effort to do something about autism in children.

For the past four years, Mrs. Blackwell has been working with autistic children—developing ways to penetrate the murky fantasy that blankets them—in a basement huddle of rooms at Washington University. Through experience and the contributions of medical and psychological professionals, she has become, as much as anyone can, expert in describing what autism is.

"An autistic child is one who has withdrawn inside himself and lives there, trapped, unable to get out," she explains.

The child seems unable to progress beyond repetitious body and hand movements, is virtually unaware of anyone else around and, in about half the cases, is speechless. "These children must be taught, not only to speak or speak meaningfully, but to play, to enjoy, to dislike, to show fear, to be afraid, to like, to love, to smile, to interact—in short, to be a person and to derive satisfaction from being a person."

The experience of one child, while not completely typical, helps to describe the problem. Mrs. Henry Balmer of St. John Parish in Imperial said their son Michael, up to age four, was in a constant turmoil. He would neither look at nor acknowledge his parents or brothers or sisters. His only speech was an echo, precise but unvarying, of what was said. "We'd ask him, 'Michael, are you hungry?'" Mrs. Balmer said, "and he'd reply: 'Michael, are you hungry?'"

As he grew older, Mrs. Balmer continued, Michael became more aggressive, challenging the doors and windows of his room and their home, occasionally attacking furniture or objects, developing into a silent, unpredictable and, to the rest of the family, a perplexing problem that demanded some sort of solution.

Diagnosis discovered no brain damage or retardation, no particular emotional disturbance or any organic defect. "The psychiatrist said it was infantile autism, and suggested that, eventually, we'd have to put Michael in an institution," she said.

At about age five, however, Michael's habits began to change somewhat. "He would spend at least half of his day sitting on the living room couch and paging through Time magazine. For once, he was doing something quietly."

Some evenings, the boy and his father would sit together, just looking through the magazine and the youngster kept pointing to the page numbers. After several weeks of repeating aloud the numbers on the page, the Balmers discovered that Michael was actually reading them, up to 100 and even beyond. "And to test him, we would deliberately misread the number he was pointing to. He became furious," she said.

The Balmers progressed to words—the section headings in Time—like People, Music, Business, and the boy seemed to be understanding. "It struck me," she said, "that there's a mind, an intelligence there. How could we put him into an institution and forget about him?"

Via referrals from one and another sources, Michael was enrolled in the classes conducted by Mrs. Blackwell at Washington U., classes which are available nowhere else in the U.S.

His instruction began last September on a one-to-one basis, with Michael and a teacher trying to develop what most autistic children lack: eye contact with another person. In the succeeding months, he has learned to talk—imperfectly, to be sure, but understandably. At the same time his blindly aggressive and repetitive behavior has slackened to the point that he functions well in his own family at home and in the class of four youngsters that meets three hours a day at the WU school.

Mrs. Blackwell and the school's instructors employ what are called "behavior modification techniques." These techniques, although carefully worked out and implemented, are basically performance-reward actions. The child is coaxed to look the teacher in the eye, for example. When he does, he is immediately rewarded in some minor but desirable way. This develops into a whole system of "social exchanges": the instructor motivating the child to some small deed by exchanging a reward in return for the performance.

It takes a great deal of time, Mrs. Blackwell notes, but the techniques can be learned by anyone—even parents.

Indeed, for a child to be accepted for the classes, the parents must agree to learn the teaching techniques, in order that they both use them with the child at home and also to come in and teach other children in the classes. "That," Mrs. Blackwell noted, "is the principle of exchange."

The successes being accomplished in the WU classes are threatened however. The educational research group that has underwritten the work up to now is being pressed by other needs, and Washington U. has needs, too, for the space being occupied.

Anticipating the upcoming crisis, Mrs. Blackwell and several professional advisors, along with parents of autistic children, formed the Judevine Foundation (a family name of Mrs. Blackwell's) to solicit funds to carry on the work.

The Foundation is still seeking money to get firmly established. In the meantime, it is going ahead on plans to lease the old school building standing empty on the near north side. If all works according to plan, Judevines' Center for Autism—the only one of its kind in the nation—will be located there, teaching autistic children individually and in classes, training parents and teachers in the behavior modification techniques and marketing a package of instructional materials.

The basic problem at present, Mrs. Blackwell added, is to direct attention to the problem. Autistic children, while not mentally or emotionally defective, are sometimes placed in schools designed for children with those other disorders. The autistic child usually benefits little from those approaches, and because of his aggressive behavior is often shunted out and into an institution.

Yet all the while, there is an intelligence and an ability straining to break through the indefinable blanket that has muffled his development.

"Not all can be helped equally," Mrs. Blackwell added, "but nearly all that we've had here have improved."

"Our goal is to get the child into a normal school at his own age and grade level. We don't know how far he'll be able to go, but at least he's out of his shell. At least he's in the world."

HON. ARTHUR SUMMERFIELD

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1972

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I join my colleagues in noting the passing of former Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield. I have known Art Summerfield ever since the middle forties when he was already deeply involved in his commitment to good government. He was an inspiration to everyone who had the pleasure of knowing or working with him.

Art was born in Pinconning which is in the congressional district of Michigan which I represent. Over the years his dedication to serving people on the local, State, and national levels certainly marked him as one of the finest public servants our Nation has had. Over the years he has contributed immeasurably to the quality of life for the citizens of Flint, Mich., his home for most of his life. As a member of the Republican Party he served his State and Nation in positions of great responsibility as a dedicated and committed partisan, but always with the respect and firmness which are the hallmark of the true believer in the worth of our two-party system.

As Postmaster General of the United States, Art Summerfield served with a distinction characteristic of his high regard for America and its people.

After leaving the office of Postmaster General, Art Summerfield returned to Flint and continued his service to his community and his party. Sadly, he died at a time when he was most able to pursue these interests from his vantage point as a retired and respected business and civic leader. My home State of Michigan, the Republican Party, and the U.S. Government will miss his advice and assistance.

Mrs. Cederberg and I extend to his lovely wife Mariam and his family our deep and sincere sympathy.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION SETTING A DATE FOR COMPLETE U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to include in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts State Senate, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation setting a date for complete U.S. withdrawal from Southeast Asia. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION SETTING A DATE FOR COMPLETE U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

Whereas, The most recent stepped-up bombing of the people and territory of North Vietnam is a dangerous escalation of our role in the Indochina war; and

Whereas, This move is a flagrant and direct violation of the declared policy of the Nixon Administration to wind down the war; and

Whereas, The national interest would be best served by setting at once a date for the immediate and complete withdrawal of all materiel and armed forces—land, sea and air—in and over all of Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, This step is the best and most promising assurance that American prisoners of war now in North Vietnamese hands will be at the earliest time released; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to prepare at once legislation designated to accomplish the aforesaid objective and requests the President of the United States to expedite the implementation of such action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

REMARKS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER ON IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the esteemed dean of the House of Representatives and distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, addressed the American Citizenship Conference in New York City last Friday, April 28, 1972.

Mr. CELLER's speech was enthusiastically received and hailed for its enlightened, timely, and forward-looking thoughts.

Mr. CELLER's speech is so significant that I feel that it should be included in the RECORD and brought to the attention of all Members of the Congress:

REMARKS OF HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER THE FUTURE OF IMMIGRATION—UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND NEW HORIZONS

I am genuinely pleased and honored to be here today and I welcome the opportunity to address this distinguished group on the subject of immigration.

We, in Congress, have long appreciated the expert advice and cooperation of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference (AICC) and we recognize that the members of this Conference are intimately familiar with every aspect of our present immigration laws and policies.

Therefore, rather than discuss where we stand today in terms of United States immigration policy, I think it would be more useful to comment upon the future of immigration—to review the "unfinished business" of the 1965 Act and to explore "new horizons."

I think we can all agree that this country is rapidly approaching a new era in immigration policy.

Before characterizing the proper direction which this new policy should take, it is necessary to discuss recent developments which relate to, or may affect, future immigration. Unquestionably, the recently issued Report of the Commission of Population Growth and the American Future, will have a definite effect on our future policies.

In recommending the need for adopting a deliberate population policy, the Commission concluded that, "no substantial benefits will result from further growth of this Nation's population . . . and that population growth of the current magnitude has aggravated many of the Nation's problems and made their solutions more difficult."

Many individuals, including some Commission members, recognizing the increasing impact on immigration on our population growth, immediately responded by suggesting a decrease in immigration.

Fortunately, the majority of the Commission members rejected the suggestion and recommended that the present level of immigration should be maintained "because of the contributions which immigrants have made and continue to make to our society."

I mention the findings of the Commission not to define the proper relationship between immigration policy and demographic conditions—and it is ridiculous for anyone to assume that immigration policy is formulated in a vacuum, without regard to population growth or population distribution—but to emphasize that some individuals may deliberately misinterpret or misuse the Commission findings to support a curtailment of immigration.

It is quite unfortunate that individuals, who advocate a restrictive immigration policy will easily acquire a great number of followers in those who are predisposed to blame all of the social and economic "ills" of this Nation on the newly-arrived immigrant.

In many cases, this hostility emanates from their depression or frustration over social and economic conditions in this country. In some instances, it may result from their impulsive or suspicious reaction to aliens in general.

I am reminded of the story involving the famous English writer, Charles Lamb.

In the early 1800's, Lamb was walking along a London street with a friend when suddenly he stopped and pointed.

"Do you see that man over there?" he said. "I hate him."

"Hate him?" His friend inquired, "how can you hate him, you don't even know who he is?"

"Precisely," Lamb said.

It was this type of an unreasonable reaction to strangers that enabled this country to maintain a discriminatory immigration policy for almost a half century.

We are all aware that the various arguments presented by restrictionists are not novel or unique. In fact, as early as 1797, it was argued on the Floor of the House that "while a liberal immigration policy was suited to the needs of the country when it was new and unsettled, now that the United States had reached maturity—and was fully populated, all immigration should be stopped."

We cannot allow the xenophobes and restrictionists in this country to arouse, or in many cases to intensify, public sentiment against immigration.

Because many Americans distrusted and feared all foreigners, the United States was saddled for decades with an immigration law that was based exclusively on a known quantity—the ethnic ratio in this country in 1920.

I vigorously opposed this national origin quota system when I first came to Congress in 1923 and I was truly gratified when this repugnant system was repealed in 1965.

In considering the future course of immigration, and in evaluating its impact on our population growth, I should emphasize that there is no great pressure nor unified desire to substantially increase immigration to this country.

The primary concern, and the concern of all interested groups, is to remove the inequities of the present law and to provide an equal opportunity for all persons competing for immigrant visas.

In his Nation of Immigrants, the late President Kennedy, realistically observed that an "enlightened policy of immigration need not provide for unlimited immigration . . . but it should be generous; it should be fair; it should be flexible."

He then added, "With such a policy we could turn to the world with clean hands and a clear conscience."

How can we turn to the people of the Western Hemisphere with a clear conscience?

We are all aware that there are in-

adequacies in our present immigration law which were either uncorrected, or created, by the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Therefore, I say it is incumbent upon the Congress to complete the "unfinished business" of the 1965 Act, and more particularly, to correct the iniquitous situation in the Western Hemisphere.

You will recall that in 1965, the Senate first imposed an overall ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration. Although my Committee and the House did not favor such a ceiling it was retained in Conference Committee. Subsequently legislation which I proposed to extend the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration and to delay the imposition of the ceiling passed the House, but was not acted on in the Senate.

Consequently, on July 1, 1968, the 120,000 annual limitation was imposed on Western Hemisphere countries.

This ceiling has resulted in untold hardships for many potential Western Hemisphere immigrants and this fact is clearly demonstrated by the 16-month waiting period which they are presently facing.

In my judgment, a separate ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration is patently unjust to the people of the Western Hemisphere and consequently should be removed.

Moreover, it represents a radical departure from our traditional good-neighbor policy and it has created an atmosphere of resentment among many nations of this hemisphere.

The ceiling, however, is just one example of the countless inequities confronting potential Western Hemisphere immigrants.

In addition:

- (1) there is no preference system;
- (2) the labor certification requirement has become unwieldy and imposes an unreasonable burden on the prospective immigrant;
- (3) adjustment of status is unavailable in the United States for natives of the Western Hemisphere; and
- (4) Cuban refugees who adjust are counted against the 120,000 ceiling.

In order to correct these injustices I have proposed legislation, which would establish a world-wide ceiling on immigration and a unified preference system.

In 1965, the Senate concluded "that to continue unrestricted immigration for persons born in Western Hemisphere countries is to place such aliens in a preferred status compared with aliens born in other parts of the world." Today, however, the converse of that statement is true.

Undeniably, individuals from the Eastern Hemisphere now enjoy a preferential position—particularly since all of the preference and nonpreference categories are presently current with the exception of the third preference.

Furthermore, in 1965, we acknowledged that family reunification and the admission of professionals and other workers in short supply were the primary goals of a sound immigration policy.

Yet, family relationship is entirely ignored insofar as the Western Hemisphere is concerned.

Therefore, in the interest of pure logic and simple justice, we should provide a similar preference for both hemispheres.

In addition, my proposal would relax the present labor certification requirement by restoring the procedures which were in effect prior to 1965. In other words, a prospective immigrant would not be required to obtain an individual certification and a specific job offer.

Instead, the intending immigrant would be admitted unless a determination was made that he may displace a United States citizen or adversely affect labor conditions. This would reasonably place the burden on the Government and not on the alien who, under the present system, does not possess the re-

source nor the means to satisfy our rigid certification requirement.

We recognize that we have—a continuing task to examine our immigration policies in the light of experience—and a clear responsibility to remove all vestiges of discrimination and bias from our procedures for selecting immigrants.

Further legislative efforts to complete the "unfinished business" of the 1965 Act are definitely required if we are to demonstrate to the world our dedication to the concept of "equal treatment of all immigrants."

This leads directly to my second topic and that is—what other areas of concern are being, or should be, explored by the Judiciary Committee.

