By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 15127. A bill establishing a commission to develop a realistic plan leading to the conquest of multiple sclerosis at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 15128. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prevention of Cooley's anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KYL, Mr. MANN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 15129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain homeowner mortgage interest paid by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on behalf of a low-income mortgagor shall not be deductible by such a mortgagor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15130. A bill to amend section 351 of title 38, United States Code, to enlarge the class of persons entitled to benefits thereunder to include veterans suffering injury or death as a result of natural disaster occurring while they undergo treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility, and the dependents of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15131. A bill to protect the public health from the distribution of drugs manufactured in establishments not meeting current good manufacturing practices by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15132. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, to increase the amount of earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes, and to make appropriate adjustments in social security tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15133. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prevention of Cooley's anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15134. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, with respect to its application to small employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15135. A bill to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968, to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, to make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 15136. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 15137. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to $3,000 and $4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for depreciation on capital expenditures incurred in connecting residential sewer lines to municipal sewage systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15139. A bill to amend title 18 to penalize the use of firearms in all crimes and to forbid plea bargaining in connection with such crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 15140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an excise tax on fuels containing sulphur and on certain emissions of sulphur oxides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.J. Res. 1209. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Luis Munoz Rivera; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. KEMP, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. GROVER, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. CLARK):

H. Con. Res. 620. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H. Res. 997. Resolution to express the sense of the House that a Federal building in Washington be designated as the "J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 998. 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. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 999. Resolution calling for peace in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a United Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 1000. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 142; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H. Res. 1001. Resolution urging supplemental appropriations to implement the President's message of March 17, 1972, calling for equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 15141. A bill for the relief of Luis Leon Cascone and Danilo Luis Leon Cascone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 15142. A bill for the relief of Maj. William J. Pelham, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

237. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Beverly Hills, Calif., relative to American involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

238. Also, petition of Michael D. Martindale, Bay City, Mich., relative to release of prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

239. Also, petition of Frank B. W. Davidson, San Luis Obispo, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

240. Also, petition of William Moyer, Richard Richeson, and Earl Hanson, Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WILLARD B. VAN HORNE, SR., OF EAST CHICAGO, IND.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1972

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Willard B. Van Horne, Sr., of East Chicago, Ind., the oldest practicing attorney in Indiana, and also a pioneer legislator dating back to the Indiana General Assembly in 1911 to 1916, will celebrate his 93d birthday on June 4 of this year. I, along with thousands of his friends in the Calumet region of Indiana, have admired his vitality and activity in legal and civic circles for many years.

Mr. Van Horne's son-in-law, Charmes M. Squarcy, assistant to the Vice President of Inland Steel Co., has advised me of some of his father-in-law's outstanding accomplishments during his long service to his community, county, State, and Nation, which I hereby include with my remarks:

WILLARD B. VAN HORNE, SR.

Perhaps the most incredible fact of all about Willard B. Van Horne, Sr. is that at the age of ninety-three he is still actively engaged in the practice of law on a full five day a week basis. His practice is a general one and any refusal of cases is solely on account of lack of time. One company, the Washington Lumber and Coal, has been his client continuously since 1913. Several of his private clients are third generation. He served in the Indiana General Assembly in 1911, 1913 and 1915 and is fond of telling you that in the 1913 session he was one of four Republicans, 95 Democrats and one "Bull-Mooser." He is still sufficiently interested in politics to have appeared before the Indiana General Assembly last February, making a few very well chosen purposely innocuous remarks, as he said it would abuse the privilege of an ex-member to say anything which could be construed as lobbying.

Two years ago in spite of a cast on his leg, from ankle to groin, he flew to Washington to attend the annual meeting of the Chamber of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Commerce of the United States, because he particularly wanted to hear and see President Nixon at the opening session.

He participates regularly in the local and state bar association, Kiwanis, Shrine and Elks. The list of other community activities is too long to enumerate. Like his cousin, William Van Horne, who was knighted by the British government for his construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, he has an enormous appetite for gourmet food and good cigars. Although he has a housekeeper three days a week and an elderly son who lives with him, he is fond of cooking, and would still be gardening if his waistline would permit.

He communicates regularly with his five children, eight grandchildren and five great-grandchildren and enjoys their accomplishments as his own most important success.

Born on June 4, 1879, in Grant Park, Illinois, of Dr. G. W. Van Horne and Sarah Mather (both of distinguished early American families) he was graduated from Valparaiso University in 1901, and from Kent College of Law in 1902. This June 5 with as many of his friends as can crowd into the spacious office he now shares with his eldest son, he will celebrate the 93rd anniversary of his birth and the 71st year of his admission to the bar of the State of Indiana.

THE MINING OF NORTH VIETNAMESE HARBORS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the mining of North Vietnamese harbors raises the possibility of a naval confrontation with the Soviet Union for the first time since the Cuban missile crisis 10 years ago. This dangerous escalation was undertaken in the name of protecting our troops in South Vietnam by cutting off supplies from the north.

The Los Angeles Times of May 18 published an article showing that the mining of North Vietnamese harbors has only dubious military validity. The article was written by Mr. Leslie Gelb, formerly the Director of Pentagon Policy Planning and Arms Control and Director of the Pentagon Papers project for the Secretary of Defense. Mr. Gelb estimates that after an initial period of adjustment, total transport into North Vietnam would probably not be reduced by more than 50 percent or even 25 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gelb's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MINES IN HAIPHONG HARBOR WILL NOT KEEP ALL SUPPLIES OUT OF HANOI'S HANDS

(By Leslie H. Gelb)

For three years, President Nixon has been warning Hanoi and Moscow. If Hanoi stepped up the level of military activity in South Vietnam and endangered Vietnamization, the President said he would take "decisive action." Now, he has taken these actions: mining North Vietnamese ports, interdicting cargo transfers to smaller craft, bombing the rail links with China and attacking military targets in the North. But will these actions be "decisive"? And when?

I am not an expert on military supply problems. I am, however, familiar with the supply situation with respect to North Vietnam. Corrections, of course, would be welcome from the Pentagon if my facts or reasoning are faulty. My facts and reasoning are fully consistent with CIA estimates as revealed in the Pentagon Papers and by more recent CIA studies divulged by Senator Mike Gravel (D-Alaska.)

The first question is what will Russia and China do? They provide nearly all the arms, ammunition and petroleum used by the North Vietnamese. Without their aid. Hanoi would have to change its strategy. But Moscow and Peking are not very likely to cut off or cut down on their aid. There is no reason to believe that they would leave their ally without bullets any more than we would. Moreover, Hanoi does not need as much aid as Saigon. U.S. aid to Saigon totals 8 to 10 times the Soviet-Chinese aid to Hanoi.

The next question is can Russia and China continue to supply North Vietnam in the face of the naval quarantine and bombing? The alternatives are: ship, plane, train, truck and people.

A maximum of about 75% of the supplies reaching North Vietnam come by sea. The Russians could challenge the quarantine with mine sweepers and subs. The Chinese could launch air attacks against U.S. ships. But they are unlikely to do so given the enormous U.S. sea and air conventional superiority in the area and the risks of global confrontation. If mines are swept, new ones can be emplaced. North Vietnamese fast boats, armed with long-range ship-to-ship missiles, could attack and badly damage or sink some U.S. vessels. But such actions would not break the quarantine. Barges and small boats emanating from the China coast and landing on beaches and small ports at night could get through. In sum, the quarantine could be 90% effective. But the point is sea transport is a convenience, not a necessity.

The Russians have a large fleet of heavy cargo aircraft, big enough to haul tanks. This would be the fastest and easiest way to make up the sea transport deficit—especially if they could overfly China. President Nixon has not discussed this possibility, but is unlikely to shoot down Soviet aircraft.

The capacity of the two rail lines connecting China and North Vietnam could be increased significantly. Even if the United States blows up the tracks by day, they can be repaired in a matter of hours. Therefore, fully loaded trains could even result in no decrease in rail transport by present levels.

Trucks coming from China also would put a hefty bite into the sea transport deficit. Roads would need improvement, but sufficient trucks are available. Night-driving trucks are not easy to destroy, as indicated by the U.S. bombing experience on the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Supplies for rail and trucks could be unloaded by Soviet ships docking at South China ports.

If worse comes to worse, people can carry supplies on their backs. The Chinese have done it before. The North Vietnamese lugged tons of heavy equipment to the hills surrounding Dien Bien Phu in 1954.

All of this would take a period of adjustment, say one to three months. When this period is completed, my guess is that total transport into North Vietnam would not be reduced by more than 50% and probably closer to 25%.

Meanwhile, the North Vietnamese have extensive stock-supplies of equipment and ammunition in the North. In Laos and Cambodia, and in South Vietnam itself—not to mention what they can capture. These supplies probably could last months. If not six months, depending on rates of consumption. In other words, were Hanoi to adopt a less offensive posture in the coming months, their supplies would last a long time. Moreover, there would be little to fear from a successful counter-offensive by Saigon. Saigon forces are not well enough led or motivated for such a venture.

Will the President's actions, then, be decisive? No. Certainly not in the short run. where Hanoi has sufficient supplies for the present offensive. The current battles over Hue and Kontum will not be affected at all. Nor will his actions be decisive in the long run. Hanoi will once again have to tighten its belt. It may even be compelled to moderate its offensive in three or four months. Hanoi can and will fight on.

The difference between X and Y tons of supplies is not what this war is all about. It is a civil war and a war for national independence that began in the early 1940s. Hanoi had more to fear militarily in the late 40s against the French and in 1968 when faced with more than half a million U.S. forces.

In time, the quarantine and the stepped-up bombing will be seen for what they are—another tragic phase in a war that cannot be won by outside force.

MISSISSIPPI TO LOSE SERVICES OF THREE GREAT MEN

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the second session of the 92d Congress we will also witness the end of service in the U.S. House of Representatives of three of my very able colleagues from Mississippi. Congressman BILL COLMER, Congressman TOM ABERNETHY, and Congressman CHARLES GRIFFIN have all announced their plans to retire thus ending a total of 75 years of outstanding public service to their district, State, and Nation. I would like to share with my colleagues the resolutions passed recently by the Mississippi Legislature recognizing these three men and commending them for their unselfish devotion to duty. The resolutions are as follow:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS OF A TRULY GREAT AND PUBLIC-SPIRITED MISSISSIPPIAN, WILLIAM M. COLMER, UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS AFTER 40 YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE HIGHEST ORDER OF STATESMANSHIP

Whereas, the State of Mississippi is extremely fortunate to have been represented in the United States Congress by William M. Colmer for forty productive years; and

Whereas, Congressman Colmer has announced his intention to retire at the end of this year so that it is fitting and proper to pause and take note of some of his more outstanding accomplishments; and

Whereas, William M. Colmer was born in Moss Point, Mississippi, the youngest of five sons in a family of nine children, and at the age of nine began earning his own way, stencilling the brand name on lumber for a sawmill, making Fifty Cents a day; and

Whereas, having been frugal and industrious, Bill Colmer worked his way through Gulfport High School doing janitorial work and clerking in a store and earned his funds for college by serving as a newspaper correspondent, among other things; and

Whereas, just out of Millsaps College, Bill Colmer taught school at D'Lo in 1912 and was Superintendent of the Lumberton

School from 1914 to 1917, during which time he studied law at night; and

Whereas, on September 19, 1917, W. M. Colmer made the best investment of his life when he claimed the hand of Miss Ruth Miner in marriage; and

Whereas, to that union were born three fine sons, namely: W. M. Colmer, Jr., James H. Colmer and Thomas W. Colmer, all of whom are veterans of World War II as members of the U.S. Navy and who now are making honorable contributions to society in their chosen vocations; and

Whereas, when World War I began, Bill Colmer enlisted in the Army as a Buck Private and advanced to the rank of Regimental Sergeant Major before being discharged two years later; and

Whereas, upon his discharge, Bill Colmer began his law practice in Pascagoula and soon was elected County Attorney and later became District Attorney; and

Whereas, in 1932 Bill Colmer was elected to represent the Sixth Congressional District and made one promise to the people which he has faithfully kept, the promise being "to represent my district, my state and my nation to the very best of my ability, placing the welfare of all of the people above self and party"; and

Whereas, Representative William M. Colmer, who is now the third ranking member of the United States House of Representatives in point of years served, took over as Chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee in 1967 and streamlined the procedures, instituting a schedule of regular meetings and exhibiting such a cooperative spirit that one Washington commentator noted, "The Rules Committee is losing its aura as a bone of contention with the House leadership"; and

Whereas, Congressman Colmer is the senior member of the National Forest Reservation Committee; and as Chairman of the House Post War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, Colmer played a key role in recommending legislation to provide a smooth reconversion of the nation to a peacetime economy after World War II, a role which he considered his greatest single accomplishment in his first twenty years of service in Congress; and

Whereas, in 1945 when Congressman Colmer returned after a conference with Stalin and advocated a "get tough" policy with Russia, his recommendation fell on deaf ears in the administration and he organized the Committee of 78, a group of Southern Democrats on whom he could depend to serve as a check or balance of power group against damaging administration legislation, which group has worked effectively through the years under his leadership; and

Whereas, a financial conservative by nature, Bill Colmer has advocated a balanced budget and a curb on deficit spending during his many years in the Congress; and

Whereas, as early as 1952 Representative Colmer set forth his ten-point plan to balance the nation's budget and stated on many occasions, "I fear the Russian menace less than the danger of the collapse of the fiscal structure"; and

Whereas, Congressman Colmer has advocated progressive legislation in the fields of agriculture, rural electrification, veterans' affairs, aid to the elderly, rights of the working man, river and harbor development and development of South Mississippi industrially and recreationally, most recently having been the author of the bill to establish the Gulf Islands National Seashore Park; and

Whereas, Bill Colmer, known as an "unreconstructed" States' Rights Democrat who has refused to compromise his convictions and principles, has been honored nationally on many occasions, including being listed in *Who's Who in America, Who's Who in Law, Bench and Bar of Mississippi,* and Rowland's *Mississippi Heart of the South;* being the first Mississippian ever to be awarded the American Good Government Society's George Washington Day Award; being made an honorary member of the Executive Committee of the Pine Burr Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America; being rated 100% in conservative voting according to the Americans for Constitutional Action in 1965 and 1966 and being granted their Distinguished Service Award; being honored at a Congressional Appreciation Dinner in 1968; having his portrait hung in the United States House Rules Committee Room; and being named Man of the Year in 1970 by the Mississippi Broadcasters Association; and

Whereas, a winsome leader, as early as 1956 a newsman stated of Colmer: "The Coast Congressman is regarded today by many as the most influential individual member of the United States House of Representatives 'without any clubs to wield.' His House following is due to the high personal regard and esteem in which he is held by most of his colleagues"; and

Whereas, although Colmer has received and answered over one million appeals from the people of South Mississippi during his tenure of office, he has never been too busy to lend a helping hand to the most humble constituent; and

Whereas, a gentle and gracious man, with warm good humor, enjoying a joke on himself, Bill Colmer at a dinner in his honor once stated that he worked for the *Jackson Daily News* during college days and was paid the munificent sum of $1.00 a column, to which his former employer, the late Major Frederick Sullens, quipped, "and at times he almost earned his pay"; and

Whereas, for the past forty years his constituents in Mississippi would avow that Congressman Colmer "almost earned his pay" in protecting his nation's economy, foreign and domestic policies and principles of greatness from her enemies, both within and without:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, the Senate concurring therein, That we do hereby recognize and commend Congressman William M. Colmer of Pascagoula, Mississippi, for his forty years of devoted service to his people in the Congress of the United States and extend to him every good wish and pray God's blessings on him during the long and happy days of his retirement.

Be it further resolved, That we join his many friends in congratulating him on his translation into daily living of the admonition of Holy Writ that says: "A man that hath friends must shew himself friendly."

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Colmer and that copies be furnished to the Capitol Press Corps.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION COMMENDING REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS GERSTLE ABERNETHY FOR HIS MANY YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

Whereas, Congressman Thomas G. Abernethy has served North Mississippi for fifteen consecutive terms in the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America; and

Whereas, he has announced that he will not seek reelection but shall retire, leaving behind a service record of which any statesman could be justly proud; and

Whereas, it is altogether fitting and proper that we do pause to give official recognition of his many accomplishments in public and private life; and

Whereas, Thomas G. Abernethy was born in Eupora, Mississippi, on May 16, 1903, and received his high school diploma there, later attending the University of Alabama, receiving his LL.B. from Cumberland University in 1924, and then doing further work one year at the University of Mississippi; and

Whereas, in 1925 he established his law practice in Eupora where he was elected Mayor; and

Whereas, in 1929 he moved to Okolona continuing his practice of law and in 1935 was elected District Attorney; and

Whereas, on July 5, 1936, Thomas G. Abernethy made his "declaration of dependence" on the love and companionship of Miss Alice Margaret Lamb, as their marriage was consummated that day; and

Whereas, in 1942 he was elected to represent his Congressional District in Mississippi in the United States House of Representatives, a post to which he has lent dignity and stature during the long and difficult years in which he served; and

Whereas, the farmers around the nation, as well as the farmers in North Mississippi, never had a better friend than Thomas G. Abernethy of Mississippi; and

Whereas, he strongly defended farm price subsidies, liking the principle thereof to what government was doing for the factory worker by establishing unemployment compensation; and

Whereas, battling valiantly against the northern monied dairy interests, he was able to gain repeal of laws that discriminated against the production and sale of oleomargarine which was produced primarily from southern cottonseed oil; and

Whereas, Congressman Abernethy has worked his way up to a position of prominence as the third ranking senior member of the Committee on Agriculture and as the twelfth ranking member in point of seniority out of the entire 435-member House; and

Whereas, though too young to serve in the Armed Services in World War I, he has ever been an advocate of the veteran by working in Congress for the G. I. Bill of Rights, the Veterans' Preference Program in employment practices, and other benefits to veterans and their families; and

Whereas, in religious and civic circles, as well as in the political arena, Thomas G. Abernethy has served tirelessly, being a Methodist, a Mason and Shriner, and a member of Lambda Chi Alpha and Alpha Kappa Psi fraternities; and

Whereas, his contributions to society have not gone unnoticed, for in 1962 the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation presented him its award for "Outstanding and Meritorious Service to Agriculture"; in 1964 the Disabled American Veterans bestowed on him the National Commander's Award for "his long years of dedicated service in behalf of America's war disabled veterans"; in 1965 Americans for Constitutional Action cited him for "his support of constitutional government"; and the Federal Land Banks presented to him their Golden Medallion for his outstanding contributions to American agriculture; and

Whereas, the father of two daughters, Mrs. Gail Abernethy Doty and Mrs. Kay Abernethy Martin, and one son, Thomas G. Abernethy Jr., all of whom attended the University of Mississippi, Representative Abernethy is concerned about the education of our youth and has a deep and abiding love for that Mississippi institution affectionately referred to as "Ole Miss," as evidenced by his recent donation to the University of his Congressional papers for the use of posterity; and

Whereas, while he and his wife have retained their good health, they intend to return to Mississippi for a retirement of happiness and fulfillment:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi,

the Senate concurring therein, That we do commend and congratulate Representative Thomas G. Abernethy for his aggressive and productive three decades of service in the Congress of the United States of America and welcome him and Mrs. Abernethy back home to Mississippi to stay and invest in retirement those many talents with which he served in Congress for so well and so long.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be furnished to Congressman Abernethy and to members of the Capitol Press Corps.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION COMMENDING HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR DEVOTING OVER ONE-HALF OF HIS LIFETIME TO PUBLIC SERVICE

Whereas, Charles H. Griffin was born on May 9, 1926, near Utica, Mississippi, the son of Mrs. Nora Shelton Griffin who still resides in Utica and the late Charles Farris Griffin; and

Whereas, he was graduated from Utica High School and Hinds Junior College, receiving his bachelor of science degree in public administration from Mississippi State University and in 1949 joined the staff of Congressman John Bell Williams in Washington, D.C., being named his Administrative Assistant in 1955; and

Whereas, Charles Griffin served in the United States Navy during the years 1944 to 1946 in the Pacific Theater aboard the USS Tennessee, the USS St. George and the USS Floyd's Bay; and

Whereas, in 1953 Charles Griffin married the former Angelina Pedrotti of Gloucester, Massachusetts, affectionately known as "Angie," who was employed by the United States Navy Department and who has been his mainstay and chief supporter and served as campaign manager for him; and

Whereas, Charles Griffin was initially elected to Congress over six opponents to fill the unexpired term of former Congressman John Bell Williams of the Third Congressional District; and

Whereas, Charles Griffin was renominated for a full term over three opponents and re-elected for a second full term to be concluded on January 3, 1973; and

Whereas, Charles Griffin has served faithfully and ably on the House Banking and Currency and House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees and on the Small Business, Bank Supervision and Insurance, International Trade, Oceanography, Coast Guard and Geodetic and Survey and Navigation Subcommittees; and

Whereas, he has a constructive legislative record and has sponsored and supported legislation dealing with such major issues as the Fish Farming Act, extension of the Hill-Burton Act, price controls, freedom of choice in public schools, effective crime control measures, has consistently opposed forced integration, guaranteed annual income, foreign aid, gun registration and inflationary legislation, having voted on over 2,100 bills during his terms as Congressman; and

Whereas, he has been recognized and honored by the United States Capitol Historical Society, was presented the Distinguished Service Award of the Americans for Constitutional Action for his conservative voting record in support of economy in government and other basic Constitutional principles, received the "Watchdog of the Treasury" award for his voting record for economy and fiscal responsibility in government, and has a voting record of one hundred percent in support of legislation promoting the defense and security of the United States according to the American Security Council; and

Whereas, he is a member of the First Christian Church of Utica, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Masonic Order, the Loyal Order of the Moose, the Mississippi State University Alumni Association and the Mississippi Historical Society; and

Whereas, Congressman Griffin has announced his intention to retire at the conclusion of his current term, at which time he and his charming wife "Angie" plan to return to Mississippi to reside:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, the Senate concurring therein, That we do commend and congratulate Representative Charles H. Griffin for his long devotion to public service and welcome him and Mrs. Griffin back home to Mississippi upon his retirement from Congress.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be furnished to Congressman Griffin and to members of the Capitol Press Corps.

BEAUTIFICATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAM OF SAVANNAH, GA.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the city of Savannah, Ga., one of our Nation's oldest and most historical seaports, is receiving national acclaim for its beautification and restoration program that signifies urban planning and modern living at their best.

Savannah, "the Mother City of Georgia," was planned and laid out by Gen. James Oglethorpe when he first established the Georgia colony on a beautiful bluff overlooking the Savannah River. According to Wolf Von Eckardt, the architectual and city planning expert for the Washington Post:

Oglethorpe's system of arranging his city in a neat pattern of open squares was—and remains—a real innovation in urban design. It still holds the key to urbane livability and orderly urban growth.

The city's restoration program, started by the Historic Savannah Foundation and aided by private interests, is attracting visitors, urban planners, and historians all over the country. To date, approximately 800 of Savannah's more than 1,100 certified historic buildings have been restored as much as possible to their original beauty and charm. The civic-minded citizens of Savannah are to be commended for demonstrating such an outstanding spirit of urban improvement. This has been a community project, with individuals, families, and private businesses acquiring and restoring historic building after building. According to Southern Living magazine:

The balance within the two-square-mile old city gradually shifted from decay to a new bloom of health.

Savannah is certainly well on its way to becoming one of the Nation's showcase cities. All Georgia is proud of the work going on there.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a very fine article written by Wolf Von Eckardt and published in last Saturday's Washington Post, and also a splendid article on the restoration of Savannah, published in the May edition of Southern Living magazine. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE VAMP OF SAVANNAH

(By Philip Morris)

Walled and green Savannah of the squares. The walls are houses and buildings that closely line its streets. The green reaches out over sidewalks and unfolds bountifully in square after square across the old town.

Walk down Bull Street under canopies of live oak through historic Johnson, Wright, Chippewa, Madison, and Monterey Squares and end up at the beaux arts fountain in Forsyth Park. Then thank the stars or moonlight through Georgia pines that it's all still there. For it almost wasn't.

Old Savannah has endured a number of trials since it was founded in 1733 by James Edward Oglethorpe on a bluff above the Savannah River (see the 1734 drawing on page 77). There were the great fires of 1796 and 1820. Epidemics. Revolutionary and Civil Wars. But each time the city recovered, altered somewhat but still intact.

Savannah's greatest trial came only in the first half of this century. The place once toasted by President George Washington and the Marquis de Lafayette had entered a long era of neglect during which building after building disappeared. Neighborhoods declined beyond recognition. The malaise was slow but as destructive as any fire. A city carved from forest, built according to Oglethorpe's imaginative paper plan and embellished with life, landscape, and buildings for more than two centuries faced a parking lot future.

Then in the mid-1950's something happended. The proverbial tennis shoe group got into gear, though seven-league boots better describes their long-range effect. Nine ladies, led by Mrs. Anna Hunter, formed Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc. Dismayed by the destruction of a grand old city market and encouraged by the successful Trustee's Garden restoration done some time earlier by Mrs. Hansell Hillyer, they drew the line in front of a fine Georgian structure about to be laid to rest for a funeral home parking lot.

Davenport House, now a museum with Historic Savannah cozy in its basement, was saved. But more important, the group—growing in membership—went on to draw a larger line around the entire old city.

There was certainly precedent for it in the city's past: Savananah was on its way to saving itself again.

By 1959, Historic Savannah Foundation was well-organized and had won broad backing from the community. A survey of 2,500 structures was made, with volunteer help from the Junior League. Some 1,100 buildings were rated as notable, excellent, and exceptional—worthy of something better than providing used brick for suburban buildings. With donated funds, more and more threatened structures were purchased by the foundation for resale—with restrictions—to people interested in renovating them.

The method worked. Individuals, families, businesses acquired and renovated building after building. The balance within the 2-square-mile old city gradually shifted from decay to a new bloom of health. Today, approximately 850 of those 1,100 designated buildings have been renovated or are on their way toward that end. Squares that 10 years ago were dirt patches surrounded by chain-

link fencing or cut through with automobile ruts have been redesigned, rebuilt, and relandscaped.

Over their long history, Savannah's distinctive squares have proved most flexible. At the earliest age, the first examples were rudimentary places for water wells, bake ovens, and such. These central places have since evolved into civic places adorned with monuments, while the recently renovated squares in outer residential wards—added as the city grew through the 19th century—now serve as outdoor living rooms for their neighborhoods. Most Savannah townhouses also have private pocket gardens to the rear (instead of to the side as at Charleston).

Many architecturally important structures like the Davenport, Owens-Thomas, and Wayne-Gordon Houses are now museums. But most rescued Savannah buildings have gone back into everyday use. Neighborhood children play near monuments. And people who eat their lunches on benches in Johnson Square downtown undoubtedly do some gossiping like early Savannahians did when the community well was there.

Wayne Cunningham, who is in the shipping business (Savannahians were the first to send a steam-powered ship across an ocean and built the first lighthouse on the South Atlantic Coast), described how the momentum built in favor of the old city. "For quite a number of years it was the same individuals who redid houses because they enjoyed it. Then it caught on with more and more young families. When I moved my family here, we were the only ones around with children. Now there are 20 kids under seven years old on our block."

But Cunningham indicated that the city mix of ages and interests, which they like, is still there. He does detect some irony in first the neglect and then the new popularity of the district. "It's certain that if Savannah had been a boom town 20 years ago, only half of what's left would be here now. And now the value of many old structures has been increased by demand to the point that it isn't as practical to do as it was a few years ago."

From the start, practicality has been a Savannah concern, even though, as Wayne Cunningham vocally underlined, "Quality is the key word we've held to, both for old and new. Everything should revolve around that—develop fully the best standard of quality and taste for the city."

Renovation, rather than the precise and costly art of architectural restoration, has been the rule in this liveable renaissance. Young attorney Wiley Ellis, who recently renovated a house for his family, explained, "As long as we kept the outside true to its past, Historic Savannah expected us to have a comfortable, up-to-date house to live in."

Though there are exceptions, a typical townhouse now costs from $15,000 up to $18,500 to purchase, according to Reid Williamson, executive director of Historic Savannah. Renovation costs range from $10,000 to $15,000 per floor. (Most houses have three or four floors.) "Usually you need to go back to the studs, just start all over," Williamson commented. And though the popularity of the concept has caused an increase in initial costs from what they were several years ago, it has not slowed down the number of renovation "starts," which are higher than ever before.

Putting valued old buildings to alternative use has also had much to do with Savannah's success in saving its overall architectural character. Some former houses hold restaurants or fine shops. And along the remarkable Factors' Row, which once housed the city's great cotton industry along the waterfront, the lower wharf side it being occupied by interesting restaurants, pubs, and museums, while the upper stories have been converted to office space. The Savannah Chamber of Commerce now occupies the superb Romanesque-style Savannah Cotton Exchange located in Factors' Row.

This flexible approach to usage and renovation made sense because, for one thing, Savannah does not have the exquisite collection of 18th-century buildings found in Charleston. A handsome and domestically scaled townhouse predominates in Savannah, mostly from the mid-century. Such renovation proved reasonable for a wide range of residents. And since it was, from the start, a community effort with individuals picking up houses to redo and banks making loans for the work, the saving of Savannah had to meet real needs.

Besides its one-of-a-kind plan that counts 20 squares—each with its own personality—spaced throughout the historic areas, the thing that sets Savannah apart from most of the other admirable restoration-renovation projects across the South is its size and diversity. The district involves literally the whole center of town, from its quiet townhouse streets to the new hustle at the waterfront.

It is interesting to note, too, that Savannah represents a very urban and relatively formal counterpart to the latest open-space community planning in the South where buildings are clustered together but share common recreation and scenic land.

Savannah leaders are the first to admit that much remains to be done to assure, simultaneously, the city's past and its future. Broughton, the central shopping street, is like Main Street anywhere, with its hard commercial look out of character with the surrounding districts. There are plans to redo the commercial rows to fit the character of the city—in many cases by stripping off inappropriate modernizations and by sign control.

Lee Adler II, former president of Historic Savannah, sees the high rise as a threat to the architectural scale of the city and urges adoption of historic district zoning of the sort that has protected Charleston and New Orleans' Vieux Carré for decades.

In attempting to set standards for gaps in the architectural continuity of the historic area—some buildings, remember, were not worth saving and others had been destroyed before the renovation movement got rolling—Savannah has sponsored a document that might well find good use in many cities throughout the South. Prepared by Atlanta Architects Muldawer and Patterson, AIA, the handbook describes a formula for gauging, not the particular style of new buildings planned for the area, but their general appropriateness.

There are 16 design criteria set forth, ranging from scale to materials to roof shapes to height. Only if a proposed building related to surrounding structures on at least six of the criteria, could it be built. There is great hope that application of the formula will assure that sections of old Savannah needing major rebuilding and the occasional gaps in established areas will be structured in character with the whole community. In severely diminished sections where federal urban renewal tools are being employed and for which the formula was originated it is expected to be adopted as a guide.

While all this remains to be seen (and many Southern cities and towns will be watching), the best of Savannah past waits to be seen now—brightened and proud to receive visitors.

There are many ways to look at Savannah. Handsome and understated brick attached buildings predominate, but there are wood exceptions and the stucco on certain fine Regency houses and otherwise Gothic-styled churches is a delight.

The Owens-Thomas House ($1 per person) by William Jay and the Independent Presbyterian Church by John Holden Greene are among the chief architectural ornaments of the country and should be sought out.

Museums include the Low House (admission free); Davenport House ($1); Ships of the Sea Museum ($1 adults, 50 cents children), with access to the *Cruz del Sur*, an old sailing vessel moored nearby; and Georgia Historical Society (no charge).

Many restaurants in the district are located in restored structures.

Visitors to Savannah have a good guide to the historic highlights of the city and to its recent history-making restoration efforts in the Historic Savannah Foundation Tours. The little buses hold comfortably-sized groups and if Mrs. Betty Lee's driving-talking foray is a measure, the tours make guests feel quite at home and knowledgeable. The tours depart regularly from the Georgia Welcome Center at the foot of the Talmadge Bridge, the DeSoto Hilton, and Pirates House Restaurant.

An informative walking or driving guidebook called "Sojourn in Savannah" ($2) is also available, and the excellent and comprehensive *Historic Savannah* ($17.50), a hardbound volume of text and illustrations about the city, is available locally or on request to Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc., P.O. Box 1733, Savannah, Georgia 31402.

Savannah, Key to Urbane Livability

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

It is a tragedy for American cities that the immigrants heading West did not pass through Savannah.

Had they seen Georgia's harbor town as James Oglethorpe planned it in 1733, says John W. Reps, one of our foremost urban historians, they might well have imitated this sort of urban plan, rather than stamp our cities with the gridiron uniformity that could only lead to urban sprawl.

Oglethorpe's system of arranging his city in a neat pattern of open squares was—and remains—a real innovation in urban design. It still holds the key to urbane livability and orderly urban growth.

What is more, this much needed lesson in urban design is most charmingly alive. Oglethorpe's "showy little city," as an English visitor called it more than a hundred years ago, has largely withstood the wrack and ruin of "progress" and is now being adroitly restored.

Savannah's unique methods of comprehensive restoration, in fact, offer another important lesson, though they are now at a decisive turning point.

It is an unusual and almost dreamlike experience to walk the nearly two-and-a-half square miles of Savannah's Historic Landmark District on a sunny spring day. The shaded streets are of a most agreeable width that is at once airy and intimate. They are lined by all manner of houses, some free-standing, some in rows, that display a variety of architectural styles, materials and colors, a variety unified by the buildings' common desire to be polite, to speak softly, as it were, in a melodious Southern murmur.

And then, at every other block in either direction and always beckoning you, the street opens into a square—a garden, really, a lush, green oasis. Each is differently landscaped. Some are adorned with fountains and statuary. Most are roofed by the leafy branches of huge, old oaks, heavily hung with Spanish moss. All the squares are comfortingly enclosed by buildings. You are still in the city. There is no pretense of natural countryside trapped in a park, like animals in a zoo. These are urban parks, elegant outdoor salons.

Salons for the public life. Most of the squares are churches and schools and stores. They are neighborhood centers. They offer

not only trees, flowers, water, benches, and breathing space, but also open spontaneous sociability into the city. They open up the town and bring it together at the same time. And they slow vehicle traffic, which must circle them, of course, as they slow the pace that so often becomes hectic in crowded cities. There is none of the usual confusion here that efficient movement requires speed. What matters is how you move, not how fast.

As Oglethorpe planned it and as, indeed, it worked out, Savannah grew, not along indeterminate streets, boulevards and avenues that spread a town's residents and life all over the countryside. It grew square by square, ward by ward, in an accretion of complete neighborhoods. These wards interlock, forming a tightly woven fabric that no one is ever on the outer edge, an outsider of. Everyone belongs.

By the time the Civil War arrested its growth, Savannah had 24 of these squares and the highway builders, by some miracle, paved only two of them in their haste towards urban ruin. A century later the remaining 22 were largely surrounded by slums. The fine old buildings decayed and began to be razed for parking lots. Most were exploited for "Savannah Grays," the handsome, reddish-gray brick of which they were built. This brick is no longer made and became a snobbish fashion for the new, phony-Colonial houses in suburbia.

Restoration started as a private effort by concerned citizens in the mid-1950's aided by, of all things, the Savannah Gas Company. Among the most charming places to live in Savannah is a restored, old apartment house complex in the shadow of a huge gas tank. Then, enraged by the destruction of the old city market, Mrs. Anna Hunter, an artist and writer, mobilized six of her lady friends. When yet another beautiful historic house was to be bulldozed into a parking lot, they fumed and sputtered and . . . why, they bought it!

That brilliant brainstorm started a unique new mechanism of historic preservation which has to date saved some 800 of Savannah's more than 1,100 certified historic buildings. The seven ladies were soon joined by savvy and idealistic businessmen like Lee Adler. Together they organized the Historic Savannah Foundation which set up a revolving fund to buy threatened buildings from the wreckers and re-sell them under a protective convenant which enjoined their new owner to restore them to rigid specifications.

Lee Adler, who is now a director of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, still bubbles with gleeful enthusiasm over the feat.

"Ten years ago we learned that a wrecker and bought this house over there for $6,500, just for the Savannah gray brick," he told us, as he showed us around.

"That same day we got it from him for $8,500. Now look at it." We looked at a matchless Regency house, glowing with immaculate, modest pride.

A great number of well-to-do people, some from as far away as New York, have come to restore and live in these jewels and in ambience as enchanting as any you find in the most famous old towns of Europe, only more tranquil than any French or Italian tourist attraction of the same vintage. The city fathers caught on to a good thing. They landscaped the squares, helped things along and began to promote the tourist trade.

All this has now proven so successful, that Old Savannah's restoration has become official business. The city planner, bureaucrats, builders, promoters, zoners, and federal urban renewers with their surveys, new ambitions and gobbledegook have gotten into the act.

Historic preservation, in short, has become part of "progress" in Savannah. It was, perhaps, inevitable.

So now there is that humdrum new Hilton hotel, a fearfully inappropriate high-rise apartment tower and a $10 million Civic Center that awkwardly tries to harmonize its modern bulk with the historic gentility of its neighbors. The result of this compromise is not architecture, but a silly charade.

But all is by no means lost. The urban renewers have worked out thoughtful design criteria that should assure that new construction will blend reasonably well with the present character of Historic Savannah. But the city still lacks a review board, like Georgetown's Fine Arts Commission, to enforce these noble intentions.