First of all, as you know, the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of Peter Rodino, has just concluded a detailed investigation of the illegal alien problem in this country. Unfortunately, this study has revealed that the presence of untold numbers of illegal aliens in this country—many of whom are displacing American workers—has nurtured a negative attitude toward legal immigration.

It has also been learned that the inequitable Western Hemisphere situation—which I mentioned earlier—has actually exacerbated the illegal alien problem. Many desperate individuals, who find our doors closed to them, are forced to flout our immigration laws in order to provide for themselves and their families.

It is therefore apparent, that legislative efforts to remedy the illegal alien problem should be followed by legislation which would: (1) provide an adequate opportunity for Western Hemisphere immigration; and (2) recognize the special relationship existing between the United States and our contiguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico.

Secondly, there is an urgent need to expand and revitalize our asylum policy for refugees.

Because of the present numerical and definitional limitations on the admission of refugees, it was necessary for me and my Committee last year to urge the Attorney General to invoke his discretionary parole authority for the relief of Soviet Jews.

On several occasions over the past several years, our present law was unable to accommodate reasonable numbers of refugees fleeing from political persecution in Hungary, Poland, Cuba, and Czechoslovakia.

In each of these emergencies, it was necessary to persuade a usually reluctant Attorney General that he possessed sufficient authority under the parole provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the admission of these refugees.

I have long endeavored to broaden the United States refugee policy of assisting and resettling those who flee from their country to escape oppression.

Although our Government can be justly proud of its magnificent record in behalf of refugees everywhere, the Congress should seek to enact a generous, flexible and comprehensive refugee program which would obviate emergency legislation.

In addition, I have proposed that we substantially liberalize the definition of "refugee" by bringing it into conformity with the definition contained in the Protocol Relating to Refugees adopted by the United Nations.

The last item on the agenda of "new horizons" is the urgent need to provide for the entry of "new-seed" immigrants. As you know, these immigrants are unable to qualify under our present law, since they do not possess the necessary family relationships, nor the skills required for labor certification.

None of us need be reminded, that this is the type of immigrant who was responsible for founding and maturing this great Nation. The "new-seed" has enriched our

tradition and has contributed immeasurably to the cultural, economic and social development of this country.

These are some of the numerous reforms which are necessitated by, or not included in, the 1965 Act. Time simply does not permit an exhaustive discussion of other areas of urgent concern.

Enactment of meaningful immigration reform truly presents a formidable challenge at a time when this country is facing severe social and economic problems at home and even more difficult problems abroad.

Therefore, we appreciate the efforts of this organization in educating Americans as to the desirability of a fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory immigration policy—and we welcome your continued cooperation in convincing the Congress and the Administration to give immigration issues the priority and attention they properly deserve.

KHRUSHCHEV AND STALIN'S GHOST

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, forgeries are big these days. We hear a lot about the "mellowing" of the Communists.

At first glance these two subjects would appear disparate and unrelated. They converge, however, in the case of the "Khrushchev Memoirs," published in 1970 amid wide public credulity.

I do not think it would be going too far to say that Paul Cole Beach, one of our country's brightest young scholars, has written the most cogent and rational analysis of these purported "memoirs" yet to appear. It is not impossible that we might refer to Mr. Beach's work on this subject as definitive.

Beach has written in a wide variety of scholarly, intellectual, and popular magazines and is presently completing his doctoral dissertation on Jose Ortega y Gasset at Johns Hopkins University.

I recommend his treatment of this vital question to all my colleagues here in Congress. The paper, which originally appeared in March 1971 as a book review, demands and merits wide circulation.

["Khrushchev Remembers," translated by Strobe Talbot (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970)]

KHRUSHCHEV AND STALIN'S GHOST

I

"If Marxism-Leninism is false," a Soviet citizen asks, "must we believe in God again?"¹ A crisis of ideology haunts Soviet life. It is a crisis which may be laid partly to the relaxation of terror that followed Stalin's death, and partly to the campaign of de-Stalinization that Nikita Khrushchev launched on his way to power.²

Within a year of Stalin's death, Nikita Khrushchev had emerged as a central contender for the dictator's empty position. Yet there was sharp opposition to Khrushchev from a sizeable minority in the Politburo. When Khrushchev took the position of First Party Secretary, which put him within reach of total power, Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, and others intrigued with renewed vigor, and such conflicts surfaced dramatically at the Twentieth Party Congress.³ Mikoyan made highly critical remarks on Stalin that

Footnotes at end of article.

by implication seemed to include Khrushchev, who had been taking the Stalinist line on heavy industry and on the U.S.S.R.'s military "invulnerability," and who alone had made it a point to praise Stalin's determined smashing of "enemies of the people." Yet not two weeks later, Khrushchev delivered his famous "secret speech" to the Congress condemning Stalin for having "deviated from the clear and plain precepts of Lenin" and for having created a "personality cult" which ruled by *diktat* and arbitrary police terror.⁴

Scandal was inevitable. Khrushchev himself, of course, was deeply implicated in Stalin's crimes.⁵ Yet he managed, in pursuit of the leading role, to turn "de-Stalinization" into a weapon against his opponents. He told Congress delegates that it was necessary, "in a Bolshevik manner, to condemn and to eradicate the cult of the individual as alien to Marxism-Leninism," and that the Party had "to fight inexorably every attempt at bringing back this practice." When he concluded his speech with a call for a return to Leninism, he was greeted with a standing ovation and tumultuous applause.⁶ With this shift, he turned his opponents into a neo-Stalinist faction—into an "anti-Party group" seeking its own ends.

Not that Khrushchev was able to stop his rivals at once with this ploy. He was forced to continue this line of struggle for most of his career, a pragmatic necessity which resulted in much of the Soviet Union's internal "liberalization." For when Khrushchev attacked the wisdom of Stalin's rule and leashed police terror, he stirred deep fissures in Soviet society. Not only had he called into question the regime's moral and historical legitimacy, he was also led to seek support outside the ruling circle. He thereby sparked real anti-Stalinism, Solzhenitsyn's expose of camp life, for example, evoked storms of genuine protest.⁷ The upshot of Khrushchev's course was a growing loss of Party control over Soviet society and a spreading discontent with Communist rule which reverberated throughout the Eastern bloc.⁸ "Khrushchev's iconoclasm," says Soviet scholar Carl Linden, "inevitably placed the legitimacy of party rule in doubt, an inescapable fact which hastened his own ouster from power."⁹

Steps were taken to tighten the Party's hold on Soviet society, indeed, even before Khrushchev's fall from power; and in the intervening years there has been a still greater hardening of the Kremlin's attitude.¹⁰ Since the Czechoslovakian upheaval particularly, the collective leadership of Khrushchev's former proteges, Brezhnev and Kosygin, has fallen back rapidly before more militant Politburo members, like Suslov and Shelepin, who show little interest in the U.S.S.R. becoming some kind of Westernized "socialist democracy."¹¹ A real neo-Stalinist faction is now making a serious bid for power, and the critical moment in the power struggle might well come at the Party Congress scheduled this month.¹² Wladislaw Gomułka's fate in Poland, on the eve of the Congress, is an ominous portent. The Soviet Union stands at a crossroad that might lead back to a Stalin-like dictatorship. It is in this context that Nikita Khrushchev's purported "memoirs" have surfaced.

II

Whether they are genuine or not, the timing of the "memoirs" makes them a political act of high importance. However, their meaning is ineluctably linked to their source, and nothing is clearer than that no one not intimately connected with the publication of the "memoirs" knows where they came from. Yet with the notable exception of Victor Zorza, the Western analysts in print (including some thirty Soviet area specialists from the intelligence community who recently met at the State Department) have rushed to vouch for their authenticity. Moreover, they have

done so with little more than rumor, speculation, and personal assertion for evidence. The State Department consultants, for example, frankly admit that they do not know "how or why" the "memoirs" reached the West.¹³

Such credulity sheds light on why the KGB's foreign intelligence branch operates a "misinformation section" and why, by contrast, it protects its own espionage and evaluation process by insisting scrupulously on certain rules—not the least being that the paramount factor in judging a document is the reliability of a *known* source. The K.G.B. equally insists on physical and content analysis of the procured material. Similarly, it is more wary of documents gotten from informants anxious for money, and most skeptical where the amount of the reward hinges on the document's alleged importance. Moreover, the K.G.B. simply refuses to deal with middlemen who decline to name the source of their material, and it rarely favors conclusions strained from limited data.¹⁴

So far Western analysts have blithely ignored these rules. The key "evidence" for the Khrushchev book's authorship, indeed, has so far been little more than the favorable views of various Soviet experts—Harrison Salisbury, Foy Kohler, Michel Tatu, Henry Shapiro, Llewellyn Thompson, and others—who claim enough knowledge of Khrushchev to make an informed opinion. What do such opinions amount to? Edward Crankshaw's preface to *Khrushchev Remembers* is a pertinent example, one typical in the thrust of its analysis.

It is, Crankshaw says, "Khrushchev himself, quite unmistakably speaking." What convinced him of that? Maintaining that he has read almost every word of Khrushchev's and has met and listened to him publicly and privately, he argues that "there was no mistaking the authentic tone." Yet what tangible evidence is there of the book's authenticity? According to Crankshaw, he is as "sure as it is possible to be sure of anything that cannot be scientifically proved . . . [emphasis added]." When pressed for tangible evidence, Crankshaw can only turn rhetorical: "How was this remarkable document assembled, and why? I have to say at once that I do not know. My own personal decision as to its authenticity had to be based on the evidence of a Russian typescript and nothing else at all."¹⁵ But was it the original typescript? Silence.

Apparently, Crankshaw let himself be convinced by nothing more certain than "a Russian typescript" and the "authentic tone" of the book. Frankly, these are hardly very solid norms of evaluation even considering Crankshaw's expertise. Since his own "first thought" was that the book was faked, one suspects he might have meditated longer on how Soviet analyst E. H. Carr and former C.I.A. chief Bedell Smith were beguiled into crediting Maxim Litvinov's "memoirs," which were forged by a Russian defector.

Speculation about the origins of Khrushchev's memoirs, of course, has proceeded rapidly. Several major theories have been set out.

The most popular theory, it seems, is that the "memoirs" stem from handwritten notes or tapes of conversations taken down over time by members of Khrushchev's immediate family, which is to say, former *Izvestia* editor Aleksei Adzhubel and his wife Rada or perhaps Yulia or her late husband Lev Petrov. The secret police, who guard Khrushchev closely and provide his house staff, allegedly uncovered this activity sometime in 1969, and are supposed to have decided (with or without the consent of Party higher-ups) to surface his recollections in the West.¹⁷

Speculation has it that Victor Louis, a Soviet reporter who writes for London's *Evening News*, was called into the affair at this point. Although Louis is notorious for his links with the K.G.B., he has exten-

sive contacts in the West and has floated manuscripts before. He tried to sell a bastardized version of Svetlana's memoirs, peddled Gordon Lonsdale's espionage apologetics, and acted as middleman for N.B.C.'s televised interview with Khrushchev in 1965-1966. He has also played a prominent role in several spy exchanges, and it is widely speculated that he also purveyed the bulk of Khrushchev's "memoirs."

The Scandinavian press says Louis met two representatives of *Life* magazine—Jerrold Schecter and Murray Gart—in Copenhagen's Hotel d'Angleterre last August 20-27, and tried to negotiate a deal for a transcription of some 300-500 thousand words and a series of photographs. He completed the deal, it is said, for a huge sum. Mentioned figures range from \$600 thousand to \$5 million. Much of the money was deposited, claims Stewart Alsop, in a Swiss bank account opened for Khrushchev and his family.

Why were the "memoirs" surfaced? Some argue that the book reflects the work of "liberals" in the Soviet hierarchy—Aleksei Shelepin, say, or others in police and military circles—trying to stave off the neo-Stalinist faction led by Brezhnev, Kosygin, and Podgorny. Some suggest instead that it is the product of neo-Stalinists seeking to ruin Khrushchev and the surviving "liberal" faction—a pretext for convicting them of anti-Soviet slanders and cooperation with Western intelligence (who else opens Swiss bank accounts for Soviet figures?). It is also said that the K.G.B. seized and surfaced the "memoirs" to discredit them before Khrushchev could edit or make corrections, or that the K.G.B. sold them in order to replenish its reserve of foreign dollars.

Frankly, this is the crudest conjecture. No solid evidence supports any of the chain of events posited in this theory. Not surprisingly, Victor Louis himself denies any involvement in the affair. Moreover, the suggested motives for publication are not terribly credible either. If Shelepin is a "liberal" and Kosygin a "Stalinist," then Khrushchev is a Zionist saboteur! If the K.G.B. wanted to scuttle the "memoirs," why didn't it merely destroy them? I prescind from asking who knows the real state of the Soviet secret police's foreign currency reserves.

Henry Shapiro speculates differently.¹⁷ It was not Aleksei Adzhubel who smuggled the "memoirs" out of the Soviet Union, he contends, but Lev Petrov, who was married to Khrushchev's adopted daughter Yulia. Shapiro maintains that Adzhubel's relations with Khrushchev were strained, while Petrov was for sometime his confidante. For many years Petrov edited Novosti's English-language newspaper *Soviet Weekly*, which was distributed in Britain, and therefore had good contacts in the West. He was resentful of Khrushchev's poor treatment, Shapiro claims, and of Stalin's growing rehabilitation. Since he suffered from a terminal cancer that precluded any fear of retaliation, Petrov might have stolen a fragment of Khrushchev's notes and smuggled them abroad within anyone's knowledge. Shapiro sets this out as only an educated guess.

Another thesis is that Khrushchev's recorded one million words of commentary on tapes which were brought out by couriers over an eighteen-month period to Helsinki, Copenhagen, Vienna, and Sofia before being turned over to Time Inc. According to the *New York Times*, this report was advanced by "informed sources" in Washington and confirmed by "reliable Soviet sources."¹⁸ It is also said that the authenticity of the tapes was determined by "voiceprint." Walter Scott revealed this last item.¹⁹ While the use of "voiceprints" is a developing part of police technology, Scott's revelation probably indicates little more than familiarity with Solzhenitsyn's *The First Circle*.²⁰ When queried by reporters, in any case, Donald Willson,

Footnotes at end of article.

vice president for Time's corporate and public affairs, refused to confirm the report. Moreover, no tapes have been produced to support the story, though a photo of Khrushchev allegedly carrying a portable tape recorder (the news photo only reveals a closed, leather carrying-case) has been widely published in the United States.

The Soviets, of course, have their own view of the book. In early November, the Novosti press agency called the memoirs a "non-book" and a "form of forgery." Shortly thereafter, *Pravda* labeled the book an example of "bourgeois subversion," and *Izvestia* termed the "memoirs" the latest of a series of documents concocted by Western intelligence agencies and renegade Communists. Within days Khrushchev himself issued a handwritten denial of authorship which Tass and Fotokhronika (the official Soviet photo agency) reproduced and distributed abroad. "I have never passed memoirs or material of this nature to the Time publishing house or to other foreign publishing houses. I did not turn over such material to Soviet publishing houses either. Therefore, I declare this a fabrication. The venal bourgeois press has been exposed many times for such lies."²¹

Western newsmen countered that this was Soviet propaganda, and that Khrushchev's denial was completely predictable, either as a safety precaution or as something forced on him by the Kremlin. His denial, moreover, has quite a few loopholes. While he denies having passed on "memoirs" to any publishing house, he does not explicitly deny authorizing such a work or having given it to someone else. While his denial is conditional, however, it could be completely true. The silent premise of the Western reaction is that the "memoirs" are genuine. Yet maybe neither he nor the Soviets were involved, or perhaps only Khrushchev himself can be exempted. Either interpretation would imply forgery, East or West.

So far the only truly critical Western view is that of Victor Zorza, who suggests that the "misinformation section" of the K.G.B. and Western publishers fabricated the "memoirs" (albeit with contrasting motives). He accepts the involvement of Victor Louis, and then builds a case that "the K.G.B." is acquiring through Louis the experience of negotiating and bargaining with Western mass media organizations. It is learning how to manipulate them [and their cupidity] for its own purposes. . . . The publication of the Khrushchev reminiscences, already assured of perhaps the widest magazine and book audiences in the Western world, looks like a dry run for some more ambitious psychological warfare operations.²²

Zorza's analysis may lie close to the truth. Yet it is only sophisticated speculation, and it has its own shortcomings. Why did the K.G.B. pick the most delicate possible moment in the current power struggle, for example, to surface a document with such explosive potential? It seems highly unlikely that K.G.B. chief Yuri Andropov would proceed alone with such a dangerous operation at this historical moment, particularly if it were nothing more than a strict psy-war experiment. Moreover, it is scarcely clear that the Soviets are not already rather skillful propagandists who know how to use the Western press.

Harrison Salisbury calls the book "backstairs kitchen gossip."²³ While some of the published analyses have been carefully qualified, much of the extant speculation falls into the same category. Few Soviet scholars seem willing to wait for firmer evidence before committing themselves, which is partly the case, one suspects, not only because of the book's political importance now, but because of an in-built academic and media pressure to speak. What is known about the

book now, and what if anything does it mean?

III

When *Life* started serializing Khrushchev's recollections, managing editor Ralph Graves observed that the magazine had kept silent about Khrushchev's "reminiscences" for "more than a year," and implied that *Life* had material in its possession which it took pains to authenticate during this time; though he added that "intensive work on the articles and pictures" only started this fall, when Moscow bureau chief Jerrold Schechter labored over "the manuscripts and piles of photos" and Gedeon de Margitay went overseas to try to sell them to major European publishers and news outlets.²⁴

When Little-Brown brought out the book in December, it noted that it was "made up of material emanating from various sources at various times and in various circumstances." It too avoided the use of the word "memoirs." Strobe Talbott, who translated and edited the book, wrote that: "The original material, when it came into my hands, was quite disorganized. . . . I have had to take certain liberties with the structure . . . to render Nikita Khrushchev's reminiscences into a coherent, if informal, narrative." The book, as Edward Crankshaw phrased it, was "assembled."²⁵

Among other things that raises a pertinent question which *Life* spoke to in a pre-publication advertisement: "Did Khrushchev intend this manuscript to be published in the West? We do not know."²⁶ The book publisher said much the same thing: "Whether the author intended or expected his words ever to find their way into print, either in his own country or in the West, is a matter of speculation."²⁷ Where did the material come from then? The *London Times*, which bought British rights, said in November that Khrushchev's manuscript originated with the K.G.B. "There is reason to believe that [the complete manuscript] is in the possession of the K.G.B., which, for its own reasons, decided to sell excerpts in the West."²⁸ These are rather remarkable statements.

Much can be said of them depending on how much one wants to factor the psychology; such statements could be deliberately misleading, or they could be meant to appear that way. Yet if they are in any way true, what can fairly be said of them? The publishers leave the impression that the principal question is whether or not Khrushchev expected or intended his manuscript to be published, either in the Soviet Union or abroad; which at once implies not only that Khrushchev composed a manuscript, but that it may have been made public without his knowledge or permission. The silent premise is that the "memoirs" are authentic.

Khrushchev is implicated, of course, regardless of his "intention" since the Kremlin could hardly be expected to overlook the inflammatory character of the book on the basis of his subjective wishes in the matter. Moreover, mistakes of such magnitude would be treated as criminal negligence politically. Yet at the same time the publisher hedges against this initial impression by carefully avoiding use of the term "memoirs" and by conceding that the original material was not a book as such.

The material had to be collected for over a year from "various sources." Moreover, the material itself was fragmentary, and at least one of the publishers thinks that the Soviet secret police provided most of it, excerpts which were then edited into a "coherent narrative" by Strobe Talbott; or, in Crankshaw's words, "assembled." From this, it is reasonably clear that Khrushchev himself did not write a book or memoir; and that if he wrote anything, it was not intended to go "into print." While "the voice is largely the voice of Khrushchev," as Henry Shapiro says, "the hands are somebody else's."²⁹ Most of

the material, moreover, was already known in the West; was it compiled and embroidered from that? If so, by whom?

Such a "forgery," after all, is not impossible. Most of the content analysis of Khrushchev's book, indeed, has so far been cast toward whether or not he might have made such remarks, which is to say, whether or not such a "memoir" is intrinsically possible. Some well-respected Soviet analysts have contended that, in fact, Khrushchev's remarks are not either impossible or even improbable. Khrushchev has long been known, it is said, to have a tendency to box the ideological compass. When he speaks, he tends to track back on his statements, presumably to cover himself against criticism from his opponents.

Such scholars also point out that he has been known to be indiscreet in private, particularly when drunk, and to make extreme comments in public which depart from his formal or prepared texts. Similarly, they maintain that the "Iron curtain" today is very far from being total and that a large quantity of dissident material can still be smuggled out, sometimes with police collaboration. Yet even if this were conceded, it leaves unanswered the question of Khrushchev's motives for writing, which has evoked speculation that he might wish not only to settle accounts with his former enemies, but to "rehabilitate" himself. Memoirs might help to polish his rather tarnished image.

Such a line of argument is highly plausible, except that showing an event to be possible intrinsically is not the equivalent of showing that it took place. Moreover, it raises the question of whether a "forger" might not have counted on precisely this line of reasoning lending substance to his efforts, particularly when coupled with the use of a body of known material which would itself elicit recognition from the experts as genuine. Minor errors in the text would not be enough to discredit it and might even lend it verisimilitude, since Khrushchev has never been known for his penchant for accuracy. Motives for such a "forgery," in the labyrinth of Soviet or international politics, are legion.

Michel Tatu, in any case, terms the book "a collection of anecdotes which make lively enough reading but leave an overall impression of déjà vu."³⁰ Moreover, Crankshaw himself states that the book does not cut much new ground, and that it exhibits some extraordinary gaps. "What is missing," he says, "is any sort of account of the power struggle inside the Kremlin which ended in his victory and subsequent defeat, [and] we are told next to nothing about the domestic scene during the Khrushchev era."³¹

Since the book is presumably intended to help reestablish Khrushchev's place in history (a motive spelled out in the book itself), it is striking that he should neglect his time at center stage. Not only is Khrushchev voluble, but modesty is not one of his more noticeable traits. Yet it is not merely a question of this. If Khrushchev means to help himself and hurt his enemies, he makes so many less than acute confessions that it is suspicious. "I should tell you of my association with Vlasov," he writes, "who later turned traitor and betrayed his homeland." Although Vlasov was guilty of treason, Khrushchev explains in some detail how he was responsible for helping him attain high military position.

Moreover, he notes that since Vlasov defected and organized an anti-Soviet army for the Nazis, he got a deserved punishment when he was captured: "He was tried and hanged."³² It is highly unlikely that any Soviet, not to say a person seeking to rehabilitate his reputation, would willingly link himself with Vlasov, Nazism, and treason. Not only would it be politically mindless, but it would be hard to link oneself with any more odious incident, one calculated not to rehabilitate a reputation, but to destroy it.

Footnotes at end of article.

Scattered about Khrushchev's narrative, as Edward Crankshaw comments, are many remarks with such "explosive implications." While the hook largely centers around Stalin's crimes, Crankshaw rightly points out that when Khrushchev condemns Stalin, he also condemns himself; he says "quite enough to constitute the most damaging direct admission of complicity, over a long period, with Stalin at his worst." For that matter, Khrushchev condemns by implication "the whole system that had made Stalin possible."²³ So far from working to his advantage, several such passages constitute a veritable death warrant, which is hardly calculated to hurt his opponents.

Since Khrushchev is a highly practiced intriguer, one of the few men from the Ukraine to survive a long-term connection with Stalin, such ineptitude is hard to accept. Much of the book is evasive, of course, and some of the deceptions appear deliberate.²⁴ Yet the most suspicious passages are precisely those where Khrushchev's political position is compromised, where his stated reasons for writing happen to bear on the current power struggle, and where the Kremlin's current political vendettas are carried out—like the one against Svetlana Alliluyeva.

Most analysts have concentrated on Khrushchev's cloying show of sympathy for "Svetlanka," but have said little about his attacks. "Svetlanka wasn't a stable person." She seems to have had a "gradual psychic breakdown," Khrushchev claims, and to have become "psychologically stratified," or perhaps schizophrenic. "There's something odd," he says, "and even sick about her book." Moreover, she "gave the enemies of the Soviet way of life something to gossip about, and she allowed her name, the name of Stalin's daughter, to be exploited by the enemies of Socialism. . . . It was an unforgivable thing for a Soviet citizen to do."²⁵

Yet what is Khrushchev himself doing in letting his own memoirs be published in the West except the "unforgivable"? This part of the book recalls the attack on Svetlanka which Victor Louis tried to trade as a *quid pro quo* for the televised Khrushchev interview. There is even a thinly veiled threat against her children if she does not return to the U.S.S.R., which would "welcome" her back and "won't hold [her defection] against her."²⁶ No doubt there are hospitals that would help her in the U.S.S.R.—the Serbsky Institute in Moscow perhaps.

Numerous such passages haunt the book. Not the least is an attack on Stalin and the Soviet system which implicates Khrushchev himself. Stalin is subjected to a torrent of abuse. He is alternately described as a drunkard, a family tyrant, a coward, a psychotic, a political despot, a criminal, a murderer, an anti-semitic, and a mass murderer who sabotaged intelligent state policy and the norms of Party rule. Stalin, says Khrushchev, turned the Party into a "band of thugs"; he was "a criminal, an assassin, a mass murderer" who turned the Soviet Union into a "Fascist state like Hitler's and Mussolini's." Stalin probably was not even a working-class revolutionary, since "his father wasn't a worker and simple shoemaker at all, but had a workshop with at least ten employees under him. For those days [prior to 1917] that was a big enterprise."²⁷ While most of what Khrushchev alleges is true, it is not what might be expected from a former First Party Secretary, since it abandons a restraint (apparent in the "secret speech") necessary to the preservation of at least some semblance of legitimacy in Soviet rule.

Yet this striking line, much of which exceeds any charges he levied previously, overlays another in which he identifies himself with Stalin. "I will give Stalin credit for one thing; he didn't simply come with a sword and conquer our minds and bodies." According to Khrushchev, he himself believed

and "worshipped" Stalin like the rest of the Party. "I still think that Stalin's ideological position was basically correct . . . it was not accident that Stalin held the leading position in the party, and it was no accident that the Party supported him." It was not an accident in one sense, because "he really was a man of outstanding skill and intelligence. He truly did tower over everyone around him. . . ."

"Stalin supported modern improvements," Khrushchev adds, "and progressive developments of all kinds." In this regard, Khrushchev maintains that "there's no doubt that he held me in great respect" and that he himself enjoyed "a position comparable to Stalin" in the Party's eyes.²⁸ Yet it was no accident in a second sense, because the Party's course, like the choice of its leaders, is ultimately governed by the laws of history. Such a line, when viewed in this light, goes quite beyond the "cult of personality" criticism of earlier years. If it was no accident that the Party followed Stalin into nothing less than Nazism and mass murder, then Marxism-Leninism and the leading Soviets state are monstrous frauds. When Khrushchev takes this tack, he is no longer criticizing the abuses of an individual who has deflected the Party from its correct course, he impugns Communism itself.