The greatest cause for optimism, however, is the work already done by the founders and first leaders of the Historic Savannah Foundation. Their great and historic accomplishment can no longer be seriously spoiled.

With any luck, Oglethorpe's town will remain a delight—and become a model for America's new towns to come.

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION MORATORIUM BILL

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary is presently hearing testimony on various measures introduced to meet the problem of schoolbusing. A recent proposal, H.R. 13916, would place a moratorium on any new or different busing so that Congress might have time for dispassionate consideration of another bill which would also limit busing.

It is my considered opinion that the moratorium legislation is not necessary. It is not necessary because if Congress can enact an unprecedented moratorium on a constitutional right and deliberately weigh all the implications of such a step without the alleged benefits of a moratorium, it can just as well consider more orthodox legislation to set standards for busing without a moratorium. The history of this Nation is replete with crises which Congress met with legislation, legislation that was hammered out midst great controversy. Congress need not be "protected" from the feeling of the people. In fact, I had thought that the very opposite was necessary: That the people's representatives be ever aware of how the people feel. Thus if the purpose of the moratorium bill is to allow Congress to consider the busing issue in a pressureless atmosphere, then it would seem necessary not to enact the bill.

However, even if it were enacted, the moratorium bill would not be effective. It would not bring quiet to this controversy. It would cause a new flurry of litigation. And, in my opinion, the courts could only reach one conclusion—that the moratorium bill is unconstitutional. And such a ruling would only increase, not decrease, passions. The moratorium bill can serve its purpose only if it withstands judicial scrutiny. Otherwise, the bill will accomplish what it seeks to prevent.

The committee has received the opinion of 135 legal scholars on the wisdom and the constitutionality of the moratorium bill. It appears that the legal community does not think highly of the legislation. Of the 135, only one has been in favor; 134 have been in opposition.

I do not think that is a very good showing.

The committee has heard testimony from a lawyer I greatly admire, Lloyd N. Cutler, who represented the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. His carefully reasoned, well-documented analysis of the legislation I have been discussing should be of interest to every Member of this body. It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN DOAR AND LLOYD N. CUTLER BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY CONCERNING HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 620 AND H.R. 13916, APRIL 12, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

We appear here today at the Committee's invitation to testify concerning H.J. Res. 620 and H.R. 13916.

We are the present Co-Chairmen of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. The Committee is a non-profit, tax-exempt organization. It was formed in 1963 at the request of President Kennedy and it has continued its activities at the request of every succeeding President.

The Committee's purpose is to mobilize the legal resources and the moral force of the nation's lawyers to defend and uphold the civil and constitutional rights of the nation's racial minorities and other disadvantaged citizens. Our Board of Trustees consists primarily of leading lawyers throughout the country who, in today's vernacular, would be regarded as part of the legal "Establishment."

Our principal activity is to take part in the trial and appeal of cases that raise significant issues relating to the rights of minority and other disadvantaged groups. We function as lawyers, not as a political or pressure group. Attached to our statement is a copy of our most recent annual report, which describes our activities in detail and contains the names of our national Board of Trustees and members of our local committees in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Indianapolis, Kansas City, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Washington.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of policy our Committee, as such, does not advocate the passage or defeat of any legislation. In response to your invitation, we are submitting our opinion, as lawyers with some qualification in this field, as to the constitutionality of the moratorium bill and as to the constitutional implications of the proposed constitutional amendment. We should also note that the views we express were unanimously approved after appropriate notice by a quorum present at a regular meeting of the Executive Committee of our Board of Trustees in Washington, D.C. on April 3, 1972. Nevertheless, since we are presenting a professional legal opinion, we present it only as the opinion of the Executive Committee members whose names are attached to the statement, and who either attended the meeting on April 3 or subsequently notified us of their concurrence.

We shall first address H.R. 13916, the Student Transportation Moratorium Act, and then the Joint Resolution providing for a constitutional amendment.

H.R. 13916

We believe H.R. 13916, the moratorium bill, is unconstitutional for the reasons set forth below.

Proponents of the bill have urged that Congress may lawfully impose a stay on the effectiveness of future judicial orders providing

specific relief for an adjudicated impairment of a constitutional right, when Congress finds the stay necessary to allow it time to enact another measure intended to provide standardized and at least equally effective remedies.

The question so framed is one of first impression, one that, in our judgment, would be very difficult to answer. However, it is not the question we see posed by H.R. 13916. For this bill—whether taken on its own terms or in conjunction with the companion Equal Educational Opportunities Bill that the Administration has also proposed (H.R. 13915)—has not been shown to be necessary for, or likely to result in, the enactment of standardized and equally effective remedies for adjudicated impairments of constitutional rights. To the contrary, and accepting its stated intentions, it appears on its fact to enact a congressional limitation on judicial remedies for previously adjudicated constitutional rights, while Congress considers other measures that would impose still further limitations on those rights and remedies.

Congress, of course, has constitutional power to create lower federal courts and to define their jurisdiction, as well as power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. But like any other constitutional power, this power is not an absolute one. It must be exercised consistently with other constitutional grants of power and other declarations of constitutional rights.

For example, no one would suggest, we assume, that Congress could enact a statute denying original or appellate access to any federal court for all claimed violations of First Amendment rights. The federal judicial power granted under Article III extends to "*all* cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution," (emphasis supplied) and Congress cannot constitutionally bar *all* federal courts from exercising this power. *Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee*, 14 U.S. 304 (1816); *Eisentrager* v. *Forrestal*, 174 F.2d 961, 966 (D.C. Cir. 1949), reversed on other grounds *sub nom. Johnson* v. *Eisentrager*, 339 U.S. 763 (1950).

To take an even more obvious example, Congress could hardly define the jurisdiction of the lower federal courts so as to require that, notwithstanding the Sixth and Seventh Amendments, all cases must be tried without juries. Perhaps Congress could constitutionally abolish the lower federal courts entirely, although Mr. Justice Story's opinion in *Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee*, *supra*, suggests that it could not. But having created the lower federal courts and conferred on them jurisdiction over cases arising under the Constitution, Congress cannot limit this jurisdiction in ways that violate other provisions of the Constitution or prevent courts from granting effective relief.

Nothing in the Norris-La Guardia experience or in *Ex Parte McCardle*, 74 U.S. 506 (1868) is to the contrary. The curtailment imposed by the Norris-La Guardia Act on the right to an injunction in a labor dispute had the effect of protecting the First Amendment right of peaceful picketing It did not deprive employers of a constitutionally protected right or remedy, and when the Supreme Court upheld the Act, it had no need to consider any such issue. See *Lauf* v. *Shinner*, 303 U.S. 323 (1938). In *Ex Parte McCardle*, the Supreme Court held only that Congress could lawfully take away the right of direct appeal it had previously granted under a particular Reconstruction era *habeas corpus* statute; the power of the lower federal courts to grant writs of *habeas corpus* to persons detained in violation of their constitutional rights remained unimpaired, as did the discretionary appellate power of the Supreme Court to review lower court *habeas corpus* decisions under the Act of 1789 granting it the right to issue writs of certiorari. *Ex Parte Yerger*, 75 U.S. 85 (1869). And in other cases where the congressional power to bar federal courts from issuing injunctions has been upheld, the decisions have made clear that other adequate judicial remedies remained available. *Phillips* v. *Commissioner*, 283 U.S. 589 (1931); *Younger* v. *Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 45 (1971).

Moreover, the Supreme Court has held many times that the congressional authority to grant or remove jurisdiction in broad classes of cases does not include the authority to review decisions within a court's jurisdiction before permitting those decisions to become effective, or to require the court's jurisdiction before permitting those decisions to become effective, or to require the courts to decide such cases in congressionally specified ways. This has been true ever since *Hayburn's Case*, 2 U.S. 408 (1972).

The principle has been reaffirmed in a long line of cases, of which the most important are the opinion of Chief Justice Taney in *Gordon* v. *United States*, 173 U.S. 167 (1864); *United States* v. *Klein*, 80 U.S. 128 (1871); and *Muskrat* v. *United States*, 219 U.S. 346 (1911). Even *Ex Parte McCardle* notes the unconstitutionality of "the exercise of judicial power by the legislature, or legislative interference with courts in the exercise of continuing jurisdiction." 74 U.S. at 514.

When jurisdiction has been conferred on the federal courts to adjudicate the existence of a constitutional right, the courts must have the power to grant an effective remedy. This is the clear import of Chief Justice Hughes' opinion for the Court in *Sterling* v. *Constantin*, 287 U.S. 378 at 403 (1932). As Mr. Justice Rutledge put the matter in *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U.S. 118, 168–9 (1943) (concurring opinion):

"Congress has, with limited exceptions, plenary power over the jurisdiction of the federal courts. But to confer the jurisdiction and at the same time nullify entirely the effects of its exercise are not matters heretofore thought, when squarely faced, within its authority."

In the light of these principles, the moratorium bill would plainly be unconstitutional if the moratorium were of indefinite duration. Viewed as an attempt to deprive the courts of power to adjudicate Fourteenth Amendment rights and provide adequate remedies, it could not possibly stand. Viewed as an attempt to modify or stay judicial decisions within jurisdiction previously conferred, or to require that future cases be decided in a particular way, it would be equally invalid. Viewed as an attempt to deprive the courts of power to grant the only remedy for an adjudicated impairment of constitutional rights that the courts have found adequate on the facts of a particular case, its unconstitutionality would be clear.

The bill, of course, does not provide for a moratorium of indefinite duration; it specifically limits the period of the moratorium to July 1, 1973, or such earlier date as the Congress enacts the contemplated legislation defining what constitutes a denial of equal educational opportunities and of the equal protection of the laws, and providing standardized remedies. As we said at the outset, a moratorium bill carefully limited to the period required to accomplish such an objective would present a constitutional issue of first impression* Constitutionality in our view would depend on whether Congress clearly demonstrated that the moratorium was needed to enable Congress to enact the contemplated remedial legislation, and that in the remedial legislation Congress intended to protect and enforce rather than to limit the Fourteenth Amendment rights involved, and to provide at least equally effective remedies for their impairment.

One might perhaps argue that because seventeen years have already passed since the Supreme Court issued its opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 301 (1955) (Brown II), Congress may lawfully delay effective relief for an additional year today. But Congress today must take into account the long line of Supreme Court decisions culminating in *Carter* v. *West Feliciana Parish School Board*, 396 U.S. 290 (1970), placing ever greater urgency on school desegregation and suggesting strongly that any delay in the implementation of court-ordered plans inflicts continuing and irreparable harm on schoolchildren. In *Griffin* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County*, 377 U.S. 218 (1964), the court said that the time for mere "deliberate speed" had run out; in *Green* v. *School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 438–9 (1968), the Court said the burden on school boards is to come forth with desegregation plans that "promise[s] realistically to work *now*"; in *Alexander* v. *Holmes County Board of Education*, 396 U.S. 19, 20 (1969), the Court said that the "deliberate speed" standard for desegregation "is no longer constitutionally permissible," and ruled that "the obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once. . . ."

If a lower court enters a busing order that goes beyond what is necessary to remedy the impairment of a constitutional right, that error can of course be corrected on appeal. But if, on the facts of a particular case, the courts finally determine that some form of busing is the only presently available means of achieving the effective remedy required by the Constitution, then for Congress to deny anyone that remedy, even for an additional school year, is a very serious matter. Frustration or denial of court-ordered remedies for school desegregation can no longer be distinguished from frustration or denial of the underlying Fourteenth Amendment right. See *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 17 (1958); *Griffin* v. *School Board of Prince Edward County*, *supra*, 377 U.S. at 232. Action that perpetuates an unconstitutional dual school system not only delays the remedy, it compounds the harm of such a system. *Green* v. *School Board of New Kent County*, *supra*, 391 U.S. at 438. Thus Congress itself would be imposing constitutional injury on schoolchildren by staying the effectiveness of any new busing order which the courts have finally found in a particular case to be an indispensable element of prompt and effective relief. Such an act would raise serious questions under the Fifth Amendment (see *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954); *Gautreaux* v. *Romney*, 448 F.2d 731, 740 (7th Cir. 1970)). The only possible countervailing constitutional justification would be a clear demonstration of facts convincingly establishing the necessity of a moratorium to enable Congress to enact standardized and nationwide remedies that are at least equally effective.

These facts would have the status of constitutional or jurisdictional facts, in the sense that a court considering the constitutionality of the moratorium would be entitled to satisfy itself that Congress had demonstrated a compelling need for such a postponement of effective relief for an impairment of a constitutional right. *Sterling* v. *Constantin*, *supra*; *Ng Fung Ho* v. *White*, 259 U.S. 276 (1922); see Hart, *The Power of Congress to Limit the Jurisdiction of Federal Courts; An Exercise in Dialectic*, 66 Harv. L. Rev. 1362, 1386 ff. (1953). Examination of the moratorium bill and the companion Equal

*The only Supreme Court decision dealing with a legislative moratorium on judicial action is *Home Building & Loan Ass'n* v. *Blaisdell*, 290 U.S. 398 (1934), which sustained a Minnesota statute allowing courts to extend the redemption period of mortgages and thus postpone judicial foreclosure, but did so on the ground that the mortgage contract was inherently subject to modification by state law so that the constitutional ban on impairing the obligation of contracts had not been violated. The case is no precedent for a moratorium which by definition postpones the only relief a court finds effective for the adjudicated impairment of a constitutional right.

Educational Opportunities Bill persuades us that this essential demonstration has not been made.

To begin with, the findings contained in Section 2 of H.R. 13916 contain no statement or other showing that the moratorium is needed to enable Congress to enact the contemplated definitive legislation. Instead, the bill merely contains a finding (Section 2(a)(5)) of "a substantial likelihood that pending enactment of such legislation, many local educational agencies will be required to implement desegregation plans that impose a greater obligation than that required by the Fourteenth Amendment and permitted by such pending legislation, and that these plans will require modification in light of the legislation's requirements. . . ."

Even if this were so, it does not demonstrate that the moratorium is needed to enable Congress to enact the contemplated remedial legislation. The moratorium would apply only to the effectiveness of subsequently issued busing orders, leaving existing busing orders in effect. However, Section 406 of the Equal Educational Opportunities Bill would authorize the reopening and require the conforming modifications of all busing orders "in effect on the date of enactment of this Act." Aside from its own constitutionality, which we doubt, the reopening provision would reach orders issued during the moratorium period just as effectively as orders already issued. If orders already issued need not be stayed at once to enable Congress to enact remedial legislation, it is difficult to understand why orders hereafter issued need be stayed for this purpose. We therefore believe it would be most difficult for Congress to sustain its burden of showing a compelling public need to stay new busing orders to remedy adjudicated impairments of constitutional rights while the Equal Educational Opportunities Bill is being considered.

A further flaw in the present moratorium bill is that it prohibits *all* new busing orders, even those that would later be permitted under the contemplated definitive legislation.

For example, Section 402 of the Equal Educational Opportunities Bill would permit a court, as its seventh and last relief option, to order compulsory busing above the sixth grade if the court finds that no other adequate remedy for the denial of Fourteenth Amendment rights is available. H.R. 13916, however, would stay such relief during the moratorium period *even though* the court finds no other adequate remedy is available, and even though the relief concededly does not, in the words of Section 2(a)(5) of the moratorium bill, impose on educational agencies a "greater obligation than that required by the Fourteenth Amendment and permitted by [the] pending legislation." In this important respect, the moratorium bill plainly exceeds its own stated objective.

Since the justification claimed for the moratorium bill is to allow time to enact the contemplated definitive legislation, the constitutionality of the moratorium bill also depends upon whether the provisions of the contemplated definitive legislation are themselves constitutional.

It may well be, as Professor Archibald Cox has recently suggested, that under Paragraph 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment Congress may enact a uniform nationwide program of effective remedies for school desegregation that replace or modify remedies previously decreed by the courts. (Cox, *The Role of Congress in Constitutional Determinations*, 40 Cincinnati L. Rev. 199, 259 (1971)). However, we believe that some provisions of the contemplated definitive legislation go beyond the broadest permissible reading of this congressional power and well beyond the terms of the hypothetical legislation outlined by Professor Cox in his article.*

The most glaring example is Section 403 of the Equal Educational Opportunities Bill. Subsection (a) of Section 403 imposes an absolute prohibition on any court-ordered busing plan that increases over the levels of the preceding year either the average daily distance or the time traveled by all students in sixth grade or below, or the average daily number of such students who are bused. It contrasts starkly with Subsection (b), which would allow such busing for students above the sixth grade if the court finds by "clear and convincing evidence" that there is no other adequate remedy for the impairment of their Fourteenth Amendment rights. The plain intent of the Section as a whole is to forbid any court orders that would result in a net increase in busing for children in the first six grades of any school district, even if the court finds on the facts of the particular case that there is no other adequate remedy for an adjudicated and unrelieved infringement of their constitutional rights.

In *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), Chief Justice Burger recognized that travel times should be taken into account in framing busing orders, particularly for younger students (402 U.S. at 31). But the need to consider this factor can hardly justify an absolute congressional prohibition on future court orders requiring the busing of additional students in the first six grades. In this connection, it is significant that on the same day the court decided *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, it also decided *North Carolina State Board of Education* v. *Swann*, 402 U.S. 43 (1971), in which the Chief Justice and a unanimous court struck down a North Carolina statute imposing "an absolute prohibition" on involuntary busing of any student on grounds of race or to bring about racial balance. The court said that this ban "would inescapably operate to obstruct the remedies granted" in the *Charlotte-Mecklenburg* case, and noted that "bus transportation has long been an integral part of all public educational systems and it is unlikely that a truly effective remedy could be devised without continued reliance upon it." (402 U.S. at 46)

If a state anti-busing statute violates the Fourteenth Amendment "when it operates to hinder vindication of federal constitutional guarantees," it is difficult to conclude that a congressional statute achieving the same result could possibly be constitutional.

The absolute prohibition of busing in the first six grades beyond previous year levels seems unconstitutionally arbitrary in other important respects. It would prevent a court from ordering an agency to bus children at the voluntary request of their parents as, for example, when a black child wants to shift from a majority black school to a majority white school—a remedy that Chief Justice Burger said was "indispensable" in *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg* "for those students willing to transfer to other schools in order to lessen the impact on them of the state-imposed stigma of segregation." 402 U.S. at 26. In this respect, it goes even farther than the North Carolina statute struck down in the second *Swann* case. Moreover, as applied to any given educational agency, these prior year ceilings are arbitrarily and randomly affected by agency decisions to increase or decrease busing for reasons wholly unrelated to segregation or race. Such limits cannot possibly have the "standardized" or uniform effect throughout the country that is the assumed congressional objective, since their future application must necessarily depend on the many differing factors that affect present and future busing patterns in each school district.

For all of the above reasons, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we believe that H.R. 13916, taken either on its own bottom or in conjunction with the contemplated Equal Educational Opportunities Bill, is unconstitutional.

H.J. Res. 620

Turning our attention to the Joint Resolution, we find no question of constitutionality presented by the proposed to amend the Constitution in the manner that the Constitution provides. As to the constitutional implications of that proposal, however, we share the concern voiced by others about "trivializing" the Constitution by an amendment that tries to resolve in 22 words issues as fluid and transitory as busing and school assignments, that limits the basic human rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment, and that bars even the busing of minority children whose parents want them to be used to better and less segregated schools. We believe that such an amendment would be a backward step in our steady progress toward becoming a nation no longer divided against itself.

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW CONCURRING IN THE FOREGOING STATEMENT

Morris B. Abram, Esq., New York, New York.
Richard Babcock, Esq., Chicago, Illinois.
E. Clinton Bamberger, Esq., Washington, D.C.
Thomas D. Barr, Esq., New York, New York.
G. d'Andelot Belin, Esq., Boston, Massachusetts.
Berl I. Bernhard, Esq., Washington, D.C.
Bruce Bromley, Esq., New York, New York.
Warren M. Christopher, Esq., Los Angeles, California.
Ramsey Clark, Esq., Washington, D.C.
William T. Coleman, Jr., Esq., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Lloyd N. Cutler, Esq., Washington, D.C.
James T. Danaher, Esq., Palo Alto, California.
Arthur H. Dean, Esq., New York, New York.
Richard C. Dinkelspiel, Esq., San Francisco, California.
John Doar, Esq., Brooklyn, New York.
John W. Douglas, Esq., Washington, D.C.
Alexander D. Forger, Esq., New York, New York.
Lloyd Garrison, Esq., New York, New York.
Arthur J. Goldberg, Esq., Washington, D.C.
John B. Jones, Jr., Esq., Washington, D.C.
Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Esq., Armonk, New York.
Maximilian W. Kempner, Esq., New York, New York.
Henry L. King, Esq., New York, New York.
Otis King, Esq., Houston, Texas.
George N. Lindsay, Esq., New York, New York.
Robert B. McKay, Esq., New York, New York.
Milan C. Miskovsky, Esq., Washington, D.C.
James M. Nabrit, III, Esq., New York, New York.
Robert L. Nelson, Esq., Washington, D.C.
Louis F. Oberdorfer, Esq., Washington, D.C.
D. Robert Owen, Esq., New York, New York.
Robert P. Patterson, Jr., Esq., New York, New York.
William Pincus, Esq., New York, New York.

---

* In the most recent decisions considering the scope of Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, several of the opinions suggest that the congressional power to enforce the Amendment does not include the power to limit the rights it confers. *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan*, 384 U.S. 641, 651 (1966); *Oregon* v. *Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112, 128–9 (1970). The same principle would seem applicable to the denial of an effective remedy.

Stephen J. Pollak, Esq., Washington, D.C.
Barbara S. Preiskel, Esq., New York, New York.
Francis E. Rivers, Esq., New York, New York.
James Robertson, Esq., Washington, D.C.
John H. Schafer, Esq., Washington, D.C.
Bernard G. Segal, Esq., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Jerome J. Shestack, Esq., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Asa D. Sokolow, Esq., New York, New York.
Theodore C. Sorensen, Esq., New York, New York.
William B. Spann, Jr., Esq., Atlanta, Georgia.
Cyrus Vance, Esq., New York, New York.
John W. Wade, Esq., Nashville, Tenn.

ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF GOV. GEORGE WALLACE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Are All Guilty," published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 19, 1972.

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

WE ARE ALL GUILTY

Immediately after the assassinations of President John Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Sen. Robert Kennedy, Americans were subjected to the most sustained self-flagellation in history. One after another, commentators and columnists, theologians and teachers, psychologists and sociologists insisted that "we are all guilty," and proceeded to bludgeon 200 million Americans with the crime of collective guilt.

The attempted assassination of Gov. George Wallace rekindled some of that same effort to indict an entire society, the very thing Edmund Burke said he did not know how to do. But for the most part there was commendable restraint all around. We don't know if it will continue that way, but for now the TV and radio networks have not once again subjected viewers and listeners to swarms of accusers trying to saddle them with the guilt of specific violent acts.

The United States has suffered more than its share of violence throughout its turbulent history. . . . It seems to us likely that certain historical and social factors, such as a heterogeneous society, instant communications and impassioned politics, may influence at least the way violence is expressed. But that is a far cry from the accusation that violence proves Americans somehow a cut below the rest of humanity. For while violence can be found in the American tradition, a larger part of that tradition is willingness to work within the bounds of tolerance and fair play to resolve differences.

Accusations of collective guilt are really moral cop-outs because they destroy moral judgment altogether. By denying that men have even the most fundamental control over their behavior, the notion of collective guilt rejects the very essence of our Judeo-Christian tradition. By viewing society as an organic whole instead of as an aggregate of individuals, it rejects the unique individuality in each person.

Further, open-ended accusations against "society" may well breed rather than diminish violence by spreading guilt feelings among those who are clearly not guilty, and by failing to place responsibility on those who clearly are. Logically, if everybody is guilty, then it follows that no one is really guilty.

It is important to deplore every aggressive act. It is important to try to understand and eliminate the frustrations that feed aggression. But it is likewise important to repudiate the dangerously fashionable notion that all of us pulled the triggers of the guns in Dallas, Memphis, Los Angeles, and Laurel, Md.

THREE-YEAR REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF LOS ANGELES URBAN COALITION

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, Martin Stone, president of the Greater Los Angeles Urban Coalition, recently presented a 3-year report on the activities of the coalition. The report summarizes the coalition's accomplishments and Mr. Stone's conclusions about the need to involve poor people in such projects. I think the statement is a particularly insightful argument for giving poor people a full opportunity to help themselves.

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

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

GREATER LOS ANGELES URBAN COALITION
3-YEAR REPORT

The purpose of this report is to summarize my observations after having served as Chairman and later as President of the Los Angeles Urban Coalition for the past three years.

In reviewing these comments, please understand that this is my personal evaluation of some of the problems of our City and the activities of the Coalition. They are not necessarily the official positions of the Coalition, and a number of the members of our Board of Directors would disagree on some of the statements which follow.

The reason for my initial interest in the Coalition was my feeling that government and private charitable efforts to improve conditions amongst the poor of our urban centers were not sufficient. The Federal and local governments operating in this field had assumed that they could devise programs that would end poverty, create organizations to administer those programs, and that progress would shortly follow.

Now, in retrospect, it seems that our single greatest error in attempting to deal with the problems of the poor has been our national attitude of a charitable approach to the problem. The charitable concept has validity in programs to aid those who are helpless, but it actually does harm to those who have the present or undeveloped capacity to aid themselves. Poor people should be given no more and no less than a full opportunity to help themselves.

We must recognize that the most important asset in aiding a poor person is his own capability. It is this asset that the Federal Government and local agencies have failed to use properly. In fact, their approach has been so demeaning of individual self-respect and responsibility as to be harmful to the broad masses of the poor.

For the past three years, the Urban Coalition has been going about things differently. We have developed a truly representative organization in which black members or Chicano members have as much control over its processes and activities as any other group. Since most of the poor in Los Angeles are concentrated within the black and Chicano communities, we have asked these communities to tell the Coalition about the problems of the poor. After a period of testing the validity of this concept, the black members and the Chicano members have separately developed agendas which are designed to improve substantially living conditions in the minority and poor communities of our City.

The result of this activity is that I now feel that we are probably the only organization in the Los Angeles area in which the minority group members can come together with members of religious organizations, business groups, and labor representatives as fully equal participating members. This fact is our greatest strength. It is a strength in that we have strong ties into the minority communities and a sound basis of trust by those who have come in contact with the Coalition. In this way we have become a unique resource for the City; able to bring together on a moment's notice many of the different groups to discuss serious problems and attempt to work out practical solutions. It enables us to obtain reliable information regarding people, organizations, and problems in the minority communities quickly and in a constructive atmosphere. It enables us to involve key people within the minority communities in efforts to resolve immediate problems and develop constructive long-term approaches to some basic community problems.

At the same time, the extent to which the minority groups now participate in true shared control of the Coalition has caused some in the business community to question our objectivity. Some of the business leaders who originally participated in the Coalition no longer lend their support to Coalition activities. It is my opinion that this occurred as a result of two conditions. The first relates to the previously noted commitment many businessmen retain to the Federal Government and charitable organization concept of aid to the poor. These men believe that programs should be designed to help the poor without substantial involvement by the poor themselves.

The second condition concerns Coalition involvement in police-community problems. With respect to this issue, we attempted to work with the Police Department in developing community support for community relations activities of the Department. We supported the Police Department in its efforts to obtain higher salaries for policemen. We advocated measures such as the greater use of the "O.R. System" (release of minor offenders on their own recognizance without bail) and the tests of the "Citation System" (use of tickets instead of arrests for certain minor and non-dangerous offenses) to reduce inequities to the poor and reduce the possibilities of "incidents" in minority communities arising from arrest procedures. We tried to warn the Police Department of potentially dangerous tensions arising in the Chicano communities long before these tensions erupted in a series of riots in the Fall and Winter of 1970 and the beginning of 1971. We called attention at an early date to dangerous tensions building in Venice. We advocated more comprehensive hearings of citizen complaints against police practices. We brought police officials and leaders of the Chicano Moratorium marches together to attempt to work out ground rules which would eliminate the possibility of violence in marches and demonstrations.

We weren't always successful, but we did make some valuable contributions. Our pressures, along with others, brought about a change in administration and practices in

Venice which substantially relieved tensions. We did help bring police and demonstration leaders together in East Los Angeles. The Police Department has expanded the use of the "O.R. System" and is testing the "Citation System." The City Council and later the Police Commission did, at least in a minor way (though not nearly in an adequate fashion), open up citizen complaint procedures.

What must be stressed, however, is that the Coalition could not have avoided police-community questions and maintained its claim to be an institution where minority members had an equal voice. A broad spectrum of minority leaders, representative of all segments of the black and Chicano communities, brought concerns about local law enforcement agencies and practices to the Coalition. The only honest response possible was to take up these questions. Otherwise, we might have retained an organization framework; but we would not have had a real coalition. Because of our involvement, we may be the best resource the City has for bringing people together to peacefully explore police-community problems and attempt to work out improvements of the situation.

But involvement in police-community matters has constituted only a small fraction of our efforts. We have evolved into a class-action Ombudsman, working with the poor and under-represented minorities of our community. In this respect, we have initiated broad citizen involvement in the Twenty-Year Plan for South-Central Los Angeles. We are developing a national conference on Chicano immigration and employment problems. We have developed specific recommendations for improving Chicano representation in our elective offices. We were instrumental in the establishment of a Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee in the United States House of Representatives Judiciary Committee. We were instrumental in the establishment of the Mexican-American Education Commission and, indirectly the Black and Asian Education Commissions. We are analyzing and developing school finance proposals for use in the minority communities.

We also serve as a valuable forum for the County. For the past three years, ideas and problems have been discussed at Coalition meetings which have developed sensitivity and fostered change which goes beyond the bounds of Coalition activities. In addition, we organized and coordinated local hearings held by the Commission of the Cities in the '70s, updating the Kerner Commission Report.

At times we initiate projects on a demonstration basis. Our veterans' program is helping hundreds of returning vets learn of their GI Bill of Rights and get into college. The Urban Corps has helped additional hundreds of poverty-background students continue their education by providing meaningful part-time jobs. Our support effort for the Summer Jobs for Youth program provided thousands of dollars worth of free media advertising for that program.

We also assist worthwhile community-based projects in getting started. We have constructed a community center in South-Central Los Angeles which has served thousands of black youths and which is now run by a community organization. The Coalition was the only multi-racial organization willing to assist the Brotherhood Crusade in establishing a black charitable funding organization in the City. We have been asked and have agreed to assist the Chicano community in establishing a similar effort.

In addition, we serve as an area-wide coordinator in several fields. We have surveyed the major juvenile delinquency programs in Los Angeles County, and next month will bring the administrators and funders of these programs together for a major conference which should substantially improve administration and resources for these programs. We have helped to coordinate community patrol activities for the past three years at the Watts Summer Festival. We have successfully linked together universities and minority education advocates working on comprehensive reform of the Los Angeles City Schools Reading Program. And we plan to link together environmentalists and minority community members concerned with the constant deterioration of our inner city.

All of this activity has been undertaken in an agency whose budget has not exceeded $200,000 in any year, and whose actual operating funds have decreased through outright cuts and inflation costs between 25% and 30% since its inception four years ago.

There are, however, ways in which the Coalition can become more effective. First, we need greater participation on the part of business and labor leaders who are willing to be involved, sometimes in controversial problems, and to use their influence when they believe our approach is correct. We have enjoyed the support and advocacy of the past Chairman of the Board of the Bank of America, the present President of the First Western Bank, the Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL–CIO, the Western Region head of Prudential Insurance Company, the last three presidents of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, the local head of McGraw-Hill, and others. We need, however, far more widespread support from business and labor in the Los Angeles area.

We also need meaningful access to the broadcast medias, radio and television. When I was first appointed Chairman of the Coalition, I was invited to appear on as many as two or three television programs a week to discuss the Coalition; but it is my opinion that these "public service" programs have very little overall public impact. They are "throw-away" programs with totally inadequate budgets—appearing at times when the viewer audience is small. I think far more would be accomplished if television would vastly reduce the number of "throw-away" public service hours and instead concentrate on a lesser number of high quality programs in prime time hours, such as CBS' "The Chicano."

I would now like to shift the thrust of this report from the Urban Coalition to the problems of Los Angeles. I hope that the comments which follow will elicit some response from members of our business community. With respect to the improvement of the quality of life in our urban core areas and reduction of tensions, the most basic single recommendation I would make would entail a massive decentralization of responsibility and authority over the areas of greatest community concern—education and law enforcement. To date, our bureaucrats have opposed this approach, claiming the possibility of reduced efficiency.

No one with knowledge of the facts, however, can argue that educational opportunity is adequate in our minority communities. Schools in such communities are a disastrous failure.

Our massive Los Angeles City School District should be broken up into a large number of small, parent-controlled school districts. We must clearly acknowledge the fact that the primary party of interest in the field of education is not the administration or the teacher, it is the student. We must put into proper perspective questions of job seniority or personal privilege and concentrate on educational quality. If we as a society haven't got the courage to face up to this issue, then we deserve the failures we now have and the tragic consequences which will continue to follow.

With respect to law enforcement, I am convinced that the prime requisite to success in this field is not departmental efficiency or better equipment, but rather the support of the community in which police officers function. At the present time the attitude of many people in the minority communities towards police officers is that of fear and hostility. These are not their public servants; they are more an occupying force. This condition must cease. People in the minority communities don't want less police protection—they want more protection, but they want it from people who are sensitive to their needs and who are directly responsible to them. When this kind of relationship exists, the police will have the support of the communities and be able to carry out their assignments more effectively and with less danger to individual policemen than now exists.

To sum up, it is my opinion that the best way to develop meaningful police-community relations in the minority communities is to create localized police forces subject to the direction not of any centralized police bureaucracy, but of a locally elected community council.

I have avoided discussing the questions of housing, jobs, transportation, and the environment. These are matters which will be dealt with in subsequent reports. In this report I wanted to convey my views on education and police-community problems—matters which have been the subject of the greatest concern expressed by our minority caucuses over the past few years.

This concludes my report, I have offered a brief glimpse of the Urban Coalition's history where it would help to understand present circumstances and explained our present capability and operating objectives.

I hope that this letter has stimulated some further interest on your part to Coalition objectives and that we can count on your future support in making Los Angeles a better place for all of our citizens.

Sincerely,

MARTIN STONE.

JEFFERSON COLLEGE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 170th anniversary of the founding of Jefferson College in Washington, Miss.

Jefferson College, named for President Thomas Jefferson, was founded in 1802 in the territorial capital of Mississippi. This was the first institution of higher learning in what was then the vast western wilderness of a young nation. Its influence and importance was to be felt for many years.

The historical significance of Jefferson College has not been limited to Mississippi. Not only did the college serve as a site for the birth of the State of Mississippi but the reminders of the beginning of a nation and the administrations of Adams, Jefferson, and Madison are clearly etched in the history of Jefferson College.

The contributions of those who have passed through its doors as students, faculty, and visitors have been great. The names of Jefferson Davis, John James Audubon, Andrew Jackson, and Aaron Burr are all a part of Jefferson College. The contribution of the college is also measured in those thousands who over the years received an education here, and who, yet nameless to memory,

served to guide and build a State and nation.

The people of Mississippi have long recognized the historical importance of this college and efforts are underway to restore it. Not only can it serve as a reminder to a proud past but its potential to the area as an historical attraction is unlimited. In further recognition of this landmark in our history, Jefferson College Day was recently held to observe the 170th anniversary as well as the beginning of the restoration projects. It was on this occasion that the distinguished Mississippi attorney and noted historian, Mr. Frank Everett, delivered an address on the history of Jefferson College.

I certainly believe it was a most fitting address and fine tribute to the colorful history of Jefferson College. I would like to include in my remarks a copy of Mr. Everett's address and commend it to my colleagues:

JEFFERSON COLLEGE—MAY 13, 1972

Let us pretend that we are gathered at this very place exactly 170 years ago on May 13, 1802. Thomas Jefferson is in his second year as President of the United States. W. C. C. Claiborne, a Virginian appointed by Jefferson, has been in office as the second Governor of the Mississippi territory only five months. Just three months ago on February 1, 1802, the territorial capitol was moved from Natchez here to Washington, a scattered hamlet, more map than village, astride a beaten trail disappearing into a mysterious endless forest of lurking dangers, the Natchez trace. We are located in a rich green meadow shaded by virgin oaks near a rippling clear creek fed by cool flowing springs.

James Foster, a soldier of the Revolutionary War, and his family claimed and settled these lands just after independence was won.

President George Washington, to settle confusion about the line between Spanish and American territory in 1795, appointed a crochety Pennsylvania Quaker, Andrew Ellicott, as Commissioner to represent the U.S. in fixing, surveying and marking the separating boundary at the 31st degree of latitude. (Now the Louisiana line just below Woodville.)

Arriving in Natchez early in 1797, Ellicott encountered frustrating delays from the Spanish authorities. Tensions developed and so did yellow fever, so Ellicott with his escort and survey party moved here in July, 1797, and encamped around the clear springs that bear his name to this day.

While impatiently waiting Ellicott, in September, 1797, surveyed and platted the townsite of Washington for John Foster who owned much of the land. Several years earlier he had helped lay out and survey Washington, D.C., the National Capitol.

The 31° line being fixed, the Mississippi territory was formed on April 7, 1798, a very long narrow strip extending from the Mississippi River east to the Chattahoocie River in Georgia between a north line at the mouth of the Yazoo River and a south line along the 31° surveyed by Ellicott.