Such a line, indeed, runs throughout the book. Khrushchev compares Stalin ("Josef I") to Tsar Nicholas I, suggests that Lenin and Stalin were of a kind, implies that the working class (including himself) were better off before the Revolution, and ends his "memoirs" with a set of policy proposals Communists used to term "rotten liberalism." Moreover, he interlaces the book with warnings against the careerists, militarists, and chekists who want to continue Stalin's way. With considerable irony, he even predicts that "if we don't change our position in this regard, I'm afraid we will discredit the Marxist-Leninist ideals on which our Soviet way of life is based." However, he expresses confidence that "the new generation . . . will soon replace the current leadership of our country" with more intelligent rulers.²⁹

The Stalin line is more complex and subtly introduced than telescoping it suggests; but when the mosaic is looked at whole, it is incredible. Khrushchev may be a revisionist, as the Chinese say, but he is not mad. Yet there is enough "social democratic" heresy in this book to shoot Khrushchev, not to say his sympathizers, several times over. It is so crudely dangerous in this respect, that it is not terribly plausible any reasonably prudent anti-Stalinist member of the ruling circle would risk compromising himself by being associated with it. Moreover, it is hard to conceive that Khrushchev himself could be responsible for the book.

Whatever else he is, Khrushchev is not Amalrik. He is not a liberal reformer. When he undertook his original campaign of "de-Stalinization," he did so out of the pragmatic necessities of Kremlin politics, and he reneged on his "liberalizations" whenever the situation required or permitted him to plausibly do so. Whatever his bitterness toward Stalin or toward his fall from power, Khrushchev has killed thousands if not millions of citizens and Party members in the interests of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Such actions imply a commitment which is hard to reconcile with the use of crude anti-Soviet slander merely to change the policy of Brezhnev and Kosygin, a policy in many ways not unlike his own prior to his fall, or even to effect a change in the Soviet leadership. With his age and heart condition, he himself can scarcely entertain ambitions, and the other members of the ruling circle do not seem much closer to him in terms of policy than his former proteges. What stands to be gained by anti-Soviet slanders?

Yet if Khrushchev himself is not responsible for the "memoirs" as constituted, nor astute anti-Stalinists, who then is accountable? The most likely candidates are Time and the K.G.B. By preventing independent verification, the publishers, one suspects, can only be shielding themselves or the Soviet secret police. Such secrecy hardly protects Khrushchev, who is compromised merely by the fact of publication. Nor does it offer much protection to his entourage. If the regime were intent on it, they would suffer anyway. So far from offering comfort to anti-regime activity, indeed, the "memoirs" are so crude that they look like a provocation by Stalinists to tar their opponents with a charge of "ideological wrecking"—with being objectively anti-Soviet.³⁰

FOOTNOTES

¹ Anatole Shub, *An Empire Loses Hope: The Return of Stalin's Ghost* (New York: Norton, 1970), p. 150.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 137-142; and Leonard Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (New York: Vintage, 1960), pp. 587-590.

³ For details of the infighting, see Myron Rush, *The Rise of Khrushchev* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1958); and Wolfgang Leonard, *The Kremlin Since Stalin* (New York: Praeger, 1962). For a treatment of the succession problem as such, see Howard Swearer, *The Politics of Succession in the U.S.S.R.* (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1964); and Andrew Gyorgy, *Issues of World Communism* (New York: van Nostrand, 1966), pp. 208-220.

⁴ *The Anti-Stalin Campaign and International Communism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960).

⁵ Lev E. Dobriansky, *U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth* (Greenwich: Devin-Adair, 1971), p. 44 f. Cf. U.S. Congress, Senate, Comm. on the Judiciary, *The Soviet Empire: A Study in Discrimination and Abuse of Power*, Comm. Print, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965, pp. 23-27 passim.

⁶ *The Anti-Stalin Campaign and International Communism*.

⁷ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (New York: Praeger, 1963); cf. U.S. Congress, Senate, Comm. on the Judiciary, *Rebellion in Russia's Europe*, Comm. Print, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965; U.S. Congress, Senate, *Aspects of Intellectual Ferment in the Soviet Union*, S. Doc. 130, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., 1966; and Ernest J. Simmons, "Recent Trends in Soviet Literature," *Modern Age*, 7 (Fall 1963), 393-406. See also note 9 infra.

⁸ Gyorgy, *Issues of World Communism*, pp. 65-85.

⁹ Carl Linden, *Khrushchev and the Soviet Leadership: 1957-1964* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1966), p. 219 passim.

¹⁰ Shub, *An Empire Loses Hope*, pp. 437-441; cf. my "Soviet Terror: Neo-Stalinism Emerging?" *Triumph*, 5 (March 1970), 16-18.

¹¹ See Vincent Buist, "Kremlin Trio Said to Write Attack on Brezhnev-Kosygin," *The Washington Post*, March 12, 1970, A-2; James Clarity, "Supreme Soviet Open: Tighter Labor Code Planned," *The New York Times*, July 15, 1970; Abraham Brumberg, "How Russia Uses Asylums to Kill Dissent," *The Washington Post*, October 18, 1970, B-2; Anthony Astrachan, "The Creeping Rehabilitation of Stalin," *The Washington Post*, January 30, 1971, A-16; and Astrachan, "Newsmen Beaten in Moscow," *The Washington Post*, January 28, 1971, A-28.

¹² Shub, *An Empire Loses Hope*, pp. 418-422; "The Soviet Union: The Risks of Reform," *Time*, March 29, 1971, 27-39; and Tibor Szamuely, "Are Things Really Improving in the U.S.S.R.?" *National Review*, 22 (March 10, 1970), 250-257.

¹³ Terence Smith, "U.S. Experts on Soviet Union Find Khrushchev Memoirs Authentic," *The New York Times*, January 21, 1971, 2.

¹⁴ For a treatment of these rules, see Alexander Orlov, *Handbook of Intelligence and Guerrilla Warfare* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965), pp. 184-187.

¹⁵ *Khrushchev Remembers*, trans. Strobe Talbott (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1970), p. vii-viii.

¹⁶ This section is based on 'Khrushchev: Notes from a Forbidden Land,' *Time*, November 30, 1970, 20 f.; Harrison Salisbury, "Khrushchev Remembers," *The New York Times*, January 3, 1971; Stewart Alsop, "Who Is Mr. X?" *Newsweek*, January 4, 1971; Foy Kohler, "Nikita Remembers: But Not Very Well," *The Miami Herald*, December 20, 1970; Crosby Noyes, "Khrushchev's Reminiscences," *The Washington Evening Star*, January 8, 1971; Michel Tatu, "Who Edited the Khrushchev Memoirs?" *Le Monde Weekly*, December 9, 1970; Paul Wohl, "The Controversial Memoirs," *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 7, 1971; "Khrushchev 'Memoir' Criticizes Stalin," *The New York Times*, November 23, 1970; "Khrushchev Memoir Linked to Possible Internal Issue," *The New York Times*, November 21, 1970; "The Great Khrushchev Mystery," *Newsweek*, November 30, 1970; Chalmers Roberts, "Mr. K's Memoirs? The Debate Goes On," *The Washington Post*, February 7, 1971, C-1, C-4.

¹⁷ Henry Shapiro, "Son-in-Law Might Have Been Courier," *Los Angeles Times*, January 3, 1971.

¹⁸ James Clarity, "Khrushchev Memoirs Are Linked to Tape Recordings He Made," *The New York Times*, November 28, 1970; Harrison Salisbury, "Voice of 'Unperson' Creates Worldwide Interest," *The New York Times*, November 22, 1970; David Kraslow, "Taped Voice Identified as That of Khrushchev Informed Sources Say," *The Los Angeles Times*, November 18, 1970.

¹⁹ Walter Scott, "Personality Parade," *Parade*, January 24, 1971.

²⁰ See Claudia Levy, "Voiceprint Admitted as Evidence in D.C. Case," *The Washington Post*, December 17, 1971, B-3; and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The First Circle* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).

²¹ This section is based on Paul Wohl, "Khrushchev 'Memoirs' Shrouded," *The Christian Science Monitor*, November 24, 1970; Anthony Astrachan, "Izvestia Attacks Memoirs," *The Washington Post*, November 25, 1970; "Soviet Press Agency Calls Book 'Forgery,'" *The Washington Post*, November 14, 1970; and Bernard Overtzman, "Khrushchev Denies Releasing Memoirs," *The New York Times*, November 17, 1970.

²² Victor Zorza, "Khrushchev's Denial Gets a Bad Press," *The Manchester Guardian*, November 17, 1970; Victor Zorza, "Khrushchev Story: True or Plot?" *The Los Angeles Times*, November 17, 1970; Victor Zorza, "A Request to Interview Khrushchev," *The Washington Evening Star*, November 22, 1970; Victor Zorza, "On the Khrushchev Memoirs," *The Washington Post*, February 19, 1971; cf. Tibor Szamuely, "Technological Fraud," *National Review*, (February 23, 1971), 201 ff.; and U.S. Congress, Senate, Comm. on Judiciary, *The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda*, S. Doc. 34, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967, pp. 8-31 passim.

²³ Harrison Salisbury, "Khrushchev Remembers," *The New York Times*, January 3, 1970.

²⁴ Ralph Graves, "The Jones Project," *Life*, (November 27, 1970).

²⁵ *Khrushchev Remembers*, pp. v, xxi, viii.

²⁶ *Time*, November 23, 1970, 88 f.

²⁷ *Khrushchev Remembers*, p. v.

²⁸ Victor Zorza, "Khrushchev's Denial Gets a Bad Press," *The Manchester Guardian*, November 17, 1970.

²⁹ Henry Shapiro, "Son-in-Law Might Have Been Courier," *The Los Angeles Times*, January 3, 1971.

³⁰ Michel Tatu, "Who Edited the Khrushchev Memoirs?" *Le Monde Weekly*, December 9, 1970.

³¹ *Khrushchev Remembers*, p. x ff.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 180 ff.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. x ff.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 292-296.

³⁶ *Ibid.*; Marjorie Simons, "Psychiatric Treatment of Soviet Dissidents Hit," *The Washington Post*, November 30, 1971, A-12; "Psychiatrists Shun Censure of Soviets," *The Washington Post*, December 3, 1971, A-20.

³⁷ *Khrushchev Remembers*, pp. 6 ff., 63, 74 ff., 89, 124, 160, 173, 205, 258-269, 279, 298-291, 302, 343, 352.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3 f., 6, 20, 26, 30, 44, 49 f., 57, 61 f., 64, 80, 94, 102, 107 f., 124, 205, 210, 307, 314, 323.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7 f., 17, 19 ff., 31, 46 f., 57, 225, 235, 287, 349, 520, 521 f., 525.

⁴⁰ Yet this itself is only a hypothesis, which rests on the presumption that Khrushchev and the "liberal" faction is powerful enough to require staging an international incident and running the risk of ideological scandal to be silenced effectively. Such a presumption is tenuous at best. With his heart condition, Khrushchev himself might be silenced in a more politic fashion from the Kremlin's standpoint if he were to have a heart attack and expire quietly in a Moscow hospital, something which is well within the capacity of the secret police to have arranged. Similarly, those few "liberals" in the Politburo might more effectively be shunted into state or provincial positions, or if necessary treated to a stay at the Serbsky Institute in Moscow. Something like this would seem more in keeping with the Kremlin's traditional way of acting, rather than floating "memoirs," which may have originated (if this is true) somewhere in the West.

⁴¹ Since this paper was first published, several articles have appeared which are worth noting. For example: Victor Zorza, "Zorza on the Khrushchev Memoirs," *The Washington Post*, February 19, 1971, A-19; Victor Zorza, "Is a Major Rift Under Way in the Kremlin?" *The Washington Post*, October 11, 1971, A-18; Victor Zorza, "Soviet Right Grows Restless," *The Washington Post*, January 26, 1972, A-23; Victor Zorza, "Hughes: Reprise of Khrushchev," *The Washington Post*, February 2, 1972, A-15; Strobe Talbott, "Khrushchev Remembered," *Parade*, October 10, 1971, 17 ff.; John Kenneth Galbraith, "Days in the Life of Comrade Khrushchev," *Book World*, 5 (March 14, 1971), 1 ff.

DISTINGUISHED OHIOAN AWARD

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening, the dean of the Ohio congressional delegation, the Honorable WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, and two of his distinguished Ohio colleagues, Congressmen FRANK BOW and JACKSON E. BETTS, were honored by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce during its annual banquet in Washington, D.C.

The Distinguished Ohioan Award was given to each "in recognition of his leadership and accomplishments on behalf of the State of Ohio, its business and all of its citizens, reflecting its State motto 'With God all things are possible.'"

The honor, which the Ohio chamber began in 1968, was previously awarded to Senator Bricker, Governor Rhodes, Senator Lausche and Mr. Barton Holl.

JOHN J. SYNON—AMERICAN PATRIOT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, John J. Synon, a pro-American newspaper writer died April 5, 1972, in Richmond, Va., and was laid to rest under a Confederate Flag in Hollywood Cemetery within speaking distance of Jefferson Davis' plot of earth.

John Synon's life was one of courageous journalism, including a campaign biography of George C. Wallace. He served as director of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc.; director of the National Putnam Letters Committee; started the Patrick Henry Press; and his syndicated column appeared in many newspapers throughout the country.

John's intellectual wit and service to his people will be sorely missed. He used his pen in many causes, but always in the search of truth.

No better eulogy could be given of John J. Synon, the American journalist, than the introduction to his final column, a reprint of "A Visit With Jefferson Davis"—on the future of the South.

I include the "final column" at this point:

A VISIT WITH JEFFERSON DAVIS (By John J. Synon)

(PUBLISHER'S NOTE.—This will be the final column by John J. Synon. The introduction to it was written by one of Mr. Synon's closest friends.)

John Synon was an Irishman. He enjoyed a good fight. But on April 5, 1972, at St. Luke's Hospital in Richmond, Va., John lost the most important fight of his life—his battle against what he called "The Big 'C'"—and all of us are the poorer. He was 62.

John's wife and two daughters have lost a husband and father who worshiped them, for he was above all an old-fashioned family man. He constantly referred to "My Molly," and "My Mary Ellen," and Margaret... well, wise, gentle, pretty little Margaret was the heart of John Synon, and he was proud to let the world know it.

John had a big heart; big enough for Margaret and his girls, big enough for Ireland—yes, Synon Castle still stands in County Cork—and big enough for his native land, Virginia, and the whole of the South.

No one has fought harder for the South, and he knew how to fight. In his personal, inimitable style through this column, through his stirring speeches, through the halls of Congress, through the hills and backwoods, through his people, as he was fond of calling the Unreconstructed.

Yes, John was a fighter. Above all, a fighter, for his friends and colleagues; total unquestioning loyalty. For his foes; not the time of day, or even the back of his hand.

For almost a year, John knew he had the fatal malignancy that had already marked his two brothers. But not one complaint, not one appeal for pity escaped his lips or his pen. You never saw the slightest suggestion of his darkening struggle in this column. He wanted to be in the thick of things for as long as he could. And he was. Can any man do more?

One of the most poignant notes of John's life was when he referred to a close friend a few weeks ago that his one great fear was that he would outlive Margaret. God has spared old John that fear, and Margaret car-

ries on with the same courage and determination as always. John would be—he is—proud of her.

John Synon had a particular kind of insight that Providence, in its wisdom, seems to have granted to certain favored Celts. In John's case, it was what the Irish would call "second sight." Thus, he was able to "see" things, to foretell, as those who followed his column know so well.

A few months back, John wrote "A Visit With Jefferson Davis." Most of you probably saw it. But read it again, in the light of what you now know John knew when he wrote it. You will understand a new dimension of this man's greatness of soul and the sensitive imagery of his mind.

John's friends can think of no more fitting way to bring this column to an end than by asking you to read again, in reverence, "A Visit With Jefferson Davis."

John Synon was laid to rest, under a Confederate battle flag, in Hollywood Cemetery in Richmond, within speaking distance of Mr. Davis' own plot of earth. On a quiet evening, when the softness of dusk gathers around, you will hear them talking again.

MONTGOMERY.—A person doesn't go around expecting to run into Jefferson Davis, you know, so when I saw him sitting alone under that magnolia near the south entrance to the capitol, I was nonplussed.

"President Davis?"

"Hello, John," he replied, casually enough. "Sit down."

I hesitated a moment, then did as I was told.

"Mr. President, I thought you were in Richmond."

"Well, I am, most of the time, with my family. But I enjoy coming back to Montgomery, every now and then."

"You certainly are looking well."

"Well, I've had some rest," he smiled.

For a while we went on like that, making small talk. Finally, I said:

"Mr. President."

"Yes."

"Why do you suppose they never took you to court? They had you indicted for treason; why didn't they go through with it?"

"I don't know really. Perhaps if you'd ask Sumner or Butler or Thad Stevens, they could tell you. But I do have a theory."

"Well, you kept asking them to get on with the case, didn't you?"

"Indeed so. As I remember, I demanded trial six or seven times. I kept going back to the Federal building there in Richmond, my lawyer or me, one of us, but they just never would proceed. Finally, they dismissed me, untried, and, I may add, unhung."

"Yes, sir. I know. But why? They sure had the goods on you if they ever had it on anybody."

"That's exactly right, John, they didn't have any treasonous goods on anybody. They didn't try me and therefore convict me because what I did—what all of us Southern people did—had a perfect right to pull out of the union. In a court of law, they knew I could prove that."

"But if you could have proved your innocence in court, how could they have convicted you?"

"My dear man, they could have and, no doubt, would have convicted me—they had the power—had they proceeded."

"That wasn't what they were concerned about, convicting me. I believe they were afraid of history; history was their stumbling block. They were afraid the facts would have made a martyr of me. Couple my hanging with the clear legality of our cause and the people of America, some day, may well have come to realize that the States, being sovereign, do have the right to secede. That was their concern. By not trying me, our case was never put, you see."

"Yes, sir."

"That was part of it. Suppose, on the other hand, the jury had found me not guilty. That would have stirred things even more."

"How's that, Mr. President?"

"Well, a not-guilty verdict would have said, in effect, we did have—as we do have—the constitutional right of secession and in that simple decision we would have won what we failed to win in four bloody years of fighting."

"Oh."

"That's why, in my opinion they refused to press their indictment. Either way, they could not have won."

I thought that over for a while, then started again.

"Mr. President, what do you see for us in the future, I mean, the South?"

He smiled.

"What did the witch say: 'Trouble, trouble, toll and trouble'."

"Yes, trouble. And there is another saying you will remember: 'Truth, pressed to earth shall rise again.' And I might add to that: But not without toll and trouble."

"But, sir, there doesn't seem to be much leadership. There is George Wallace but . . ."

"There will be. There will be," he interrupted, with what I thought to be a bit of flint in his voice.

And that seemed to close the conversation. For a while we just sat.

"Well, John," he finally said, "it's been nice visiting with you but it is tea time and a person tries not to keep Miss Varina waiting."

We both rose and the former President of the Confederacy extended his hand.

"There will be leadership," he said, "there will be."

And with that he left me. And I watched his long form go down the slope and beyond.

ADDRESS BY MELVIN R. LAIRD, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in case my House colleagues have not yet had an opportunity to review his remarks, I am pleased to include in today's RECORD the April 26 address of our distinguished Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, before the Rotary Club of Brooklyn at the Saint George Hotel in New York City:

ADDRESS BY HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

I am pleased to be here today because I know that pride grows in Brooklyn, and I want to talk about pride.

I want to talk about how proud I am of our men and women in uniform, both in the active forces and in the National Guard and Reserve.

I also want to talk about my pride in the thousands and thousands of men and women who have served their nation honorably during the war in Vietnam. They deserve a full measure of recognition for their service to our country.

The men and women serving in Southeast Asia today are striving to help restore peace in a troubled part of the world. Other uniformed Americans serving at home and abroad are part of the peace-keeping forces with which we seek to deter conflict.

You will note that I refer to men and women. In the Department of Defense, manpower means womanpower as well. I can reveal to you today that appointment of our

nation's first woman Admiral is imminent. She will join the women Generals already serving in the Army and Air Force.

I recognize, of course, that some may consider it old fashioned to talk about pride. I am aware that there are some who find it easier to snipe at our servicemen and women, rather than extending a helping hand. I think it is most appropriate for me to be speaking here today in Brooklyn where facing up to reality is a way of life.

Let's face it. The reality is our armed forces have a difficult job today. They know it and you know it. They also know that they can count on the support of people like you who believe that our country must stay strong to remain free.

If there are those who say this sounds like flag waving, so be it. I think we need some of that these days. Our President, who is the world's leader for peace, today is challenged by a Communist enemy who scorns international conventions, international accords and international understandings. This communist enemy is North Vietnam—equipped with sophisticated Soviet-supplied weapons, thinks nothing of mounting and maintaining an invasion across what Hanoi itself had for almost 20 years recognized as a demilitarized zone.

The communists have changed a demilitarized zone in a battlefield.

In launching this invasion, the enemy clearly endangered the lives of the diminishing force of Americans under the command of General Abrams. No one should have been surprised by our response.

President Nixon, our Commander in Chief, has said repeatedly that as we withdrew additional thousands of our forces from Vietnam we would protect them. We have done this. We are doing this. And we will continue to do this.

I think you common-sense people of Brooklyn would not want it any other way. And you must be mystified, as I am, that some Members of Congress today are talking about restricting the President's authority to protect these withdrawing Americans by seeking to deny General Abrams the air and sea power he needs to protect his troops. As one who was elected to the Congress for nine terms, I find it impossible to understand how those who sought no limits in the years when we were going up and up and up in U.S. military strength in Vietnam today seek limits on protection of Americans as our troop levels go down and down and down.

If I seem to be blunt today, it is because I am frankly fed up with those who would compromise the safety of Americans for whom the President and I are responsible. There will be no compromise with the safety of U.S. servicemen so long as I am Secretary of Defense. And I know General Abrams feels the same way.

What a magnificent job General Abrams has done. This is another source of my pride. He has simultaneously withdrawn hundreds of thousands of Americans from Vietnam—last week alone he sent home 8500—and he has continued training programs which have enabled the South Vietnamese to assume all of the ground combat responsibilities, and he has reduced U.S. casualties to a fraction of what they were in 1969 when the Vietnamization program was begun.

Obviously, I did not come to Brooklyn to burden you with some kind of fancy semantic essay. I came here to talk hard facts.

And one of these hard facts, one of these realities is that by reducing our armed forces by more than one million men and women as we have made significant transitions during the past three years, we have created the need for more civilian jobs for those who have served their country in the Armed Forces.

Since January, 1969, President Nixon has

been guiding our country through a series of historic transitions:

From an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation.

From arms competition toward arms limitation.

From the draft to all-volunteer services.

From a federal budget dominated by defense expenditures to one dominated by Human Resource Programs.

From war to peace.

From a wartime economy to a peacetime economy.

As we have turned over responsibility for ground combat operations and an increasing part of the responsibility for combat support to the Vietnamese, we will have reduced our forces in Vietnam by more than 87 per cent as of next Monday. Concurrently, we have cut our entire military establishment back to peacetime size. Some five and three-quarter million people have left the U.S. armed forces for civilian life in the past eight years. As a result, the veteran population of our nation has risen sharply.

I want to talk for a few moments about veterans of the Vietnam war and one of their problems. That problem is jobs.

These veterans had a wartime task that was in some ways the most difficult ever given to our armed forces. Yet despite all the difficulties, with rare exception, they did it well. They are entitled to the nation's gratitude and I believe they are entitled to a special measure of assistance as they rejoin their families and re-enter the civilian community.

Perhaps the most important single project to help the veteran is the Jobs for Veterans program inaugurated by President Nixon in June 1970. I know of the special interest that Rotary Clubs throughout the country, at the suggestion of Rotary International, have taken in supporting this program. I commend Rotarians for what they are doing and urge continued and intensified effort.

Persistently over the course of the past several years, the unemployment rate for Vietnam-era veterans has been higher than that for non-veterans in the same age group. But now, there are signs of improvement in this situation. In the past year the gap between the unemployment rate for veterans in their 20's and the rate for non-veterans in the same age bracket has been cut about in half—although the rate for veterans is still higher. This improvement undoubtedly results from the vigorous effort which President Nixon initiated last year to spur the hiring of veterans as well as from the excellent cooperation of labor and business.

The Vietnam veteran is ready to make his contribution to the nation's economic progress. He is better educated than the veteran of earlier wars. More than eight out of every ten of these veterans have had 12 or more years of schooling. By contrast, only six out of every ten World War II veterans were high school graduates.

The Vietnam veteran is eager to learn. Today more than 2 million of these veterans are using GI Bill Benefits to further their education. This number has risen significantly in recent years. It represents an increase of one-half million over the 1971 figure and is 35% greater than the comparable figure in 1970.

Today's veteran shows a particularly high capability for leadership and responsibility but is seeking a job in a difficult labor market.

The Jobs for Veterans program has achieved considerable success. But the problem that it was established to cope with is still with us. It will continue at least for the next year or two. This year, the normal complement of new entries to the labor market will be swelled by perhaps 700,000 who will be discharged from the armed services. This addition to the normal growth of the labor force requires continued effort to

spur economic growth, increase the number of jobs in the economy, and match job-seeking veterans with job openings. The real work that has to be done to make Jobs for Veterans successful can only be accomplished at the local level. It can be done only by employers who seek out qualified veterans to fill the jobs that they have to offer.

Here in New York City the Jobs for Veterans program is in the best of hands. Its chairman is Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, the Chairman of the Board of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and the man I chose to head a thorough study of the organization of the Defense Department three years ago.

I hope that the Rotary Club of Brooklyn will give Gil Fitzhugh and his Committee here in New York City generous cooperation in their efforts to help the veteran.

I speak of helping the veteran, but really this program helps the nation. All that the veteran asks is a chance to put to use his energy, his skill, his productive capacity. He wants to work. He wants to do his part in increasing the output of the economy on which depend all our hopes for the solution of the problems of poverty and slums and ignorance which beset us as well as our hopes for peace and progress for our nation. In short, the veteran who is seeking a job is not asking us to give him something. He is asking for the chance to give us something. He is asking for the chance to serve his nation in peace as he did in war. If anyone has earned this chance, if any one deserves a job, it is the Vietnam veteran.

A FINE CANDIDATE TO LEAD THE NATIONAL JAYCEES

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, one of the Nation's most outstanding public service organizations, the National Jaycees, will select a young man to lead the many Jaycee clubs across this Nation. There are many outstanding young men competing for this presidency, and this is what one could expect from such an organization, for the Jaycees over the years have actually taught young men the skills of community leadership and have produced young men with devotion to the tasks of building better communities.

Because of the civic enthusiasm and mood of down-to-earth activism associated with the Jaycees, many young men eager to make concrete contributions to their communities have been drawn to the ranks of the club.

Just such a young man is Sam Winer of New Martinsville, W. Va. Sam first became known as a capable young businessman, a fair dealer and a man whom his friends and neighbors could count upon for a quick and positive response to their needs. In 1970 Sam was elected president of the West Virginia Jaycees. He has served well, never accepting a compromising or half-hearted answer to the challenges of community service which constantly came before him.

The State is justly proud of Sam Winer, for we know firsthand of his contributions to West Virginia and to the

rest of the Nation as well during his current term as national vice president of the Jaycees.

The name of Sam Winer is on the list of those outstanding young men who are candidates for the presidency of the National Jaycees, and although I have not had the honor of meeting each and every one of those candidates, I can personally attest to the character, intelligence, and energy of Sam Winer. The National Jaycees could choose no more deserving a man, and the club would continue to benefit from its characteristically sound direction under the leadership of Sam Winer.

THE PROTECTIONIST SURGE

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage bill, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1971 (H.R. 7130), will probably be considered by this body in the near future. Recently a column appeared in the Newark Evening News by Kevin P. Phillips which draws attention to title III of this bill. As the provisions of title III could significantly affect the present American foreign trade posture, I insert this article in the Record:

THE PROTECTIONIST SURGE

(By Kevin P. Phillips)

WASHINGTON.—Official Washington is just awakening to an unusual legislative threat—Title III of the Minimum Wage bill about to be considered by Congress—that exemplifies the new and dangerous economic protectionism influencing the American labor movement.