John Adams appointed as first Governor Winthrop Seargent of Massachusetts who came on the scene August 6, 1798. As a federalist in politics, his views were incompatible with the Jeffersonian Republicanism of his new constituents.

After a confused beginning, Seargent managed to get the territorial government organized.

In 1802 this was a very remote and isolated area. A few miles south below the 31° line was Spain, a foreign power. Across the Mississippi River lay France, controlled by Napoleon. Only a short distance North and East stretched a vast area controlled by erratic and often hostile Indian nations.

The nearest settlement to the east was on Tombigbee River north of Mobile almost two hundred miles away. The nearest settlements to the north were at the Tennessee River and Nashville. New Orleans under Spanish rule in 1802 closed its doors to American products, causing consternation and excitement in the territory.

The Natchez trace trail, while designated as a post road in 1880, was still in the slow stages of adequate marking and crude improvement. Travellers were harassed, robbed, beaten and killed by the merciless outlaws Harpe, Mason and others. As a road, the trace was primitive and unsafe.

No road led to the east. None would exist for five years when the "Three-Chopped Way" was hacked on the trees in 1807.

Steamboats were not known. Powerless flatboats floated south with the river current in one way traffic. It would be nine years until the first steamboat plied the Mississippi in 1811.

With the introduction of mechanical ginning in Mississippi in 1795, cotton had become the major crop replacing tobacco and indigo which were not thereafter grown.

As soon as the government was set up in Washington survival demanded the establishment of law and order.

The militia was organized. Fort Dearborn was built on the north edge of Washington near this site on 50 acres purchased for $15 per acre.

Rewards were offered for capture of the Mason-Harpe gang and within two years these bandits were exterminated.

Most significantly, the very next important act of the territorial legislature was "to establish a college in the Mississippi territory" to "bear the name of Jefferson College in honor of Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, and President of the American Philosophical Society," the act passed May 13, 1802.

The preamble to the act came directly to the point: "Whereas, education conduces to the happiness and improvement of man, and is particularly necessary to the support and purity of republican governments . . ."

The most important men of the territory were named as trustees, the very top political, business and educational leaders.

The institution was authorized "to confer the degrees of bachelor and master of arts". The trustees were directed to select a site at "some healthy and central situation." They were further empowered to raise by lottery a sum not exceeding $10,000.

Only two months previously, March, 1802, the U.S. Military Academy at West Point was authorized. The schools were therefore almost twins.

There was no institution of college stature closer than Nashville, Lexington, Kentucky, and Knoxville.

The trustees first considered Greenville in Jefferson County as a site, but after visitation that location was rejected. Then it was decided to locate at Selsertown. It was finally determined by legislative act to fix the permanent site upon a 47-acre "parcel of land, including a spring commonly called Ellicott's Spring, presented by John and James Foster, and Randal-Gibson." The act was passed November 11, 1803.

I must pause there to reflect that Jefferson College will live again because of the energetic and faithful leadership of a direct descendant of an original land donor, James Foster. Mrs. Nan Foster Schuchs has skillfully brought us to this point and I feel confident that her goal of restoration will be delightfully accomplished.

It was a happy day on December 20, 1803, when Governor Claiborne went to New Orleans to receive the Louisiana Purchase for the United States. Three months later on March 27, 1804, the Mississippi Territory was extended north to the Tennessee line.

On February 2, 1807, intense excitement vibrated through the little town of Washington. By this time there was probably a small assembly hall, a few scattered residences, several businesses and stores, and probably a couple of rustic taverns or inns.

Eleazer Carter would this year establish in Washington one of the very first industries in the Territory. He manufactured an improved cotton gin which was in great demand.

The Lorenzo Dow Methodist Church had not been built. No buildings and no school had been started on the grounds of Jefferson College.

None of the great Natchez mansions had been built, only a number of modest Spanish-period cottages and buildings.

The legislature was in session and the Supreme Court consisting of Judges Thomas Rodney and Peter Bruin had convened. A 72-man jury venire had responded to a summons for grand jury duty to consider the charges against former Vice President Aaron Burr for treason.

Burr had been intercepted on his mission down the Mississippi River and arrested at Bruinsburg by order of Acting Governor Cowles Mead. The militia officers making the arrest were two very prominent young men, George Poindexter and William B. Shields. Burr had surrendered to the civil authorities of the territory and was placed under bond to await the action of the grand jury.

On this day, Aaron Burr would appear in court to determine whether he would be tried or held or released.

The village was overrun with people, officials, legislators, jurymen, militiamen, lawyers and spectators. There was no enclosed building that could hold the court and jurymen. It had been a very cold winter and Judge Rodney reported that the temperature was 10° above zero—a very cold day indeed.

Nevertheless, the court, for lack of space, was virtually forced to meet outside under the dignified protection of the spreading live oaks still standing here today. It is certain that there were many fires lit to warm the spectators and participants.

By a strange twist of circumstances, Poindexter showed up in his official capacity as prosecuting attorney and his former companion in arresting Burr, William B. Shields, appeared with Lyman Harding as defense counsel for Burr.

Both Poindexter and Shields agreed that the territorial court had no jurisdiction to try Burr for treason against the United States. Poindexter contended that Aaron Burr should therefore be held and turned over to Federal authorities for trial.

Burr would not hear to this. He demanded that the charges be considered by the grand jury or that he be released. Judge Bruin agreed with Burr. Rodney was opposed to releasing Burr. Incidentally, Judge Rodney's son was Caesar Augustus Rodney, Attorney General of the United States in the cabinet of Thomas Jefferson, Burr's enemy.

The matter was submitted to the grand jury which declined to indict Burr and returned a ringing presentment criticizing acting Governor Mead for his conduct in the affair. Shields, Burr's attorney, then jumped to the defense of Mead. Judge Rodney rebuked the jury for its unwarranted criticism and court was recessed until February 5th when Burr was to appear again for further action of the court.

Fearing and anticipating that he would be detained and delivered to Federal hands, Burr jumped bond, refused to appear and escaped in the night.

On February 5 when court met, there was no Aaron Burr, but the day was not a total loss because Judge Rodney then performed

a wedding ceremony uniting attorney William B. Shields to Miss Victoria Benoist.

Aaron Burr was later captured at Fort Stoddard near Mobile, taken to Richmond for trial and ultimately acquitted.

After a decade of struggle Jefferson College finally opened on November 11, 1811. It had acquired Washington Academy from Rev. James Smylie and constructed a frame building on the grounds to house the classrooms.

The next year, 1812, Lorenzo Dow built his little Methodist church on the front of this tract. The building was 28 feet by 38 feet. Lower walls were of brick and the upper part of wood. There was a small gallery and two rooms above reached by inside stairs. On the main floor were six pews partitioned down the middle and four foot aisles along each wall with no center aisle. Four stoves, two along each side wall, heated the building.

The War of 1812 brought the next excitement to the Washington community and Jefferson College. Andrew Jackson assembled an army of Tennessee volunteers bound for New Orleans to fight the British invaders. Jackson arrived at Natchez February 15, 1813, intending to camp his troops at Fort Dearburn adjacent to Jefferson College. He found the old fort delapidated and unusable, and pitched camp on a "handsome plain" one mile west of Washington and four miles from Natchez.

A month later the impatient Andy received surprising orders to dismiss and discharge his restless men on the spot since their services at New Orleans would not be needed.

Angered and exasperated Jackson refused to disburse his men and assumed personal responsibility for their return to Nashville in good order at his own expense. Following the Old Trace, the dejected volunteers filed past the gates of Jefferson College. It was a difficult, long, disappointing march and earned for Andrew Jackson the lifelong nickname of "Old Hickory."

Two years later, after the battle of New Orleans, General Jackson and Rachael set out for Nashville via Natchez where they were enthusiastically welcomed on April 20, 1815. Leaving Natchez in a carriage accompanied by a contingent of victorious lighthearted veterans of the battle, Andrew Jackson and Rachael were given a great public ovation at Washington as they rode the trace overarched with oaks on the campus of Jefferson College. The details are lacking, but most certainly the college was deeply involved in this warm tribute to the national hero.

Another great drama would unfold on the grounds of Jefferson College, birthplace of the State of Mississippi in July and August of 1817.

The distinguished historian, J. F. H. Claiborne, whose father F. L. Claiborne was a trustee of Jefferson College in its early years, described Washington of 1817 as follows:

"There were three large hotels, and the academic department of Jefferson College—was in successful operation. The Society was highly cultured and refined. The conflicting land titles had drawn a crowd of lawyers . . . The medical profession was equally well represented . . . It was a gay and fashionable place, compactly built for a mile or more from East to West, every hill in the neighborhood occupied by some gentleman's chateau."

In this setting the constitutional convention met in the five year old Methodist Church on the edge of the college property. Forty seven distinguished delegates attended.

For six hot weeks in mid summer the convention labored seriously and industriously until final agreement was reached.

One hundred dollars was paid to the Methodist Church as compensation for use of the building.

During this convention period construction was started on the East Building of the college. The old frame building had to this time been used to house the academic rooms. Apparently no steward's facilities existed until the early 1830's, and students probably boarded out with townspeople. The East Building was completed in April 1819. It is the same age as the State of Mississippi. The college department also opened in 1817.

In the year following the constitutional convention 1818, Jefferson Davis at the age of 10 years was a student for a short while until the county academy of Wilkinson was organized. He then returned home to Rosemont at Woodville and went daily from home to school.

Many men of noteworthy academic and scientific learning have been connected closely with Jefferson College.

One of the most distinguished was B. C. L. Walles, a truly great student and teacher of geology and science.

John James Audubon, renowned naturalist and ornithologist, taught at Jefferson College in 1823 and 1824 as he prepared his "Birds of America."

William Dunbar, an original trustee, was one of the most learned and resourceful scholars of his time in all America.

David Ker, lawyer, minister, judge and educator, was another founding trustees. In 1795 Ker had aided in the creation of the University of North Carolina where he was the first professor and president before coming to Mississippi in 1880.

There are many others of equal interest.

For several years the old Methodist church was utilized by the college for a primary or elementary school department. Title to the church was conveyed to Jefferson College in August 1833.

Construction of the west wing of the school, presently standing, began in 1838 and was completed in 1839.

About the same time the President's home was built and a steward's house and kitchen added.

The college department operated successfully, with the exception of one year, until the entire school closed in 1863 during the Civil War.

When the war ended, Jefferson College reopened with success comparable to the boom times of the 1830's in spite of reconstruction chaos. Its president, during most of this period, J. S. Raymond, was recommended highly by General Robert E. Lee. Raymond served from October 1872 for 35 years.

In 1895 the center building was constructed as a gymnasium.

These very beautiful grounds are identified with the entire scope of American history. No single geographical location in Mississippi, or maybe anywhere else, has been the locale of so many important events. The cavalcade of America has passed in review over this grass and under these oaks. This campus is the central focal point of inspiration for the birth and growth of Mississippi. From George Washington, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson to the present direct reminders exist here.

The cultural and historical impact of Jefferson College continues much alive. We are not viewing the remains of a dead past, but a vivid resurrection to new life and a new future.

Jefferson College is entering a new phase of teaching this and future generations, like Williamsburg, these restored grounds and buildings will silently speak of the foundations of American Government and life.

Jefferson College and the events it has witnessed and physically embraced is a positive demonstration to men everywhere of the priorities and verities necessary for the endurance of a nation.

These are:

First—the establishment and maintenance of law and order.

Second—strong, sound education.

Third—deep patriotism that inspires sacrifice for the national welfare.

Many millions walk here to learn and reaffirm these truths.

What a glorious achievement it would be to restore and recreate the Washington of 1817. It can be done. What we do at Jefferson College can be the first step.

Let us here create a living light of learning to illuminate the perilous paths of the future.

OPPORTUNITIES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CAREERS

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, overpopulation, mismanagement of our natural resources, and pollution of the air and water have seriously degraded the quality of life. Continued and accelerating urbanization has packed 70 percent of America's people into 2 percent of its land. We have reached the point where our attitudes and behavior must reflect a clear understanding of man's relationships to the environment and, indeed, of the interrelationships of all living things. The survival of mankind depends upon changes in our attitudes and behavior.

Last weekend more than 200 high school students from Georgia and surrounding States gathered at Northside High School, in Atlanta, to consider those problems at a pioneering conference entitled "We the Concerned." The keynote address was given by Mr. Odom Fanning, a native of Atlanta and a former science reporter for the Atlanta Journal. Before moving to Washington in 1965, Mr. Fanning was for a time associated with my friend Dr. Peter C. Goldmark at CBS Laboratories. Now as a special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, Mr. Fanning specializes in environmental science and is author of "Opportunities in Environmental Careers," a vocational guidance manual which has recently gone into its second printing.

The conference at which Mr. Fanning spoke was presented by Students Toward Environmental Participation—STEP—whose copresidents are Fiona Turnbull, of Marietta High School, and Cathy Koeningkramer, of McEachern High School, Powder Springs. It was sponsored by the environmental education project of the Atlanta public schools, whose coordinator is Mrs. Cora Kay Blackwelder. This project, incidentally, is currently the only one in Georgia funded under the Environmental Education Act of 1970, Public Law 91–516.

Mr. Fanning's remarks to the students on the subject of careers are particularly appropriate to our need for manpower to study problems of rural development. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Fanning's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

OPPORTUNITIES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CAREERS

(By Odom Fanning)

Conservation and restoration of the environment can be accomplished only by people working at it. Volunteers have their place, but in addition we must have full-time workers, educated in the fundamentals of ecology and economics, trained to perform some task requiring skills and experience, provided with the tools and supplies resulting from the science and technology in which they are involved, and employed as members of teams at various levels of government and private industry or in service or consulting firms or universities.

How many such people will be gainfully employed in environmental management in the United States in the years to come? Surprisingly, no one really knows. In my book "Opportunities in Environmental Careers" I identify about 70,000 men and women working at professional and para-professional (requiring training beyond high school but less than four years of college) vocations in the United States. I estimate that this total will double—to 1,400,000—by 1980. I am continuing these studies, and in one limited area—conservation of natural resources and outdoor recreation—I recently surveyed employers and found a surprising result. Almost every agency which responded to my questionnaire said that it could not project eight to 10 years ahead, but that it had vacancies now that it was authorized to fill. The sad truth, however, is that few of these agencies can fill any of their authorized openings because their budgets have been cut. On the basis of my limited sample, I believe that public and private agencies could employ 10 percent more staff now—if they had the funds—and that 70,000 persons could be employed and should be employed now in meeting vital problems of the environment.

New opportunities are constantly being created by new technology. I know of no better example than the study called the "New Rural Society." While the pilot project on new and imaginative uses of telecommunications is being conducted in northeastern Connecticut, much of its impetus comes from Georgia. The genius behind it is Dr. Peter C. Goldmark, formerly president of the CBS Laboratories and now president of Goldmark Communications Corporation. The latter has a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through Fairfield University, to study the new rural society. Its objective is to demonstrate that telecommunications between widely separated business units can permit the creation and revitalization of new communities in essentially rural areas.

Senators Herman E. Talmadge and Hubert H. Humphrey were far-sighted in recognizing the implications of Dr. Goldmark's project, and they recently appointed him as an advisor to the Rural Development Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Senator Talmadge, Chairman of the Committee, said that it was clear that in order to provide decent social and economic conditions in America's small towns, and to stop rural outmigration, it would be necessary to apply the nation's vast technological capabilities to such problems.

Millions of American have been displaced from their rural homes by changing patterns of farming and lack of educational, cultural, and economic opportunities in rural areas. It is the Senators' belief—and Dr. Goldmark's—that many of these people would have preferred to remain near their homes and loved ones. A major issue of national policy is involved, for we now have 90 percent of the population living on only 10 percent of the land. This imbalance threatens to improverish the countryside, and at the same time it is bringing incredible problems to our overcrowded urban areas.

This is an environmental problem of the first magnitude—perhaps greater than those of pollution or transportation—and I am pleased that technological development is being given a chance to prove that it might have some answers to such social and economic challenges.

TO TRADE OR NOT TO TRADE

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, to trade or not to trade—that is the question. With unemployment around 6 percent—coupled with a record $1.5 billion trade deficit for this first quarter of 1973—it is only natural that the issue of trading policies should be discussed in labor councils, the business community, among farming interests, and by leaders in Government. I am submitting for the RECORD an analysis of our trade problems entitled, "A Positive Response to Burke-Hartke," prepared by the Cargill Corp., a Minneapolis, Minn., based grain firm. This paper raises some points that should be of interest to any student of the issue:

A POSITIVE RESPONSE TO BURKE-HARTKE

THE PROBLEM

Since approximately 1965, the United States has found itself in an increasingly difficult and puzzling economic situation. The $6.8 billion trade surplus in 1964 was transformed into an approximately $3 billion deficit in 1971. Much of this reversal was the product of a very rapid rise in imports into the U.S. During the 1960s, while exports rose only about 120 percent, imports jumped fully 165 percent. During the same period, unemployment declined from 5.2 percent in 1964 to 3.5 percent in 1969 and then rose swiftly to 6 percent by the end of 1971. At the same time, the U.S. experienced serious and continuing price inflation. This inflation undermined the competitiveness of U.S. exports, as two recent studies indicate. One study . . . is a set of preliminary estimates, by Robert E. Lipsey and Irving B. Kravis of the National Bureau of Economic Research, comparing international price changes between 1962 and 1970. It shows that, in terms of each country's currency, price levels for internationally traded manufactured goods rose 16% in the United States over the eight-year period, 26% in Britain, but only 9% in Germany and 7% in Japan.[1]

The second study, done by the Council of Economic Advisers . . . compares unit labor costs in manufacturing for the United States with those of its major trading partners. It shows that, from 1964 to 1969, unit labor costs rose 13.2% in the United States as against 6.4% for its major partners.[2]

Because of these inflationary pressures, the U.S. dollar came to be clearly overvalued.

Since the dollar occupied a central role in international finance, both as a vehicle for international transactions and as a means of holding international reserves, the U.S. was not able to devalue its currency as easily as other nations. Moreover, in spite of complaints about the increasing U.S. deficit in its balance of payments (BOP), other nations proved unwilling to revalue their currencies upward against the dollar, since they did not wish to lose the competitive edge the dollar's over-valuation gave their exports. The New Economic Policy announced by President Nixon on August 15, 1971, was an attempt to implement new tools to deal with these mounting difficulties, traditional methods having proved inadequate. The major features of the NEP for our purposes were: (1) the 90-day freeze on wages, rents and prices, which has been transformed in Phase II to price, wage and rent controls; (2) suspension of convertibility of the dollar into gold; and (3) a temporary 10 percent import surcharge on goods not subject to mandatory import quotas. The dollar has not yet been made convertible, even in a limited way, but the surcharge was removed after agreement was reached on a new alignment of currencies which combined revaluation upward of the yen and the mark and devaluation of the dollar. In addition, some limited trade concessions were secured from the European Community and Japan.

This selective history of economic events over the past decade identifies several important problems. First, after a period when unemployment was reduced to acceptable levels, unemployment again spurted to high and unacceptable levels. Secondly, in the same period, the U.S. saw its trade surplus evaporate as imports rose more rapidly than exports. Thirdly, the U.S. went through a period of serious and largely uncontrolled inflation, one major consequence of which was to make the U.S. less competitive in international trade, with both her prices for internationally traded manufactured goods and her unit labor costs climbing more rapidly than for her major trading partners. Finally, because of the unique role occupied by the dollar in international monetary arrangements and because of the unwillingness of other nations to yield up the trade advantages accruing to them through the dollar's over-valuation, the U.S. was unable to correct the mounting currency imbalance in timely fashion, being forced to wait until the situation had reached nearly crisis proportions.

Against this backdrop, the AFL-CIO has projected the following picture:

Between 1966 and 1969 U.S. foreign trade produced the equivalent of a net loss of half a million American jobs.

During this period, although the number of export-related jobs increased, the number of jobs required to produce imported goods increased at a faster rate. If this trend held true in 1970—as it probably did—jobs required domestically to produce imported commodities which compete with American-made goods exceeded the number of jobs connected with export trade last year, or a net deficit existed in jobs related to foreign trade.

For manufacturing, this reversal has already taken place—by 1969 there was a net deficit of jobs in non-agricultural industries of 33,000 compared to a surplus of 328,000 only three years earlier.

Some industries are particularly hard hit. For example, employment of production workers in the consumer home entertainment electronics industry has declined from 128,600 to 96,600 since 1966 as imports continue to rise. Twenty-four thousand production jobs have been eliminated from the footwear industry since 1966.[3]

This analysis really involves two kinds of employment effects: First, hypothetical job losses—that is, if one could assume that jobs would have been created in the U.S. to produce the goods that were imported, there would have been x many jobs involved in that production; and secondly, actual jobs lost in certain industries, the production personnel employment decreases that occurred in those industries during the period examined. Clearly, these are two different categories of "employment". Actual job losses are certain and real social costs. Hypothetical job losses are uncertain. What factors are included in measuring these hypothetical losses can make large differences. Moreover, there is an important distinction between job losses and employment opportunities.

Footnotes at end of article.

Where actual jobs are lost, the worker also loses his employment opportunity, since his immediate employment opportunity was his job. But if the economy is generating new employment opportunities, the displaced worker will find a new job. There is, of course, slippage between actual jobs and new jobs arising from new employment opportunities. These can present serious problems which demand attention—temporary loss of income, loss of insurance benefits and other security, depleted savings, loss of seniority. Such problems make the distinction between actual jobs and new employment opportunities a focus of serious policy discussion.

The same is not true for hypothetical jobs lost in one (the import-competing) sector as compared with new employment opportunities generated within the economy as a whole. Both types of employment are prospective, so no real economic losses can be assigned to a hypothetical decline in employment opportunities, the policy questions are: (1) what strategy will create employment opportunities most closely in step with demand for new employment; and (2) what strategy will create employment opportunities which add the most to the material well-being and security of workers.

One way of posing these important policy questions is to ask whether a given increment in import-substituting production would have the same employment and welfare consequences as the same increment applied to production for export. Indications are that, of these two policy alternatives, the export-promoting alternative would have more positive employment consequences. For example, as Krause and Mathieson point out, " . . . it should be remembered that U.S. exports are labor-intensive relative to U.S. imports, as Leontief established and others subsequently confirmed".[4] In other words, the labor input into exports is proportionately greater than into a similar quantity of current U.S. imports. The reason for this seeming paradox is that the U.S. has historically invested rather heavily in education and training, making the U.S. relatively highly endowed with human capital.[5] Moreover, this relatively high endowment of human capital gets reflected in and helps to explain the higher wage rates prevailing in the U.S. as compared to her major trading partners. In a study designed to measure both the direct and indirect consequences of imposing import quotas to protect industries currently facing intense import competition, Professor Anne O. Kreuger's analysis revealed some of the welfare consequences of protecting jobs through import substitution rather than through a policy of export promotion. Two striking conclusions emerge. First, the wage range for industries where employment would be increased by quotas had a much higher concentration of wages at the lower end of the scale than did the industries where employment would be decreased by quotas. Secondly, the industries where employment would decline as a result of protectionist measures had an unweighted average annual wage in 1967 approximately 127% of the average annual unweighted wage for the industries where employment might be increased by quotas ($6,758 as compared with $5,335).[6] This is consistent with what one would expect: the greater intensity of human capital in exports is reflected in higher wage rates.

Thus, in contrast to labor's view that hypothetical jobs would become real jobs through import substitution, with a consequent increase in worker welfare, the human-capital intensity of exports implies that more and better-paying jobs would result from export promotion than from import substitution policies.

Footnotes at end of article.

The AFL–CIO's other employment argument is that competition from imports has thrown sizeable numbers of workers out of their jobs. They have extended this argument further, suggesting that this unemployment results from the relatively liberal foreign direct investment policy pursued by the U.S. In effect, asserts the AFL–CIO, the foreign direct investments of multinational corporations have resulted in an "export" of American jobs. Many of those multinational corporations have responded by showing that, in spite of their foreign investments, they have increased their domestic employment and their exports of products from the U.S. more rapidly than the average for manufacturing enterprises in the U.S. Again, this reflects the distinction which needs to be made between shifts in certain kinds of jobs and the net effect on employment opportunities. Perhaps the best survey in this area is one made by the Emergency Committee for American Trade, which analyzed the domestic and international operations of 74 U.S. corporations, with aggregate sales of $113 billion in 1970 (18 percent of total U.S. shipments of manufactured products), over the period 1960 through 1970. Among its findings were the following. These 74 multinational enterprises:

Increased the number of their domestic employees by nearly 900 thousand from 2,452 thousand to 3,348 thousand.

Increased the book value of their fixed assets in U.S. manufacturing facilities from $15.3 billion to $34.1 billion, a gain of $18.8 billion,

Increased their sales from American facilities from $58 billion to $113 billion, a gain of $55 billion,

Increased their exports from the United States to the rest of the world from $4.3 billion to $12.2 billion, a gain of $7.9 billion,

Increased their net surplus of exports over imports from $3.2 billion to $6.6 billion, a gain of $3.4 billion. . . .

Increased their domestic employment (exclusive of employment gain through acquisition) more rapidly than the average manufacturing firm. Their rate of new job creation was about *75 percent* greater than that of all other manufacturing firms. . . .

Increased their sales from domestic facilities *twice* as much as from their overseas operations,

Exported a growing proportion of their domestic production. Their ratio of exports to domestic production in 1970—*10.8 percent—double* that of the average U.S. manufacturing firm,

Accounted for a *small* and (except for U.S.-Canadian automobile trade) *declining* proportion of total U.S. imports.[7]

From this analysis it is clear that, whatever may be the case for isolated segments of some industries or for specific plants or communities, the *net aggregate* employment and production effects on the U.S. economy of the operations of these multinational corporations has been distinctly positive.

Moreover, whatever specific job displacements have been caused by increasing import competition, they have had a minimal effect on the total employment picture in the U.S. For example, Krause and Mathieson have studied the direct and indirect employment effects of the $1 billion net reduction in the U.S. trade balance between the first quarter of 1970 and the first quarter of 1971. They found that this sizeable decline in the U.S. net trade position accounted for a loss of 16,600 jobs.

To put the results somewhat differently, if unemployment had increased only because of trade dislocations, the unemployment rate would have risen from 4.16 percent to 4.18, rather than to the actual 1971: [1] average of 5.93 percent.[8]

It is important not to exaggerate the conclusions that the data assembled above support, either positively or negatively. But the following conclusions seem to be substantiated by this information: (1) to pursue a policy of import substitution in order to protect existing industries would retard the growth of export industries in the U.S.; (2) because of the high intensity of human capital in U.S. exports, a policy of import substitution rather than export promotion would be likely to have adverse consequences both on the level of employment in the U.S. and on the welfare and standard of living of American workers (and this appears to be true even without including the reduced purchasing power left to the American consumer as a result of substituting more costly domestically produced goods for current imports); (3) that the available evidence suggests that, in the aggregate, multinational enterprises have contributed more to domestic employment, domestic production and U.S. exports than have manufacturing enterprises as a whole; and (4) that domestic fiscal and monetary policies are much more important than trade policies in securing the policy objective of full employment.

This is not to say that labor has not identified some serious economic problems that deserve careful attention and constructive solutions. Plant closings and job losses are serious personal, community and national problems. But the proposals supported by some segments of organized labor in the Burke-Hartke bill sweep much more broadly than is necessary to come to grips with these problems and, more importantly, those policies would produce consequences—both domestically and through foreign retaliation in the area of international commercial policies—which would be counter-productive to increasing employment and improving labor welfare. They would also unfairly burden economic activities that have not been the source of the identifiable problems and which, in fact, help to generate the strength the nation needs to cope with the problems that are real. In effect, to tax the export-oriented and dynamically growing, more successful and more highly paying industries is a short-sighted policy that would disadvantage this area of the economy without achieving a long-term solution to the underlying problems.

Perhaps one handle on the real concerns of labor can be achieved by a brief review of the events which brought labor from its traditional position as a supporter of free trade to its present position as an advocate of protectionism. Of course, not all of labor by any means has made this turn-about; significant sectors of labor remain convinced of the long-term advantages for them and for the economy as a whole of freer trade and investment policies. But the reversal in position by a substantial segment of the labor community is a striking development which needs to be understood.

There have always been vested interests in this nation which have felt jeopardized by the increasing liberalization of trade and investment policies we have generally experienced since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Through much of this period, labor was a steadfast supporter of liberal trade policies. Their support was important in securing passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, providing the tariff-cutting authority which underpinned U.S. participation in the "Kennedy Round".

Portions of the labor community, however, were adopting a basically protectionist position as early as 1962, reflected in increasing Congressional dissatisfaction with the "relatively pure free trade approach"[9] they believed was embodied in the Trade Expansion Act. This drift toward protectionism accelerated gradually until 1967, and then emerged quite strongly with the lapse of tariff-negotiating authority in that year.

It is difficult to argue that this shift was caused by rising unemployment, since much of labor had moved to a basically protectionist position by the time unemployment stood at its post-Korean War low of 3.5 percent in 1969. This is not to say, however, that high

levels of unemployment do not contribute to protectionist pressures. The strong push behind the so-called "Mills bill" of 1970 and, now, behind the "Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972" are clear indications that political demands for protectionist legislation are greater in periods of high unemployment. Most economists agree, however, that trade policies are insignificant, when compared to the tools of monetary and fiscal policy, in dealing with problems of aggregate unemployment levels that are politically unacceptable. What seems to be the case, then, is that high levels of unemployment in the economy amplify the political pressures for protectionist trade and investment legislation, even though a declining trade balance and rising unemployment throughout the economy as a whole are largely unrelated economically.[10]

The causes of labor's concern seem to be somewhat narrower, although no less important from a policy standpoint, than levels of aggregate unemployment. In the period just after World War II, when many of the present multinational institutions—like the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the International Monetary Fund—became active, U.S. industry did not face any serious competition from industries in other nations. Today, Japan and the European Community are healthy, expanding industrial areas, fully able to compete with the U.S. on an equal basis. When the U.S. underwent a prolonged period of serious inflation after 1965, these nations were well-equipped to capitalize on the increasing over-valuation of the U.S. dollar compared to other currencies. They rapidly expanded their exports to the U.S. Certain domestic industries began to experience serious import competition from foreign industries, imposing large burdens of adjustment on these industries and the companies and workers in them.

The Adjustment Assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 proved to be inadequate to cope with these problems, both in their conception and in their interpretation and implementation. With the heightened degree of import competition and the increasing pace of change it entailed, the costs of adjustment imposed on those industries most exposed mounted rapidly, without any adequate policy tools to ease their burdens of adjustment. In the absence of an industrial and manpower strategy for the nation as a whole, designed to anticipate and to meet these challenges, those forced to bear a disproportionate share of the burdens of adjustment began to question whether the acknowledged advantages of freer trade were worth the price they were being asked to pay.

The multinational enterprise has come to play an important role in these developments. In the first place, it constitutes a vehicle by which technology can be diffused from the U.S. to other nations. Of course, it is also a vehicle for bringing foreign technology to the U.S., including the basic oxygen steel-making process, the rotary engine, the radial tire and many other basic processes or products. Thus, the multinational enterprise is a very visible vehicle and a very important element in the accelerated pace at which change now occurs in an increasingly interdependent world. Moreover, whatever has been true of the growth of multinational enterprises in general, several of them have obviously replaced U.S. plants and sources with foreign plants and sources. But, to put this aspect of multinational activities into context, if automotive imports resulting from the U.S.-Canadian Automotive Agreement are excluded, imports from U.S.-owned plants abroad represent only 2.4 percent of total U.S. imports. Even though these developments can be justified in terms of meeting foreign competition and even though they contribute to a general improvement in our economic well-being, they have become a focal point of criticism of the dislocation which follows upon economic integration, specialization and interdependence.

In many ways, it appears that this is labor's greatest concern. The greater freedom of investment, plant location decisions and movement of investment capital have weakened labor's ability to negotiate with companies, weakened labor's ability to protect the jobs and security of some of their workers and, in some cases, eroded the membership base for the unions themselves. It is not clear that declining union membership in certain industrial sectors and even for the manufacturing sector as a whole should be a public policy concern of the highest priority. But the rising insecurity for certain segments of the labor force, the loss of seniority, pension rights, health and life insurance, the collapse of one-industry communities—in other words, the burdens placed upon those who bear the major costs of adjustment in the economy (costs which are justified by the positive benefits they produce for the nation as a whole) do deserve the highest policy attention. Ironically, this may be the greatest misfortune of the protectionist efforts of supporters of Burke-Hartke—that the needs of those most harmed by the more rapid pace of change in today's technologically-dominated economy are not served by protectionism in the long run, but the long-term solutions to these problems are forestalled by pursuit of spurious objectives.

An effective long-term solution to these very real problems points, at the very least, to the need for a national industrial and manpower policy coordinated with such additional objectives as balanced economic growth through a diversification of the productive base and a regional balancing of economic development. In addition, in periods of relatively high unemployment, there will be a further need for aggressive fiscal, monetary and, perhaps, price and income policies to reduce aggregate levels of unemployment.

The industrial and manpower policy itself should be guided by the following objectives. First of all, it needs to be conceived as a method for anticipating necessary adjustments and not simply reacting to past, painful dislocations. This naturally means greater planning of educational, training and employment policies than the U.S. has had in the past. It will also require the development of a national clearinghouse for information on local employment and production opportunities. These activities almost necessarily must be undertaken at the federal level. Many people in the business community may find such radical alterations in traditional freedom of operation in labor and other factor markets disturbing, and their concern underlines the need for maintaining flexibility within this planning and coordinating policy. But those who would reject this alternative out of hand ought to ask themselves whether they prefer the alternative—increasing intervention in the flow of change itself through protectionist measures like that of Burke-Hartke. The U.S. can either seek to improve its capacity for and reduce the costs of factor—including labor—adjustment or it can seek to retard change by isolating the U.S. from the change going on in the rest of the world. If we are willing to accept the challenges of the former alternative, we may also be in a position to learn from the experiences of many European countries as well as Japan, who in many ways have moved far beyond the U.S. in the direction of coordinated manpower, industrial and regional development programs.

Secondly, where dislocations do occur in spite of the efforts to anticipate their effect and direction, programs must be devised to meet the human needs arising from those dislocations. For the workers and communities involved, more is at stake than simply the loss of current earning power. Seniority rights within the union and within the company are lost; health and life insurance protection is lost; pension benefits accrued through service are lost or reduced; the tax base which supports a community's welfare services, its police and fire protection, its educational and other community facilities and its health and sanitation services is eroded; finally, the entire economic health of the community can be jeopardized by the sudden loss of income of a significant portion of its wage earners. Obviously, not all of these losses can be recouped directly or through public policies. But many things can and ought to be done on a planned basis to support the economic and social well-being of individuals and communities caught up in this painful dislocation process.

Thirdly, training programs for displaced workers have to be improved. Moreover, some foresight in planning the skills which will be offered is necessary, so that a retrained individual is employable when he completes the program. Placement of workers also needs to be coordinated on a regional and national basis more effectively. These efforts link up with the planning steps discussed above.

As companies adapt to the increasingly interdependent economic world now emerging, labor unions and the labor movement will also have to adapt to new needs. They must come to recognize the shortcomings of past union policies in this new economic environment. This will mean not only new contract-negotiating strategies and objectives but also new membership policies. For example, greater international labor organization may have to be undertaken. Perhaps unions will have to move into previously unorganized areas. Moreover, as some union leaders—like George Meany—have publicly recognized, strike-enforced collective bargaining may be becoming too expensive for the union membership itself. It is difficult to map out what new directions will need to be taken, but unions will have to recognize that the best interests of their membership may be better served by new policies and new objectives.

On the industrial and production side, it appears that greater attention must be paid to developing and marketing products which reflect our comparative advantage. A recent study by Robert B. Stobaugh and associates at the Harvard Business School attempted to compare, through intensive examination of 9 case histories, the effects of making a foreign direct investment with what would have happened if the investment had not been made. This in-depth approach complements well the survey methods used by several others who have looked at the multinational corporation at a more generalized, aggregated level. This study reached two conclusions that need to be highlighted here.

In the first place, it concluded that the net "aggregate effects of U.S. foreign direct investment on U.S. employment and balance of payments are positive."

U.S. foreign direct investment provides jobs for production workers manufacturing components for further processing or assembling in foreign plants, goods for resale abroad or for sale on a commission basis that would otherwise not be sold abroad (so-called associate exports), and capital equipment for use in the foreign plants. Further jobs are provided for white-collar workers in the home office providing services for the foreign plants, technical personnel providing engineering and similar services, and research and development activities that could not be justified without the possibility of gaining income from the foreign plants.[11]

In addition, the study concludes that "if U.S. foreign direct investment did not exist U.S. exports would be lower than they otherwise would be . . . for most U.S. exports of manufactured goods are transitory until plants are built abroad."[12]

Secondly, the study pointed to one major source of U.S. comparative advantage, one which could be continued and expanded through investment in research and develop-

Footnotes at end of article.

ment and in human capital. Greater concentration by industry on the creation of new products and new jobs not only would strengthen the U.S. industrial base but would also strengthen our export performance and concentrate growth in higher income areas:

The factor that has enabled U.S. exports of manufactured goods to increase has been the continuous introduction of new products into old industries and the start of new industries. Today our technologically advanced industries [sic]), such as computers and aircraft, are very large exporters with increasing net trade balances, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of U.S. production . . .