Title III is "Buy American" run amuck. Under its provisions, Federal agencies would be unable to purchase goods from foreign sources. Even vital, strategic materiel would have to be bought in America—or nowhere.

Alerted to this possibility only a few weeks ago, Federal agencies are rushing to produce lists of their strategically essential foreign purchases. Defense Department officials privately admit that Title III would have a devastating effect on procurement. And the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has already weighed in with a sheepish confession that the U.S. space program, so grandly displayed this week, depends on some imported materials: for example, British-developed anti-fog chemicals used on the visor of astronaut space helmets since Apollo 11, as well as West German-produced flame retardant used for flameproofing paper and cellulose spaceflight equipment.

NO ALTERNATIVE IN SIGHT

For all its Know-Nothingism, Title III is hardly a laughing matter. Congressional unwillingness to buck "Buy American" sentiment in an election year could very well speed the measure through the House of Representatives, where consideration is expected in a few weeks. Opponents seem unable to agree upon and rally around a single alternative minimum wage bill that, among other things, would omit Title III. If the AFL-CIO decides to support Title III as part of its general campaign to push Congress toward protectionism, organized labor's efforts could prove decisive.

Title III's author is Rep. John Dent, a Democrat from Industrial Westmoreland County,

Pennsylvania, who chairs a key subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee. Several years ago, Dent got a bill like Title III through the House, but it died in the Senate. This year, he may do better.

Business lobbyists worry that the AFL-CIO may decide to boost Title III not so much for its own sake as to increase pressure for consideration of organized labor's Number One protectionist favorite, the kindred Burke-Hartke bill. So far, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills has refused to call hearings on Burke-Hartke, but a House vote for Title III could force his hand.

White House aides share this worry as well as another: that Congress—and the nation—may be drifting into a protectionist mood that would make it hard for President Nixon to make needed international economic decisions that go against the sentiment of the hour.

Certainly the signs are there—witness the legislative stirrings in the century-old protectionist heartland reaching from the shoe and cigar factories of Rep. James Burke's Boston-area district through Rep. John Dent's glass- and pipe-manufacturing bailiwicks to the Great Lakes steel centers represented by Sen. Vance Hartke. As any good historical atlas will show, this is the area that has voted for protectionist measures since pre-Civil War days.

A SWITCH FROM BIG BUSINESS

Until recently, though, big business was the driving force for economic protectionism: originally to safeguard fledgling industries, later to maintain high profits. But now many of America's large corporations are multinational operations, and they oppose protectionist measures. Labor has picked up the banner.

The result is a bunch of thoughtless bills that make the Smoot-Hawley tariff and others look like industrial statesmanship. America's corporate robber barons and their henchmen at least had vision to go with their avarice. But from organized labor and its minions, we get petty measures; measures befitting leaders who, for all their shop talk of "international brotherhoods," are wholly parochial in outlook.

Unhappily, labor's protectionist trend is bound to increase. Organized labor ranks have not grown with the national work force in recent years. Their great strength is concentrated in the large manufacturing industries unionized during the 1930s and 1940s—just those industries, like shoes, steel, textiles, and pipes, under pressure from foreign competition. And while the corporations can set up subsidiaries in Asia or elsewhere, their employees do not have the same flexibility. So the unions are turning to protectionism.

Under these circumstances, labor pressure for measures like Title III and Burke-Hartke can only grow. Organized labor—its leadership and policies—is rooted in the economic past, and that, in the end, is what Title III and Burke-Hartke are trying to preserve.

PROVIDENCE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the question of Federal aid to nonpublic schools is being widely discussed, I believe the position of the city council of Providence, R.I., will be of interest to my colleagues.

The text of the resolution approved by the city council on April 24, 1972, follows:

RESOLUTION No. 174

Whereas, In order for democracy to survive and succeed it must develop youth with a strong sense of values and ethics, and

Whereas, The Day Schools which teach religious values and ethics especially the ten commandments such as thou shalt not covet thy neighbors' property to have played a vital and necessary role in developing youth with value and ethics, and

Whereas, These Day Schools have been closing at an alarming rate, and

Whereas, Recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court cast a cloud on the legality of Governmental cost sharing of secular and non religious subjects taught at said schools.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Rhode Island Congressional Delegation and the President of the United States of America be and they are hereby urged to introduce and work for passage of An Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit governmental financial aid to Religious Day Schools to help defray the costs of their secular program, and

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America; the United States Director of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Rhode Island Congressional Delegation; the United States Senate and House of Representatives; Leaders of the Rhode Island Legislature and the Governor of the State of Rhode Island.

CLARKE H. HARPER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, over the years many persons have contributed greatly to this country and its people through dedicated but often unsung government service. Such a person is Clarke H. Harper of the Federal Aviation Administration, who has been an exemplary civil servant for 38 years.

Today, however, Mr. Harper is no longer unsung. He has been selected as one of the winners of the National Civil Service League Annual Career Awards. The selection of Mr. Harper for this honor is warmly endorsed by all who know him, and I am pleased to extend my congratulations to him at this time.

I came to know Clarke through my role on the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. His wealth of knowledge, his integrity, his dedication per's that constitutes the nuts and bolts him a most valuable witness for the committee's hearings on the FAA budget.

His painstaking and intelligent work, and his talent for explaining programs and proposals, go a long way in assisting the committee in its deliberations on the FAA budget. It is work such as Mr. Harper's that constitutes the nuts and bolts of our governmental system. When an individual performs this work in an outstanding manner, the system and the people it serves are the beneficiaries.

The National Civil Service League has added new lustre to its career awards by

its selection of Clarke H. Harper. I congratulate the League for its wise choice, and I extend my most sincere congratulations to Mr. Harper for this well-deserved honor.

POISONING PROGRAM FOR PREDATORY ANIMALS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement by 13-year-old Debbie Thomas, of Nashville, Ind., on the Government's poisoning program for predatory animals on public lands. In a remarkably mature statement of concern, Miss Thomas warns of the ecological consequences of this program, and I believe it deserves the attention of all Members of Congress. It reads as follows:

WHO'S THE REAL VICTIM?

(By Debbie Thomas)

Have you ever seen a coyote? Well, you had better look fast! Our U.S. Government is sponsoring a poisoning program through the use of a non-selective poison called 1080 (ten-eighty).

In 1963, curiously enough the last year such information was available to the public, a branch of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service used this poison to kill 90,000 coyotes. Today they are still using 1080 poison to kill predatory animals in seven of our western states.

Ten-eighty is an odorless and tasteless poison that is most often injected into a meat bait. This poison is so potent, one pound can kill 320,000 coyotes. Keep this in mind as I tell you that between the years of 1964 and 1969 well over two million pounds of 1080 poison were used to kill anything that would pick up a meat bait.

This poison doesn't degrade easily, which means if an animal feeds from a poisoned carcass, it too is poisoned. Ten-eighty is rendered harmless only when diluted in a large body of water. Therefore, if this poison finds its way into a smaller water system, say under five acres, the fish that swim in this water, and the animals that feed on the fish and drink this water are all poisoned.

In the states of New Mexico, Utah, Texas, Arizona, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Wyoming, ranchers are allowed to graze their stock on public land at ridiculously low prices. These lands, by the way, were originally set aside to protect predatory animals. The ranchers demand that all predatory animals be removed from this land at public expense. And, it's costing you plenty! In 1970, eight million dollars of the taxpayers' money were spent for this purpose. This money, being spent to protect livestock, exceeds their actual value.

To give you a better idea of how much protection the sheep and cattle need, I now describe a coyote. The coyote feeds mainly upon small rodents such as mice, moles, rats and rabbits. It also has the canine instinct to attack any snake it sees. On the other hand, the coyote is afraid of man and keeps his distance. But this poison kills the coyote's natural food once it has entered the food chain, and he is forced as a victim of circumstance, to bring down the domestic livestock, or starve. It seems the poison, in the final analysis, defeats the purpose of protecting the livestock.

In addition, there are laws in these seven states that forbid any random poisoning; which the government is conveniently over-

looking. Any branch of the government will do anything in the face of enough public opinion; therefore, I call on you as the public and you as the individual, to write to your congressman, the Fish & Wildlife Service, or another branch of the government to stop this needless killing and to find another way to solve this problem.

I've talked to the young people in my class at school, and I really got response. We are writing, as a class, to many branches of the government. But we can't do enough alone. We need your help to get anything done.

Unless we all act now, the coyote is another animal to which we can all say—Good-bye.

POWER POOL INQUIRY

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate has completed hearings on President Nixon's nomination of Acting Attorney General Richard Kleindienst to become head of the Department of Justice. Those highly useful hearings have focused public attention on the techniques employed by one of the Nation's great conglomerates to win sympathetic decisions from the White House and the Department of Justice.

ITT is not the only large corporation to secure sympathetic and favorable attention from the Nixon administration. By the same token the antitrust division of the Department of Justice does not have a monopoly on generous treatment for giant corporations.

The Department of the Interior markets hydroelectric power generated at multipurpose water resource development projects constructed by the United States. The Department is required by law to sell this power on a preferential basis to municipal utilities, public agencies, and cooperatives.

James R. Smith, an official of the Northern Natural Gas Co. was the Nixon administration's designee to administer this important program.

On February 7, without any prior consultation, Assistant Secretary Smith informed the small municipal utilities and rural electric cooperatives that the Bureau of Reclamation would affiliate with the power company dominated MAPP Pool. It has been established that he made that decision without any legal or technical analysis of his decision's relationship to the law or the Department's ability to discharge its existing contractual commitments.

My fears that the public interest is being subordinated to the interests of Northern States Power Co. prompted me to prepare a letter to Secretary Morton. The letter requests that he give this matter his personal attention and that no action be permitted until legal and technical analyses have been prepared which satisfy the Secretary and the affected Members of Congress.

Five of our colleagues joined me in signing the letter. I ask to make this letter a part of the Record.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., April 26, 1972.

HON. ROGER C. B. MORTON,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We understand that Assistant Secretary Smith has committed the Bureau of Reclamation to affiliation with a power pooling arrangement developed by the utilities affiliated with MAPP. This decision by your Assistant Secretary has caused both concern and consternation on the part of many rural electric cooperatives and municipal utilities that are, by law, preferred customers for Federally generated power.

We are informed, and assume that you have been informed as well, that the sponsoring utilities were unwilling to permit the small utilities in the Missouri Basin Systems Group to participate in the drafting process. We are told that the commitment to MAPP was made without any advance discussions with the Systems Groups or its members.

Fred Simonton, Executive Director of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, tells us that the record established since February 7th makes it clear that a major decision was made without proper staff work and analysis.

If his information is correct, this decision was made without any legal analysis setting out the relationship between the MAPP Pool and the antitrust laws, the preference clause and the Federal Power Act.

He tells us that the Department has not supplied and apparently has not prepared a legal analysis of the effects of this proposed action on existing contracts. Similarly, the Bureau of Reclamation was not required to document the anticipated effects of affiliation on its system from an engineering and technical point of view.

We have reviewed the legal analysis prepared for the Missouri Basin Systems Group by William C. Wise, as well as the technical analysis prepared by R. W. Beck and Associates. We find these analyses convincing. No doubt the Department's inability to produce similar documentation magnifies the importance of the available studies.

Moreover, we are impressed by the constructive and positive posture assumed by the Missouri Basin Systems Group in the presentation entitled, "A Suggested Arrangement For MBSG Pool Participation in The Proposed MAPP Pool."

We believe that the MBSG proposal provides your Department with a unique opportunity to provide leadership and to serve as a catalyst to bring about real power pooling involving all utilities regardless of ownership in the broad and general public interest.

We respectfully request that you give this important matter your immediate and personal attention. We shall expect to hear that action will not be taken until after careful legal and technical analyses have been prepared in the Department and made available to and discussed with the Members of Congress from the area.

May we have your assurances that you will not act until you have complied with this request?

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF AMTRAK

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be on hand for the first anniversary celebration of Amtrak on Monday, May 1. This was indeed a very impressive display. It was here that we saw some good evidence of the wis-

dom in Congress to establish the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and I had an opportunity to review briefly the contributions made in a brief 12-month period.

Mr. Speaker, the record of activity is very well summarized by the remarks made by Secretary John Volpe, under whose guiding hand and direction the progress was made. The remarks by the Secretary speak more eloquently than anything I could add. It is my hope that every Member of Congress and those interested in what I call the fifth great freedom—the freedom of movement of men and goods, will read and ponder on his eloquent testimony.

Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate, also, that the National Railroad Passenger Corporation commissioned Roger Lewis its president. He has proven that it has the capability to bring the railroad passenger transportation out of chaos and the modern age.

Mr. Speaker, the selection of Mr. Lewis as president was a very fortunate development and his remarks are ample proof of his ideas, concepts, and vision. It is my hope that all will read and ponder this as well.

The remarks of Mr. Lewis and Secretary Volpe follow:

FIRST ANNIVERSARY CEREMONY OF NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (Remarks of Roger Lewis, president)

Secretary Volpe, Chairman Stafford, Members of Congress, Members of the Railroad Industry and Honored Guests:

This is the first anniversary of Amtrak. Just 365 days ago, Secretary Volpe led the inaugural run from here to New York signaling the start of Amtrak's nationwide railroad passenger service as directed by Congress.

We didn't have a lot to start with—a bare handful of employees, rented locomotives and passenger cars, a new route pattern somewhat disrupted by a sharp reduction of the number of trains to be operated. But we did have the challenge and the opportunity to create for the traveling public another viable essential link in our country's transportation system, by consolidating the services of 13 separate railroads into a unified nationwide system.