The overall trade balance in technology-intensive goods has continued to increase—from around $6 billion in 1960 to $9.1 billion in 1965 and $9.6 billion in 1970. And the rise between 1965 and 1970 would have been some $1.5 billion higher except for the special provisions of the U.S.-Canadian auto pact . . .

Because of the higher incomes associated with the new technology-intensive industries generating new products, aiding these industries and making it easier to move resources into them rather than attempting to keep resources in the older, noncompetitive industries presumably would increase the U.S. national income. An added incentive, besides higher income, is the greater opportunity for coping with change in an expanding industry than in a retrenching one.[13]

Since the U.S. remains the largest market for new products, since the human-capital intensity of new technologies yields the U.S. a natural comparative advantage in these areas, industrial policy would better serve the needs of the society as a whole as well as industries and companies facing difficult adjustment problems if it were directed at expanding horizons rather than at retrenching to protect established but declining industries. This argument is even stronger when one adds to new products the potentialities of new production processes. As one example of the possibilities here, agricultural exports have been one of the most dynamically growing U.S. export areas, and that growth has resulted in great part from the continuous application of new technologies to production. As a result, agricultural productivity has increased dramatically and much more rapidly than for industry. An area for potential future growth will be development and manufacture of more efficient pollution-abatement devices.

Obviously, this process will involve shifts to new industries as well as shifts within established industries. For example, some of the greatest import competition the U.S. has experienced has been in consumer electronics and in certain areas of chemical production. But because of the introduction of new products in the areas of computers and other electronics fields and because of the development of new industrial chemicals, polymers and pharmaceutical goods, both of these industries as a whole have been able to maintain continued and growing trade surpluses.[14] Continued strength in these and other industrial areas will be achieved best not by seeking to protect established industries against the natural shifts in industrial and product cycles which occur in an increasingly interdependent world but by capitalizing on America's growing demand for new products and her ability to meet that new demand by investment in research and development and in human capital.

Obviously, there is nothing easy or simple about this alternative. Its difficulties may cause some to prefer the more short-sighted but simpler approach of retreating into a protectionist policy in an attempt to preserve the status quo. But, as with all attempts to stand in one place in the face of change all about, such a strategy leads to isolation.

Footnotes at end of article.

CONCLUSION

The problems of adjusting to change are serious and real ones. They point up the fact that the United States has not, in the past, developed a balanced policy of freer trade and investment. We have become complacent about the problems of adjustment to change because in earlier periods change came less rapidly and shifts of workers and resources to new employment could be accommodated more easily. That complacency is out of place in today's dynamic and highly competitive world economy. But the reversal of U.S. trade and investment policy envisioned by the Burke-Hartke bill is equally out of place. I have already attempted to show how it is counter-productive and how it imposes substantial burdens on certain sectors of the economy—like agriculture—that rely heavily on export markets. To the extent that the rationale behind Burke-Hartke lies in the belief that the U.S. is the only relatively "open" market for imports, there are serious questions concerning both the accuracy of such a view—especially in view of the proliferation of non-tariff barriers to imports erected by the U.S. in the past few years in contrast to European and Japanese efforts, however much we might criticize their pace, in the opposite direction—and whether closing the U.S. market serves the goal of balancing international flows of goods and capital. Finally, to the extent that the rationale behind Burke-Hartke lies in the belief that protectionism will solve the continuing problems of adjusting to change, proponents of such a position have grossly ignored the costs of such a tactic. Those costs are well summarized in a dissent by William R. Pearce to a section of the Williams Commission report dealing with the problem of adjustment:

"The costs of protection are many and varied. Import restrictions protect both competitive and noncompetitive firms in the protected industry. They undermine the restraints imports place on inflation both by permitting protected industries to accept excessive wage demands because they can be passed on to consumers and by restricting the availability of many low-cost consumer items. Protection does not avoid the costs of adjustment. It simply transfers them to other workers and industries, since we are forced under GATT rules either to compensate our trading partners or run the risk of retaliation. Moreover, to the extent that protection persists over an extended period of time, the costs of protection—in contrast to the once-and-for-all costs of adjustment assistance—are multiplied.

"Given this situation, I see little justification for—correctly—recommending adjustment assistance for limited dislocation but then reversing course and recommending protection where major industries are involved. Such an approach might be forced on the government by political realities—since the funds for adjustment assistance must be appropriated by the Congress whereas the cost of protection is hidden in higher product prices borne by users of protected goods—but it does not constitute good public policy. If major industries are to receive protection, this decision should be reached with full knowledge that the economic costs of such protection will heavily outweigh those of programs of adjustment assistance." [15]

This statement well expresses the issue posed by the problems of change and the approach Burke-Hartke proposes to take toward those problems. Congress is designed to arrive at the interests of the nation as a whole by piecing together the individual interests of separate districts and states. Instances of dislocation are readily identifiable, and the political pressures to take action radiate strongly from those instances. The costs of protection as the policy solution to those problems are diffuse and less frequently articulated. As long as those costs remain hidden from public view, they will not be weighed adequately in public policy decision-making, especially when the policy choice appears to be between facing up to the real costs of adjustment through a coordinated industrial and manpower policy for the country and covering up those costs temporarily by measures which, in the first instance, discriminate against our foreign trading partners and which only after a lag come to discriminate against other sectors of the U.S. economy.

Most public discussion and most of the analysis here focus on the economic dimensions of Burke-Hartke. Economies, however, do not exist in a vacuum, as the disastrous experience under the Smoot-Hawley tariff law demonstrated. More recently, the economic measures President Nixon announced on August 15, 1971, illustrated once again that investment and trade policy, monetary policy and foreign policy are inextricably inter-twined. The 10 percent import surcharge stirred serious discussion of retaliation, and most observers believed that if that surcharge had become anything but a temporary device, we would have seen retaliation against U.S. exports and foreign investments from a number of quarters. Burke-Hartke proposes an essentially permanent regime of trade and capital restraints which would be certain to provoke retaliation.

In addition to undermining our relations with Europe, Canada, Japan and other industrialized nations, Burke-Hartke would also seriously undercut another dimension of our foreign policy. For several decades now, it has been a part of our foreign policy to aid the less developed countries (LDCs) of the world to begin the long and arduous struggle towards greater development and a better standard of living for the two-thirds of the world's population that lives in these LDCs. By erecting barriers to labor-intensive manufactured products—both through quotas and through restraints on the transfer of capital and technology to these LDCs—Burke-Hartke in effect blunts the promise which our past foreign policy has held out to these countries.

As Hugh Patrick notes:

"The United States is in danger of retreating into comprehensive economic protectionism. . . . The problem is not just textiles. Already it is steel, and consumer electrical appliances. Soon it may well be automobiles, a wide range of standardized, mass-produced, skill-simple consumer appliances, and even consumer goods. And it is not just Japan. Already in textiles it is Hong Kong, Korea, Taiwan. In specific industries there are half a dozen Japans around the corner—Brazil, Mexico, Singapore, any country that becomes successful in industrializing and learning to reduce real costs. . . .

Economic protectionism will inevitably result in loss of America's leadership role internationally, and lead to political isolationism." [16]

We have already noted above that Burke-Hartke does not really constitute an effective long-term solution to the problems of dislocation and adjustment which a more rapid pace of change has brought in its wake. We have also noted the tremendous economic costs of such an approach—both domestically and through retaliation. The point here is that Burke-Hartke also exacts tremendous diplomatic costs as well. One must seriously question the equity of transferring the burdens of adjustment onto the shoulders of the economically fragile LDCs, removing from them the one hope they have for closing the gap between the haves and the have-nots. One must also question seriously the wisdom of the reversal of our foreign policy implicit in Burke-Hartke. That bill would mean the withdrawal by the U.S. of the promise we have held out to them through the history of our foreign aid and most recently through the development of a generalized preference scheme for manufactured exports of the LDCs—that there would be a growing U.S. market for the industrialization we have en-

couraged these nations to undertake. At the very least, Burke-Hartke would alter this past policy so drastically as to deserve careful and considered study before any action is taken.

In the interim, those who do believe that the protectionist policies embodied in Burke-Hartke are short-sighted should identify and communicate those concerns to Congress. Agriculture can play an instrumental part in this process by forcefully and cogently communicating to Congress the costs protectionism would exact from it. Other industries will have to join in. In addition, efforts must be made to recognize the serious burdens of adjustment rapid change means. Again, the agricultural community can play an active role in this process, since it has come to appreciate the importance of a balanced regional development policy, embracing rural and urban needs within a common program. The problems of adjustment in an increasingly interdependent economic world pose the same challenge—developing a balanced industrial and manpower policy which permits society as a whole to secure the advantages of more liberal trade and investment while facing up to the costs some are asked to bear while making the needed adjustments. The challenge is two-fold: to make it politically impossible to ignore the costs of a protectionist strategy while making it politically feasible to deal directly with the limited problems that change entails.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Trade Deficit: A Fact in Search of a Theory," International Economic Letter, February, 1972, First National City Bank, 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, 8.

[3] Needed: A Constructive Foreign Trade Policy, *op. cit.*, 62.

[4] "How Much of Current Unemployment Did We Import?, Lawrence B. Krause and John A. Mathieson, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2: 1971, 421. A study summarized by Andrews Brimmer, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, also points out that when one adds to employment generated by exports employment gains from processing and marketing imports and employment gains from the greater purchasing power low-cost imports provide, "these jobs clearly exceed the number of 'hypothetical' jobs which might result if competitive imports were produced in the United States. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 118, pt. 8, pp. 9467–9652.

[5] See "Trends in U.S. Trade and Comparative Advantage," William H. Branson and Helen B. Junz, *ibid.*, 322ff.

[6] "Quotas on American Imports Would Reduce Employment in American Industry," Anne O. Kreuger, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 32, p. 42230. The relative distribution of wages in the industries Kreuger studied (ground on the basis of industries where quotas would increase employment and industries where quotas would decrease employment) can be summarized as follows:

Wage range	Number of industries in group where employment is increased by quotas	Number of industries in group where employment is decreased by quotas
Less than $4,000	1	0
$4,001 to $4,500	2	1
$4,501 to $5,000	2	0
$5,001 to $5,500	1	0
$5,501 to $6,000	1	3
$6,001 to $6,500	1	6
$6,501 to $7,000	1	3
More than $7,000	1	2

It is also interesting to note that Kreuger's analysis bears out Leontief's conclusion that U.S. exports are more labor-intensive than her imports. Comparing direct and indirect employment effects arising from demand for exports with direct and indirect employment effects of replacing U.S. imports with domestic production (and assuming that the latter alternative would not shift costs up and consumer demand down, which is, as she says, an "extreme assumption"), she found that for the industries she studied, import substitution would *decrease* total employment by approximately 150,000 or 15 percent.

[7] "The Role of the Multinational Corporation in the United States and World Economies", based on an analysis by the International Economic Subcommittee of the Emergency Committee for American Trade of the Domestic and International Activities of 74 U.S. Corporations (February 1972), 4–5.

[8] "How Much of Current Unemployment Did We Import?" *op cit.*, 421.

[9] "Crisis in United States Trade Policy", C. Fred Bergsten, Foreign Affairs, July, 1971.

[10] As Krause and Mathieson note, ". . . while the trade balance was declining from $6.8 billion in 1964 to $0.7 billion in 1969, unemployment also declined from 5.2 percent to 3.5 percent." "How Much of Current Unemployment Did We Import?", *op. cit.*, 418.

[11] "U.S. Multinational Enterprises and the U.S. Economy: A Research Study of the Major Industries that Account for 90 Percent of U.S. Foreign Direct Investment in Manufacturing", Robert B. Stobaugh and associates, Harvard Business School, January 1972, 30.

[12] *Ibid.*, 30.

[13] *Ibid.*, 32–34.

[14] *Ibid.*, 32.

[15] United States International Economic Policy in an Interdependent World, *op. cit.*, 318–19.

[16] "United States & Japan: Danger Ahead", United States-Japan Trade Council (December 1, 1971), 9.

TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL HARMONY—II

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, millions of Americans feel that only an environmental disaster such as a "killer smog" can jolt our government into taking significant action toward cleaning up our environment and protecting the quality of life which we have known in the past.

But that feeling need not prevail. Congress is working diligently in many areas of pollution control, and some very important measures have already been passed. We owe it to ourselves, and to our children, to continue our endeavors in this field. I have heavily committed my time and energy to the challenge of developing strong and effective legislation to deal with the environmental crises which we are facing.

The area which requires our immediate attention and concern is what I have referred to as the triangle of pollution: Air, water, and noise. I have been involved in major legislative efforts in all three areas, and as a member of the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, I feel that we on that subcommittee are making significant strides forward. Every American must be willing to bear a portion of the burden of the huge task facing us in cleaning up our air and waters and combating the rampant spread of unbearable noise.

All my efforts are based on my campaign commitment to the aims and philosophy of the Santa Barbara Declaration of Environmental Rights, which states:

> It is manifest that centuries of careless neglect of the environment has brought mankind to the final crossroads. The quality of our lives is eroded and our very existence is threatened by our abuse of the natural world.

Unquestionably, we must seize the opportunities offered by the great variety of legislation now before Congress and continue to enact measures which will return our Nation to the environmental balance and harmony it once knew.

AIR POLLUTION

I am proud to have supported the Clean Air Act of 1969 when I was a Congressman. This legislation applies stringent standards on motor vehicle emissions for the 1972, 1973, and 1974 model years. The 1970 amendments to the act specify that all 1975 models must achieve a like reduction of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions from the 1970 levels. They further state that all 1976 models will achieve a like reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions from the 1971 models. The Environmental Protection Agency is provided with the authority to control or prohibit the sale of vehicles which endanger the public health and welfare.

I stand by strict enforcement of these laws, and I urge assembly line inspection of vehicles to insure that they meet these standards. I support the recent decision by EPA Administrator William Ruckelshaus that no extensions will be granted to automobile manufacturers and oil companies on compliance with the Clean Air Act.

In March, I held a hearing in Los Angeles on the administration of the Clean Air Act. As a result of that hearing, I became convinced that it is necessary for the Congress to take appropriate action to protect our citizens from the effects of auto pollution. I have made numerous recomendations to the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, based on the need for an integrated approach to clean, safe, quiet, drivable, and efficient automobiles. I will pursue this matter throughout the coming years, while watching carefully to insure that the consumer is not required to pay an unfair cost of production of air pollution control devices in automobiles.

NOISE POLLUTION

An estimated 10 to 40 million Americans have some degree of hearing impairment caused primarily by overexposure to excessive noise. The unwanted sound which threatens public health, peace of mind, and the value of property, is a serious and mounting problem. Noise must be recognized as a threat to all of us as human beings and dealt with before the unpleasant inconvenience of today follows the course of air and water pollution to require major efforts to control.

Consequently, I introduced in March the Noise Pollution Control Act of 1972, cosponsored by Senator MUSKIE. This

bill shared many of the features of the House-passed noise legislation, but I felt that a more comprehensive attack on the problem was necessary. Hearings have been held in both San Francisco and Washington, and we are now proceeding with the work of combining various solutions into one final noise control bill.

WATER POLLUTION

Industrial, municipal, and agricultural wastes are the chief sources of water pollution. I am proud of having joined Senator MUSKIE in the introduction of the original legislation in this area: The omnibus water quality bill, S. 523. Extensive hearings were held last spring, culminating in the lengthy closed committee sessions to report out a final bill. At this time I introduced amendments to this legislation to establish by 1976 a national minimum water quality standard, with strict procedures for the extension of deadlines, to make our Nation's water safe for swimming and to protect fish and wildlife. Additionally, my "Tahoe Amendment" became a part of the final bill, as my efforts to save the tremendous beauty and fragile ecology of the lake basin continue. S. 2770, the resultant bill, was passed by the Senate on November 2, 1971. This legislation will be the major structure for efforts to clean up America's waterways for the benefit of ourselves and our children. The House passed a similar, but less stringent and comprehensive, piece of legislation this session, and the differences are being discussed and settled in a conference before the President receives a final version.

In addition, I am cosponsoring several other measures which will fight the rampant pollution of our waters. One such bill would give special aid to the one-third of the Nation not served by sewer systems and the 5 percent of the existing systems which discharge waste directly without any treatment. Another bill is S. 1017, the Clean Lakes Act of 1971, which calls for a coordinated program of increased waste treatment and lake cleansing for fresh water lakes.

To help combat oil pollution, I support bridge-to-bridge communications for all ships flying under the American flag. This I feel would lessen the chances of such collisions as the one in San Francisco Bay last year which spilled oil into the bay. I have also joined in offering S. 673, which would put a moratorium on drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel.

Thermal pollution, the discharge of heated effluents from electrical powerplants and other sources, is another threat to our aquarian environment. I favor tough and strictly enforced standards curbing thermal pollution, as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

In each of these areas, and new fields as they come in, I support strong legislation to curb pollution in our Nation. As a member of the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, I will continue to work for solid legislation.

SOLID WASTES

Bottles, cans, cartons, paper, and other refuse fill our dump sites and litter our countryside and cities. Scattered refuse is one of the most evident, and least desirable, forms of environmental pollution.

I am sponsoring a series of 16 bills which would commit the Federal Government to use recycled materials. These measures involve many agencies, projects, and so forth, and include the printing and publication of such documents as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, I am cosponsoring S. 856, which provides Federal assistance to the States to carry out programs to remove abandoned or junked cars.

PESTICIDES

Evidence linking pesticides to injury and death of a variety of life forms, continues to mount. We must not permit ourselves to be sold by the marvels of science without making certain that they will protect all facets of the environment. I am cosponsoring S. 1794, to study and develop biological and cultural methods of pest control, and S. 573, which gives the EPA authority to regulate the use of hazardous substances. The former bill passed the Senate and is presently awaiting action by the House Agriculture Committee.

RADIATION

I support the tightest controls on the utilization of nuclear power to produce electrical energy. However, the heart of the problem is the need to understand and meet the growing demands for energy. Power production in California has doubled every 8 years. We must educate ourselves as consumers to the need for changes, and we must find new sources of "clean" energy.

I am also deeply concerned about the potential danger to human beings exposed to extensive microwave radiation. This is a form of electromagnetic energy which is generated during the operation of such devices as radar, communication relay systems, electronic—microwave—ovens, medical and dental diathermy apparatus, and so forth. We know that microwave radiation can cause severe damage to the eye, leading to blindness, cause sterilization and severe burns, and possibly cause severe psychological problems.

In an attempt to gain some knowledge into the effects of prolonged exposure to this form of energy, I have introduced S. 3487, which authorizes $10,000,000 for research on the biological effects of microwave radiation. These funds have been suggested by HEW to supplement the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968. I sincerely hope that we will soon ascertain exactly what are the dangers of microwave radiation and what might be done to prevent overexposure.