If we had great problems we also had great assets. Our network of right of way and trackage is the greatest in the world. And we had some of the finest passenger train service such as the Santa Fe's Super Chief and the Metroliners already in service to the public. Then we had 15 million passengers each year who needed the trains. And we knew there were countless millions more who would ride good trains if the service could be improved. Lastly, of course, as we approach the 21st century when population is expected to double again and as we congregate more and more around the big cities, the railroad right of way running as it does without interruption from city-center to city-center and suburb to suburb represents perhaps our greatest under-utilized national asset. An America without a dynamic and growing intercity rail passenger service is as inconceivable as an America without a growing air transport system or an expanding highway system.

We think Amtrak has an important job of catching up to do and we are very pleased to say that the White House and the Congress think so too. We have made a lot of solid progress in the first year. We have assembled a dynamic management team; we have bought our initial locomotives and passenger cars from the best railroads were operating; we have started a program of complete overhaul and redecoration; we

have issued nationwide timetables and we now have a single tariff to simplify ticketing. We have a consolidated, computerized reservations system in operation in Chicago. We have credit cards; package tours with bus companies, airlines, and auto rental firms. And we now have more than 4,600 travel agents selling U.S. rail passenger tickets across the country and abroad.

Our immediate goal is to operate clean equipment, on-time service, render prompt and courteous service in reservations and sales, at the station and on the train. We know that Americans have high standards in choosing their ways to travel. We know they want excellence but at the lowest possible cost and we are determined to offer a service that is competitive in quality and price with the best that is available.

The train you see behind me today, the Broadway Limited, is one going into service tomorrow between the East Coast and the Midwest. It has been redone from end to end and I think you will find it very attractive. Before the start of the summer season we expect to have trains like it on the Merchants Limited between New York and Boston, the Silver Meteor between New York and Miami, the Coast Daylight and Starlight from Seattle to Los Angeles, the City of San Francisco between Chicago and San Francisco and the Super Chief. All of our other trains won't be this way for a while because it's a big job even when you have seven shops hard at work overhauling our fleet of almost 1,300 cars, but it will give the country an excellent idea of what we are planning to offer and what every section of the country will soon have.

And there will be new equipment. This year we will commit \$100 million to acquire new locomotives and passenger cars. Additional money will be spent on new stations, track and right of way improvements and on research and development. The TurboTrain and the Metroliners you will see here are examples of the kinds of equipment available. And there are others of interest embodying modern advanced technology in other countries to be considered.

But the big thing about Amtrak is people. Railroad and Amtrak people serving people who ride our trains. Many of them have been discouraged, finding it difficult to see a future in passenger service. One of our big accomplishments has been to demonstrate that national railroad passenger service in the United States is here to stay. We are setting high standards of individual performance; we are giving our people the tools with which to work. We are offering training and refresher courses in the most modern methods of serving the public. We have a way to go but we are making progress, some of which is as impressive as this new Broadway Limited train you are about to see. We believe that people want to do a good job and will do a good job if they are told what is expected and given recognition for a job well done.

We think they understand that this is what Amtrak is all about. The sales people, porters, waiters, conductors, trainmen, passenger service representatives, telephone operators, supervisors and executives, whatever his or her job, have a stake and a future in Amtrak, one which through the years will be easily measured if more and more people ride the trains because they like them.

Whatever we have accomplished has only been possible because of the support of government agencies and Congress and particularly the Department of Transportation and its dynamic and hard-driving Secretary, the Honorable John A. Volpe. He has honored us by being here with us this morning. For the record I don't think there would have

been an Amtrak in the first place or that we would have made the progress we have made to date without his direct, personal commitment to the restoration of soundly constructed railroad passenger service as a part of our nation's transportation system. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce him to you, the Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable John A. Volpe. I wonder, Mr. Secretary, if you would care to say a word or two to our friends here who have come to join us in our first birthday party.

AMTRAK ANNIVERSARY (Secretary Volpe's Remarks)

Thank you, Roger. I'm very pleased to be here. I have a keen appreciation for your remarks comparing today's anniversary celebration to the birthday of a child. I helped preside over Amtrak's birth. And I know I speak for thousands of Department of Transportation employees when I say that although it was hard labor, we're proud of the product—proud of the tremendous start Amtrak has made in revitalizing America's rail passenger service.

This is just the beginning, of course. And many of the biggest challenges are still ahead. Nevertheless, I find it difficult to restrain my enthusiasm. I believe in rail passenger service. I ride the trains—especially the Metroliner. And I believe rail passenger service is essential to meeting the intercity mobility needs of this country.

As most of you know, my background is in the construction business. And I've attended literally hundreds of ground breaking, ribbon cutting, dedication and anniversary ceremonies. But I think today fits into another category, perhaps a foundation completion ceremony. Certainly, the foundation has been laid for the kind of train service our citizens deserve.

With this modern and refurbished train here today, with the metroliners, the turbo-trains, and the many other trains now in various stages of modernization, we can see the beginning of a new kind of rail transportation.

We can see a system that runs safely, comfortably, efficiently, courteously and on time. We see this progress reflected in many ways—from increased ridership to favorable press accounts.

I was delighted to see a complimentary newspaper article just last week on the metroliners. The comments were favorable, the passengers were appreciative, and the service was courteous.

For me the message was clear: People like the trains and the trains are providing better service to the people. That's a beginning—a foundation—and we're going to build on it.

I certainly pledge the resources of our department to that task.

I want to offer my congratulations to Amtrak and all of its employees on this first year of operations.

It's your dedication, enthusiasm and ingenuity that will insure a bright future, for America's rail passenger service. Happy birthday!

CONTINUED REMARKS OF ROGER LEWIS

I would like now to ask the conductor and one of our passenger service representatives of the Broadway Limited, Mr. Frank Bittner and Miss Christy Koontz, to step forward and help us dedicate the train and then it will be ready for your inspection. Late tomorrow afternoon it will pull out of Penn Station in New York on its historic run west with every seat filled. That more than anything you will see or hear today portends the future for Amtrak.

Thank you.

BUSING ROLLS ON AS NATIONAL ISSUE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted the following statement to the House Committee on the Judiciary in support of a proposed Constitutional Amendment to forbid the busing of public school children to achieve racial balance in our schools. I would like to share my views with you on this matter:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN BURKE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman, in my two decades of serving the people as an elected official, first on the local level and now on the national level, I do not believe that I have witnessed such a persistent, emotional issue as the controversy over the busing of children to achieve racial balance in our public schools.

All of us have, in the past, received a good number of letters on such issues as taxes, the war, gun registration, and on many other matters, but busing is, and will be a persistent issue; one which we in the Congress should face honestly and with resolute determination.

I feel it is my duty to testify today in favor of H.J. Res. 620 and an accompanying measure which I introduced, H.J. Res. 606, both of which call for a Constitutional Amendment which will outlaw the busing of children to achieve a racial balance in our schools, and which, if enacted, preserve the concept of neighborhood schools.

The issue should be the proper and equal education of all children rather than the busing of our children to achieve racial balance, yet, the question of busing has probably become one of the hottest national issues confronting all of us today. It grew from a spark in the 1960's when federal agencies ordered mixing plans of students in order for school districts to qualify for federal monies. It became a national problem when federal courts upheld the views of the national planners, contrary to the intent of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

In March of this year, when Florida became the first state to hold a referendum on the subject, 74 percent of the voters indicated they oppose busing and support the Constitutional Amendment set forth in H.J. Res. 620. This support came from all areas of the State, including two counties with a majority of its population composed of Black citizens, as well as from one county with an almost equal population of Whites and Blacks. In Gadsden County which has a population of 15,933 Whites and 23,228 Blacks, the vote for the Constitutional Amendment was 4,639 in favor, and 1,727 against.

In Hamilton County, with a population of 4,695 Whites and 3,083 Blacks, the vote was 979 for the amendment and 213 against. In Jefferson County with a population of 3,874 Whites and 4,897 Blacks, the vote was 1,325 for and 458 against.

Florida, however, is not alone in voicing its opposition to busing. National polls consistently show a strong resentment in almost every part of the Nation to the busing of students. Even the delegates to the National Black Political Convention, which was held in Gary, Indiana voted overwhelmingly in opposing busing and in favoring local schools.

I have never felt that the protection of the

rights of the minorities call for overruling the equal rights of the majority. To solve our racial problems in such a way will only lead to further polarization of the races. Yet, despite this danger, we are witnessing federal judges who enjoy the comfort of lifetime appointments, imposing radical sociological views on the majority of the American people.

What it really amounts to is a brand of judicial dictatorship by judges who under the protection of their judicial robes legislate by judicial decree for social expediency rather than to interpret the law within the scope of the Constitution.

There seems to be little hope for the majority of the people from our Supreme Court. On April 20, 1971 the High Court in *Swann, et al. v. the Charlotte (North Carolina)—Mecklenburg Board of Education, et al.* held: "That assignment of children to the school nearest their home serving their grade would not produce an effective dismantling of the dual system is supported by record."

The decision further states: "That desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school."

While the federal courts, and perhaps the U.S. Supreme Court will not alter their views, it should be apparent to all that the majority of Americans resent their rulings as a usurpation of their rights of freedom of choice and an invasion of the constitutional concept of the preservation of neighborhood schools.

Meanwhile, thousands of youngsters are caught in the maze of objections.

I strongly believe that all of us should abide by the law, but one can hardly blame the thousands of parents who are wondering when the Court will begin interpreting the laws as passed by the legislature in accordance with the Constitution, instead of ignoring the Constitution or passing law by judicial dictate.

It is my honest conviction that most Americans want quality education for all children regardless of color or creed, but do not honestly believe in destroying the pride of children in their neighborhood schools with busing as the answer.

Most parents, who want good education for their children will move to areas where it is provided. This is the principle of the neighborhood school that we have all accepted and this is why higher taxes are paid in some neighborhoods than in others. State and local taxes have gone up and a large part of this money has gone to school systems.

Those who disguise the busing of students as a means to better education either ignore the fact, or fail to realize that busing is used mainly in rural areas to transport students to the nearest school in their area. School busing in urban areas is a fairly new concept for it was not too long ago that most urban students walked to school or used public transportation.

The only honest answer is not busing, but is, instead, quality education for all children. This is a fact that most of us recognize today. It is true perhaps that we should have been concentrating our efforts on this in the past, but the truth is that populations of the urban areas have changed in the past few years. New people moved in while others moved out. Neighborhoods have changed and so has the concept of education.

The costs of education have risen tremendously and our American taxpayer, namely, the middle class working man, who carries the greatest brunt of the taxes levied is beginning, and I think rightfully so, to ask: "What has happened to our rights?"

President Nixon, in his message to Congress on March 20th placed the legislative responsibility on our shoulders. Regrettably, if the Supreme Court and the lower courts had ruled on that part of the 1964 Civil Rights

Act, which was passed in the 88th Congress and forbid the busing of students to achieve racial balance, this issue would be mute today.

The problem would also be solved if the courts would heed the various amendments to some education appropriation bills forbidding the use of federal funds for the purpose of busing to achieve a racial balance.

Also in his recent speech, the President proposed a moratorium on all new busing and asked the Congress to enact legislation to halt busing for the sole purpose of promoting racial balance, and once again called for the Congress to pass the Quality Education Act so that standards in inferior schools can be upgraded to an acceptable level.

I regret that the question of busing must be the subject of an Amendment to the Federal Constitution, but if such an Amendment is the only answer then so be it.

To those who argue that this method is too extreme, I say let your courts quit legislating. Let the majority retain the rights granted them as free Americans.

I am sure that the majority has learned to respect the rights of all Americans—Black, White, Red and Yellow. The rights granted to all under our Constitution are too great for the courts to ignore.

It is then our judiciary that has lost faith in the justice of the American people, and not the American people who have lost faith in our Constitution, or in each other.

This Constitutional Amendment may help restore that faith once again.

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, over a quarter-century ago, this Nation cooperated with several other nations across the globe to form the United Nations.

About the same time, this Nation took the first steps toward military involvement in Indochina, first in concert with France, then in concert with the newly created regime of Ngo Dinh Diem.

The costs and pains of our involvement are now familiar to every American. The tragedy is greater because we have consistently and arrogantly refused to subordinate our own perceptions and objectives to the judgment and assistance of that international organization we created to handle such conflicts.

The United Nations shall never be influential, if the greatest powers on earth stand in its way. The U.N. shall never be helpful, if the greatest powers do not seek its help.

The following letter from Patricia K. DiGiorgio, president of the United Nations Association of San Francisco eloquently makes the case for ending our involvement in Vietnam, and turning over the responsibilities for rehabilitation and reconstruction to the U.N.

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

OF SAN FRANCISCO,

San Francisco, Calif., April 28, 1972.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Representative in Congress, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Dean Rusk recently stated that the most serious error in

judgment that the United States government has made with concern to Vietnam was its failure to "seriously seek the involvement of the United Nations." Today over 10 years later this country finds itself in an intolerable and untenable situation which might have been entirely different if such help had been sought.

Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim has offered his "good office" to the United States as well as all other parties concerned to help mediate this very serious and critical problem. To this date he has received no positive response from any of the parties involved. It would seem that this is a most unusual opportunity for the United States government to rectify the wrong that occurred in previous administrations and as Dean Rusk stated "seriously seek" United Nations help.

It is apparent that the will and morale of the South Vietnamese people themselves is deteriorating rapidly, while on the other hand, the bombing of North Vietnam, which was commenced in December, has only served to strengthen the will and determination of the North Vietnamese to reunite their country.

The United States committed itself many years ago to the "containment" of China. This containment is no longer valid. 50,000 American lives, untold thousands of Vietnamese lives, untold devastation and the attendant agonies which wars produce have been uselessly expended and endured.

It is time that the United States government expressed a certain degree of maturity by publicly admitted our error in judgment. It would then seem appropriate to commit ourselves to the task of directing our energies toward the reconstruction and reunification of this devastated country.

Most sincerely,

PATRICIA K. DI GIORGIO,
President.

UNCONTROLLED FOREIGN IMPORTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Pittsburgh Press amused, interested, and intrigued me, and I thought it would be of considerable interest to those of my colleagues who share my concern about uncontrolled foreign imports and their damaging effect on domestic industries.

It seems, gentlemen, we are about to witness the breakthrough of another export from Japan. Fifteen Japanese executives are coming here, according to the Press, at their own expense to teach American businessmen the tricks of the export trade. Of course, as the Press points out, the fact Japan is fearful we may demand more trade concessions and controls on Japanese-made goods shipped here may have something to do with this sudden display of good fellowship.

American manufacturers do have some exporting problems, much of them arising from high costs, low productivity, and outmoded plants. But a considerable factor in our current trade deficit are the barriers erected against American-made goods by foreign governments, including Japan.

The Press editorial asks a most pertinent question:

Since the Japanese are now giving us technical help, do you think they'll teach us that self-preferential technique, too.

I wonder.

The editorial follows:

BACKWARD AMERICANS

Have you heard about the latest underdeveloped nation to qualify for technical aid from abroad? It's called the United States of America.

At their own expense, 15 Japanese business executives are coming to the United States to teach businessmen here how to do a better job of exporting to Japan.

All of them speak English, and one hopes that the backward natives over here will be capable of absorbing the lessons.

"I admit it's rather unusual for us, trying to explain these things to people who've been our big brother," said the Japanese delegation head. "It was only logical that we should help our American friends take greater advantage of the export opportunities that already exist for them."

As welcome as the Japanese help is, it isn't purely altruistic. Our trade deficit is now running at a record \$3.3 billion annual rate in Japan's favor. And the government and business community in Tokyo are fearful that the U.S. will demand more trade concessions and controls on Japanese goods.

It's true that American businessmen have a lot to learn about exporting. But that is not the main reason for America's trade deficit.

We have structural handicaps like high costs, obsolescent industrial plant and lagging productivity. Those are our problems and shouldn't be blamed on foreigners.

But some of our export trouble—a considerable part, in fact—is the fault of our friends abroad: They do not give the United States a fair shake in international trade.

The Common Market, for example, clearly discriminates against U.S. goods through tariffs, export subsidies and preferential trade deals. Led by the French, who are geniuses at manipulating trade rules, Western Europe is successfully stalling off U.S. complaints.

Although postwar Japan has worked hard and well, not all its export success is due to such praiseworthy qualities.

In relation to the United States, the Japanese also are past masters at erecting trade barriers of dubious legality, ingeniously delaying their removal, and meanwhile pumping goods into the American market.

Since the Japanese are now giving us technical help, do you think they'll teach us that self-preferential technique, too?

AIR SERVICE IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Alaska has unique and considerable transportation problems as a result of her vast size and surrounding terrain. Because of this, air travel becomes a virtual necessity. I have received from the Alaska State Legislature copies of two resolutions passed by that body dealing with air service and air safety in Alaska. Their passage of these two resolutions reflects on their part a real sensitivity of, and concern with these vitally important issues. By tackling specific problems such as those

outlined in these resolutions, air service in Alaska will be made to be the finest possible.

The two resolutions deal with a ground-controlled approach radar at Kodiak to meet the utmost safety requirements, and a request for establishment of scheduled airline service between Kodiak, Alaska, and the Aleutian chain for increased convenience and decreased cost. At Kodiak there currently exists a ground-controlled approach radar system operated by the U.S. Navy. The Coast Guard has requested the Navy to continue operation of the facility on a reimbursable cost basis. The Alaska State Legislature indicates strongly its agreement with the Coast Guard request.

The second resolution attempts to remove a needless inconvenience and inefficiency relative to airline service between Kodiak and the Aleutian chain. Currently, although Dutch Harbor is only 600 miles from Kodiak, the persons who continually need to travel to and from these two areas must travel twice that distance as they must travel through Anchorage. This continues despite the fact that the number of charter flights between Kodiak and Dutch Harbor already equal the number of scheduled flights between Anchorage and Dutch Harbor. There is no reason why this inefficiency needs to continue.

Because problems such as these are so vitally important to Alaska I would like to include in the RECORD for today copies of these important resolutions so that my colleagues may more fully become aware of them:

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 47

Relating to scheduled airline service between Kodiak, Alaska and the Aleutian Chain

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas there are presently no direct scheduled transportation facilities between Kodiak and the Aleutian Chain; and

Whereas, although Kodiak is approximately only 600 miles from Dutch Harbor, the many persons who continually need to travel from the Chain to Kodiak or from Kodiak to the Chain must travel twice that distance as they must go and come via Anchorage; and

Whereas Kodiak is the site of the Regional High School for the Chain, offers the closest medical and dental facilities to the many Alaskan residents on the Chain, is the Fish and Game Department's headquarters for the Chain, and is the State Trooper headquarters for the Aleutians; and

Whereas the number of charter flights between Kodiak and Dutch Harbor already approximate the number of scheduled flights between Anchorage and Dutch Harbor, all to the great inconvenience and expense of Alaskans desiring to travel between these two points;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the Civil Aeronautics Board is urgently requested to take all action necessary to establish scheduled airline service between Kodiak, Alaska and the Aleutian Chain.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Secor D. Browne, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; the Honorable Alphonse M. Andrews, Director, Bureau of Operating Rights; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 38

Relating to ground-controlled approach radar at Kodiak, Alaska

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas, by July 1, 1972, the Federal Aviation Administration is expected to establish tower service at the Kodiak Airport; and

Whereas the Federal Aviation Administration has only an instrument landing system programmed for Kodiak and does not plan on operating the ground-controlled approach system currently in use at Kodiak under the auspices of the United States Navy; and

Whereas, because of the United States Coast Guard mission requirements at Kodiak, the Coast Guard has requested the United States Navy to continue its operation of the ground-controlled approach radar at Kodiak on a reimbursable cost basis; and

Whereas the continued availability of ground-controlled approach radar at Kodiak is not only desired by the United States Coast Guard, but would assure all aircraft, military and civilian alike, that the Kodiak Airport offers the optimum services and facilities necessary to meet the utmost safety requirements;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the United States Navy is urged to agree with the request made by the United States Coast Guard that the Navy continue to operate the ground-controlled approach radar system at Kodiak after July 1, 1972, or, failing agreement to that effect, that the Federal Aviation Administration reconsider its decision to utilize only an instrument landing system at the Kodiak Airport

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary, Department of Transportation; the Honorable John M. Chafee, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Chester R. Bender, Commandant, United States Coast Guard; the Honorable John M. Shaffer, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

THREATS TO THE WORLD ENVIRONMENT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there is ever-increasing evidence that man is wreaking environmental havoc on his ocean, air, and land masses, so vital to his survival. As all of my colleagues are surely aware, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, scheduled to convene in Stockholm this June, marks the first time that the nations of the world will join together to combat the deterioration of commonly shared natural resources.

I would like to insert into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an excellent environmental article written by Ed Blanche which appeared in the Long Island Press. This article, which appeared in the Sunday, April 30th edition of the Press, offers an insightful description of the problems which such countries as Poland, Portugal, Britain, Japan, and Holland are experiencing in the struggle to control the ecologically adverse effects of industrial

development. I would heartily commend Mr. Blanche's article to my colleagues in the House.

The article follows:

WORLDWIDE POLLUTION FIGHT AN UPHILL BATTLE

(By Ed Blanche)

LONDON.—The problem of pollution is drawing increasing worldwide attention but is still not a major concern in many countries.

Industrialized countries' governments over the past year or two have responded with tougher legislation, more court actions, better enforcement machinery.

But an Associated Press survey shows that in many nations the fight against pollution remains an uphill battle overshadowed by the drive for industrialization.

Many Africans and Asians fear that industrialized nations will divert pollution-producing industries to less developed regions that lack resources to handle the problem.

In Nairobi, Kenya, motorists switch on their headlights during the day to drive through thick smog caused by clouds of oily fumes from trucks and buses.

South Africa, the most industrialized country on the continent, is also the most polluted. An airline pilot reports: "On a clear day you can see the industrial complex around Johannesburg and Pretoria 100 miles away. It looks like a gathering of big, black storm clouds."

The complex, including blast furnaces and iron foundries, pumps 22 tons of solids into the air every day.

Thailand has begun at the bottom of the pollution scale with massive cleanup in Bangkok, long regarded as one of Asia's filthiest cities. There are hefty fines for dumping.

Countries like Spain and Portugal, still scratching to burst into the industrial age, as well as most countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa, have virtually no antipollution laws. If they have, they are weak and rarely enforced.

Chile, one observer notes, "is an ecologist's nightmare and a polluter's dream."

The unsophisticated millions in Africa and Asia, are emerging from countries of primitive life, where disease was rampant, into the space age . . . to find progress can be just as deadly.

Africa faces a growing refuse problem due to lack of sewage disposal plants. Every year, millions of tons of garbage and human waste flow down rivers, fueling disease like cholera, typhoid and hepatitis. The same is true in parts of Asia.

Many countries, like Mexico, now give tax cuts to companies which install antipollution devices in their factories.

Poland, which will spend \$50 million on fighting the growing pollution menace that has damaged 600,000 acres of forest and farmland, plans 800-foot skyscraper chimney stacks on all factories to push dangerous gases high into the sky.

Many countries report an open defiance of antipollution laws. In Sweden, authorities found big corporations were willing to pay for violating the code. But the government is now moving to force the companies into line.

In Communist bloc countries officials found fines imposed on factories were not effective. So they started fining the managers, too. That did the trick.

"It's the only way we can really get any action," an Industry Ministry official in Czechoslovakia explained.

Aggressive young magistrates in Italy have cracked down on violators of the country's vague 40-year-old laws. They ordered the arrest of one Rome industrialist who'd ignored several warnings. Within four days, he installed filters at his seed oil plant.

Some people are prepared to risk the perils of pollution.

The engineer in charge of a vast new petrochemical plant in Portugal shrugged the whole thing off by saying the plant "may result in a bit of pollution of the atmosphere, but this is the price of progress. In a sense, pollution is progress."

Lisbon authorities have warned that art treasures in the National Museum of Ancient Art overlooking the Tagus River are menaced by fumes from cars and ships. In India sulfur gases from railroad yards and power-generating plants are eating away at the marble finish on New Delhi's 300-year-old Red Fort.

Greece's ruling military junta, afraid of losing the flood of tourists who spend millions every year, has cleared up the idyllic Bay of Eleyis near Athens "by sheer terror," as one official puts it.

The bay, which lies in a major shipping lane, was once one of the dirtiest stretches of coast in Greece because of dumping by thousands of ships. One merchantman spotted ditching waste overboard was fined a five million drachmae, or \$166,000, earlier this year.

The Acropolis in Athens, experts say, has suffered more damage to its marble in the last 20 years from fume-filled air than it did from the ravages of climate in 25 centuries.

Tougher legislation is on the books for Sweden, France and the Netherlands.

Britain, which has been fighting pollution since the 1950s, is now pressing for stricter control of industrial dumping. The government has pledged \$3.8 billion for a five-year program to clean up 1,000 miles of sludge-clogged rivers.

Britain also is pushing hard for an international convention on sea pollution in the Atlantic. Twelve European neighbors have already signed the pact.

European governments are setting up special departments charged with combatting pollution. The Russians, rudely awakened from decades of industrialization to find their vast land threatened by environmental dangers, are planning to reverse north-flowing Siberian rivers to replenish the Aral sea, whose level is dropping and salinity increasing.

The Volga River in Russia is so polluted it is killing off the caviar-producing sturgeon fish in the Caspian Sea. Supplies of the region's "black gold" are dwindling.

Japan, which plans to spend \$9 billion this decade on antipollution operations, has begun work on a huge waste disposal plant at Osaka and forced industrialists into taking measures to cut pollution. Major auto makers are working on new fume-free cars.

A Japanese court ordered a major chemical firm to pay 272 million yen (\$883,000) to 77 persons poisoned by mercury dumped in the Agano River.

In the chemically soured industrial cities of Japan, hundreds of persons have died from poisoned air. In some parts of Tokyo,

one in three persons suffers from severe lung trouble caused by industrial fallout of ash and grime totaling 150 tons a square mile every year.

In central Japan, 46 persons died and 150 were mentally or physically disabled after being struck by the "ital-ital (ouch-ouch) plague—mercury poisoning of rivers which damages brain cells and softens bones so much they can be broken at a touch.

In the Dutch industrial city of Rotterdam, people had to buy cartons of fresh water in supermarkets after the Rhine River was polluted by salt. Dutch officials blamed the crisis on vast dumping of waste by potassium mines in the French Alsace.

Hong Kong in Chinese means "Fragrant Harbor. Ecologists call it "Stinking Harbor," now because an estimated 195 million gallons of liquid waste deluges into the British colony's harbor every day.

In the remote African mountain kingdom of Swaziland, tribesmen believed the god of the Usutu River was angry with them when thousands of fish were killed off by millions of gallons of sludge surging downstream when a pulp mill's dam burst.

Israeli authorities, anxious over the rising noise level in Tel Aviv, have reactivated a rarely enforced law banning piano playing with open windows during siesta time.

LAW DAY

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today is the celebration in the Western and non-Communist world of Law Day, which notes our devotion as a society to the rule of law, rather than to that of men alone.

Across the world today, free societies and obedience to democratic laws is at a premium. Such rules are notable only by the fact that men trample upon them with impunity. Here in America and in a few other places we seek, in spite of all obstacles, to adhere to obedience to laws. It is my feeling that a free society abiding by a rule of law has to tread a hard, difficult path, strewn with obstacles and temptations to take the easier, totalitarian path. Most societies give in to such temptations. So far, we have spurned the call. And to our credit.

It is incumbent upon the Congress, especially in such a time, to continue to set a special example for the rest of our Nation and the world. We must show how much the rule of law means to us. We must add to that body of American law judiciously, with a care for the rights of the mass of our citizens. And at all times, we must revere the spirit of the laws as well as observe their letter. Only in this way will we endure as a Congress, as a nation and as a society, much less as an example to other nations in a time when totalitarianism clouds so much of the world.