ANIMAL PROTECTION

To protect endangered species, I have cosponsored many measures. Last December, one of these, S. 1116, to protect wild horses and burros on public lands, was signed into law by the President. In addition I am involved in Senate Joint Resolution 84, to establish a Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; S. 2141, to create a Desert Pupfish National Monument; S. 3362, to create a Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge; S. 2241, to create the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge; and S. 1315, to protect ocean mammals. So many species of animals are being placed on "endangered" or "rare" lists; it is time to assist those who have been working to protect our national wildlife heritage.

PARKS

The annual overcrowding of Yosemite National Park and the lack of public access to California's beaches clearly demonstrate the need for more park areas.

I have introduced S. 689, which creates a Channel Islands National Park. I will incorporate this in my future legislation to create a California Coastline National Park. In addition to the Channel Islands, this park could include coastal portions of the U.S. Marine Base at Camp Pendleton, the ocean frontage at Vandenburg Air Force Base, the Los Padres National Forest along the Big Sur Coast, and the Point Reyes National Seashore.

I have also joined in legislation to create another recreation area in California: a Golden Gate National Recreation Area (S.2342). I will soon be introducing legislation to designate Lake Berryessa in Northern California as a national recreation area.

WILDERNESS AND WILDLIFE AREAS

To preserve and protect our lands, I have sponsored a number of bills including S. 1017, to increase Federal funding for reclamation projects in 17 Western States; S. 1592, to establish a commission to study clearcutting of timber resources of the United States on Federal lands; and S. 1245, to protect archeological sites threatened by Federal projects. This last measure passed the Senate and was referred to the House for action on August 6, 1971.

I am also involved in many legislative attempts to protect our wilderness areas for public enjoyment. There are four bills which I have sponsored now pending in the Senate to establish: the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area (S. 2680), Lopez Canyon National Wilderness (S. 3027), and S. 1920, to acquire lands and interests within the San Bernardino National Forest.

On May 17, I introduced another bill, S. 3618, which designates 14 new wilderness areas in California. Located throughout the State, these Federal lands total 1.725 million acres and will comprise wildernesses, parks, and monuments. The proposals for this bill were developed by California citizens. I feel that frequently the official proposals of the Department of Interior and the Forest Service are not adequate nor within the spirit of the Wilderness Act; thus, this measure insures that these proposals will receive equal treatment and consideration by the Congress.

POPULATION

I have cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 108 which would declare it U.S. policy to achieve population stabilization by voluntary means. I also advocate legislation to provide birth control information and devices to those who need but cannot afford them.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY

The pace of innovation in science and technology has surpassed our ability to control their detrimental byproducts. We must regain control. Consequently, I

favor efforts such as S. 1113, which creates a National Environmental Laboratory with a $1 billion program for research and development related to environmental protection. Extensive Senate support enabled this measure to pass in December of last year, and it is now being considered by the House. It is especially important to California as it would provide research and development opportunities for many of our presently unemployed, highly trained scientists, and it could make new gains in our fight to save our environment.

I look forward to sponsoring and supporting more legislation in this vital area. And I trust that Congress will pursue the various means of improving the quality of life, following through with the bills which are now being considered. We must, in every instance, consider the merits of a bill in relation to the economy as well as the environment. We will never be able to regain the environmental state the Indians knew—our technology and industry have advanced too far without precaution to return to an ideal state. Our goal must now be an ecoindustrial society; we must achieve a balance between our environmental needs and our industrial advancement.

Congress must adopt legislation which is both innovative and responsive. We should embrace and implement the sense of ecological balance of the first Americans by enacting legislation consonant with their environmental wisdom, a wisdom indispensable to our survival and to improving the quality of our lives.

TRAGIC SHOOTING OF GOVERNOR WALLACE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, once again America has felt the savage and senseless blow of the assassin's bullet. Our political process is again marred by deplorable violence. All Americans are justifiably angry and bitter that such acts would occur in our Nation.

It is indeed a sad occurrence that in our great democratic Nation a man must take such great risks simply to express his political views and to participate in political campaigns. Gov. George Wallace, the leading advocate of law and order in this presidential race, has become the latest victim of lawlessness and violence. It is a tragic commentary but ironic that George Wallace continues to send us a clear message of the problem of lawlessness that has gripped this country, and which continues as a growing menace to us all.

During his campaign Governor Wallace has seized the imagination of the voters of this Nation as they attempt to have their voices heard. He has expressed the growing disenchantment with big and unresponsive government. He understands the fears and struggles of the workingman. He expresses their desire for a return to law and order—a return to the fundamental principles upon which our Republic was founded—and a return to a government that strictly adheres to those principles.

As of today, I understand that Governor Wallace has received more popular votes in the primaries than any other candidate. This has been a clear, unmistakable message from a people grown weary of taxation to finance countless government programs of dubious merit. It is the legitimate voice of responsible concern crying out. It must not be ignored.

I certainly wish Governor Wallace a most speedy recovery that he might be able to continue his efforts as a voice for the many millions of Americans throughout this Nation who are concerned about the direction of our Government.

A PLEA FOR JUDICIAL RESTRAINT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. WIGGINS) recently addressed himself to one of the most important questions of the day in an insightful and timely special report to his constituents entitled, "A Plea for Judicial Restraint." I would like to call this report to the attention of the entire House because it cogently examines the implications of the growing trend toward judicial activism for our system of shared powers between the branches of Government. In warning that recent actions of the judicial branch may be threatening to upset the delicate balance of mutual restraint on which that system of shared powers rests, Congressman WIGGINS underscores arguments that have previously been made by some of our leading constitutional scholars, including the late Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter and Prof. Alexander Bickel of Yale University.

Congressman WIGGINS points out that the traditional role of the courts has been "to provide a forum for the fair and peaceful resolution of private wrongs" and that they have generally left to the legislative bodies "the duties of defining a public wrong and providing redress for it." In taking on decisions involving broad policy matters and addressing themselves to alleged public wrongs which affect all of society, the courts are tilting the balance of power and responsibility among the branches of Government in such a way as to pose a threat to the fundamental constitutional design.

Moreover, this inordinate extension of the courts comprises but one thread of a wider sequence of trends coalescing in frontal challenge to our national system of divided authority:

> The States are rapidly becoming merely administrative appendages of the Federal Government, the executive branch has dominated the legislative, and now the judiciary is assuming an activist role in shaping national policy.

Congressman WIGGINS cites, in particular, the thrust of a variety of recent decisions in which the courts have asserted themselves by the use of "affirmative orders," which not only prescribe future conduct, but require highly detailed agendas for affirmative action by the defendant—be he a private citizen or a governmental agency—to undo the wrong previously committed. Certainly few would disagree, including my colleague from California, that the power to enjoin illegal or unconstitutional actions is properly and necessarily within the judicial purview, as is the authority to prescribe general remedies. But by going beyond that point and assuming responsibility to specify and administer detailed affirmative policies, the courts are in danger of becoming bogged down in a "political thicket of policymaking" that in the long-run will only jeopardize their position of objective detachment and impartiality—a necessary requisite of public confidence and support.

Congressman WIGGINS is especially concerned, as we all should be, that in taking on this authority, the courts are depriving the people of powers and responsibilities which are rightfully theirs. He reminds us that, according to the basic principles of democracy, "decisions involving policy matters should be made by a democratically selected political body directly answerable to the people" and that recent judicial activism "is inconsistent with tradition and represents a dangerous shift of power from the people, acting through their elected representatives, to judges answerable only to their conscience." His final warning is a warning to everyone, including the courts:

> If the people should lose confidence in the ability of the courts to discharge their functions with justice, objectivity, and traditional restraint, the people may exercise that authority which is ultimately theirs in a manner which could upset a balance in governmental power which was struck two centuries ago and which is worth preserving.

A PLEA FOR JUDICIAL RESTRAINT

(By Hon. Charles E. Wiggins)

In this special report I wish to focus attention upon the changing role of the courts as one of the co-equal and coordinate branches of government.

We all recall from our early civics classes that the genius of the American political experiment fashioned in Philadelphia in 1789 was the fragmented nature of the government which was proposed. The framers of our Constitution divided political power between the federal and state governments, and within the federal structure, a further division was established so that the executive, legislative, and judicial branches each exercised a check and balance against the others.

Without question, this fragmentation of governmental authority was a deliberate act by our founding fathers and was intended by them to preserve to a maximum extent an individual's freedom from the only creature capable of taking it away: an irresponsible government.

We were told that these political innovations were fundamental to our form of government and not susceptible of change save by the will of the people themselves; but these great principles which once provided us with a sense of security and comfort can no longer be viewed as immutable. The states are rapidly becoming merely administrative appendages of the federal government, the executive branch has dominated the legislative, and now the judiciary is assuming an activist role in shaping national policy.

"Checks and balances" is rapidly becoming a slogan without meaning or substance. To the extent that this carefully structured system is being eroded, individual freedom itself may be in jeopardy.

It is surely obvious to all that there is an uneasiness which pervades this land concerning the recent activities of the judicial branch of government. Perhaps the word "uneasiness" is not fully descriptive of the public attitudes which are developing and which must be of concern to all thoughtful citizens. "Disrespect and distrust" may be more appropriate.

At the outset, it is well to bear in mind the historic function of the courts. Simply stated, courts exist to provide a forum for the fair and peaceful resolution of private wrongs. To illustrate: a private wrong might include a typical automobile accident case or a land dispute or a divorce. The essence of the litigation is a private controversy between identifiable litigants disputing a transaction or event which affects them. A public wrong, on the other hand, affects all of society, such as widespread hunger or illiteracy.

Traditionally, courts have confined themselves to the resolution of private wrongs and have left to legislative bodies the duties of defining a public wrong and providing a redress for it. This is as it should be, since public wrongs do not lend themselves to judicial solutions. The reason for this is the limitation upon a court's fact-finding processes and the essentially political nature of public wrongs and remedies. Private litigants presumably know and can inform the court of all of the facts which bear upon their claim, but public questions involve policy considerations, national goals, geographic differences, and spending priorities. Only a broadly based representative body can bring the collective judgment and experience to bear upon these factors in order to place them into focus.

Perhaps more fundamentally, decisions involving policy matters should be made by a democratically selected political body directly answerable to the people.

Quite properly, the courts have played a role in limiting excesses in the exercise of legislative and executive power. But they have done so within the context of private litigation and have carefully avoided challenging governmental policy, as distinguished from constitutional power to act.

The traditional role of the courts, however, is changing. More and more, pioneering judges are entertaining litigation which is aimed at asserted public wrongs. If a legislature should frustrate the wishes of a class of citizens by rejecting their claims, the courts are being asked to fashion a remedy. This judicial activism is inconsistent with tradition and represents a dangerous shift of power from the people, acting through their elected representatives, to judges answerable only to their conscience. It is a trend which is bad for the courts and worse for the country.

If the people should lose confidence in the ability of the courts to discharge their functions with justice, objectivity, and traditional restraint, the people may exercise that authority which is ultimately theirs in a manner which could upset a balance in governmental power which was struck two centuries ago and which is worth preserving.

Crusading judges should ponder the obvious truth expressed by the late Justice Frankfurter:

"The Court's authority—possessed of neither the purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanctity. Such feeling must be nourished by the Court's complete detachment—in fact and in appearance—from political entanglements and by abstention from injecting itself into the clash of political forces in political settlements."

Within recent years, Mr. Justice Frankfurter was the most consistent advocate of judicial restraint. It has been the failure of courts at all levels to heed his advice that is the core of the problem.

All too frequently, decisions are rendered for no other reason than that the judges disagree with the legislature on matters of policy. The judgment may be couched in language challenging the constitutionality of an enactment, but the real complaint is that the legislative enactment is simply unwise. A classic illustration of judicial activism of this sort was the recent decision of the California Supreme Court declaring the death penalty to be "cruel or unusual punishment" contrary to the California Construction. There is absolutely no doubt that the death penalty was not intended to be unconstitutional by the drafters of the California Constitution or by the people who ratified it. The judges of the California Supreme Court simply decided that the original wisdom of the people was no longer valid.

The late Justice Stone, who served for sixteen years with distinction as a member of the United States Supreme Court, expressed the following view, which apparently was not appealing to the California justices:

"The power of the courts to declare a statute unconstitutional is subject to two guiding principles of decision which ought never to be absent from judicial consciousness. One is that courts are concerned only with the power to enact statutes, not with their wisdom. The other is that, while unconstitutional exercise of power by the Executive and Legislative branches of government is subject to judicial restraint, the only check upon our own exercise of power is our own sense of self restraint. For the removal of unwise laws from the statute books appeal lies not to the courts but to the ballot and to the processes of democratic government."

Another area in which courts are asserting themselves with disturbing frequency involves the use of "affirmative orders." To illustrate the problem, if an individual is pursuing a course of conduct which is legally wrong and which harms another, the injured party wants the conduct stopped, now and in the future. Courts possess the power in appropriate cases to grant such relief by issuing an injunction, or order, prohibiting future conduct. "Affirmative orders," however, go one step further. Not only is future conduct proscribed, the court requires affirmative action designed to undo the wrong previously committed.

All well and good—in some cases—but when the wrongdoer is a governmental agency, the requirement that it undertake a specific course of future conduct transfers governmental decision-making from the legislative to the judicial branch.

This technique has been employed extensively in the school desegregation cases. Schools are not only being ordered to stop acts and policies which tend to discriminate against racial minorities (a wholly proper requirement), but also are being affirmatively directed with regard to a wide range of future school policies—the location of district boundaries, the sites for specific schools, the racial composition of faculty and students within each school, the transportation of students by racial quotas to particular schools, the propriety of textual materials, test techniques, etc., etc.

These are areas which courts should shun, since the effect of these orders requires a diversion of funds to comply with them. It is no proper business of courts to choose between the expenditure of public funds for school buses or remedial reading materials, for instance. Nor is the court the proper unit of government to determine that tax funds should be channeled into education, rather than for national defense purposes or programs to protect our environment. But that is the effect of many of these affirmative orders issued by over-zealous judges.

In my opinion, it is not necessary, in order to halt illegal government action, that courts involve themselves in the political thicket of policy-making.

I should not be understood as damning all affirmative orders issued against governmental agencies. Proper cases for such a remedy obviously exist. I plead only for restraint. The alternatives are not pleasant to contemplate: continued erosion of public respect for the judiciary and the risk of repressive laws, which, under other circumstances, would not be seriously considered.

An orderly society cannot exist without the agency of a respected judiciary. It would be to further the cause of true justice and to re-establish a balance between the judiciary and the other branches of government if judicial activism were tempered by self-restraint and discretion, the foundation upon which continued national respect for the court's authority largely depends.

ELDERLY NEEDS LOW-RENT HOUSING

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months many constituents have contacted me about the need for funding of low-rent public housing for the elderly. This body shares their concern and must make every effort to see that the Federal Government fulfills its obligations to the millions of families whose incomes are too low to be able to afford decent housing.

As we consider appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I wish to express my concern over the withholding by the administration of funds already appropriated by the Congress for low-rent public housing and urge reconsideration of that action.

According to the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials, whose statistics were based on the total number of approved applications for construction starts and ones that are pending or have been denied, the demand for low-rent public housing is somewhere between one-half and 1 million additional units. Of the total, approximately 40 percent of the units can be expected to be for housing senior citizens. As urban deterioration continues, the needs will continue to rise sharply.

A goal of 795,000 units for public housing for fiscal years 1969–73 was set by HUD in 1968 but to date only 395,000 have been started through fiscal year 1972 with 90,000 units scheduled for fiscal 1973. Thus, we will have fallen 310,000 unts or 40 percent short of the original goal. In addition an original HUD goal of 200,000 new public housing units per year has now been lowered to 100,000 units per year.

Since 1937 when the low-rent housing program was initiated, the Congress has authorized $1.5 billion to build low-rent units. Of this amount, the Government has expended approximately 93 percent

of the money authorized for the program. According to the latest figures I have, however, only 67 percent of available contract authority money for new low-rent public housing will be used in fiscal year 1972 and that $130 million in available authority is being withheld. This $130 million would have resulted in approximately 80,000 new units being developed.

A review of HUD's proposed budget reveals that only 65 percent of available contract authority will be used in fiscal year 1973 and at least $97 million in available authority will be withheld. The projected withholding for fiscal year 1973 would result in 60,000 new units. This is based on the appropriation figure of $150 million for contract authority contained in today's bill.

No administration in recent years, regardless of party, has been immune to the practice of withholding or delaying the release of moneys until an opportune time. The procedure is presently being used in several other programs in addition to the low-rent public housing, including the water and sewer grant programs of Agriculture and HUD and the highway program of the Transportation Department. In many instances, the reasons involve complex questions of financial administration and broad economic objectives with which I can agree. But because I believe adequate housing—especially for the elderly—is one of the country's most critical needs, I call upon the administration to order the release of the funds for the low-rent public housing purpose for which they were intended.

THE DAILY, HUMAN AGONY OF WAR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the recent escalation of the war in Indochina means continued, escalated human suffering. I have received thousands of letters calling for a halt to this senseless conflict. One of the recent letters eloquently expresses the human cost of the war. It states, simply and directly, the reasons why we must end the conflict. Here and in Southeast Asia people are suffering and dying needlessly.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to read the letter which I insert here, and to search their consciences for the strength to end this suffering.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Congressman LOUIS STOKES,
Cleveland, Ohio

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STOKES: I know that you detest this war. But you can't realize the hurt I feel after three days since my brother, Lt. j.g. Clemie McKinney was reported missing somewhere in a place that I can't even pronounce. You can't imagine the pain our mother is suffering after we have struggled, as poor people like we are must, to educate him, to prepare him to live, only to have him risk and maybe give his life so needlessly to save face in a war that this nation can only lose face in.

If your voice can be raised louder, if your influence can be used more forcefully, bring our brothers, sons, and husbands home now!

There are people in B–52's!

There are people in F–4 Phantoms!

There are people under the bombs!

There are people on both sides of the guns.

This letter may have been his last request of me. I pray that it reaches a place that can help him or at least someone like him.

Sincerely,

FREDDIE L. POLLARD.

A TEXAS STRIKE

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for about 3 weeks, employees of the Farah Manufacturing Co. have been on strike in various Texas locations. I do not know the details on each side of this dispute, and can only hope that the issues will soon be settled. The strike, however, is a classic example of how Texas labor law frequently exacerbates disputes and works to raise needless tensions and render far more difficult the process of reaching a reasonable and just settlement.

Last week, for example, 177 persons were arrested in El Paso, Tex., for violating the Texas law against mass picketing. Under that law, it is illegal to have more than one or two pickets in front of a given plant entrance, and even those pickets must remain a considerable distance apart. In effect, this law makes it illegal for a Texas labor organization to conduct anything more than a sort of half-hearted informational picketing operation. The people who were arrested in El Paso last week have been released on bond, which was set at $400 a person. Despite the fact that none of these people has been jailed, all of those arrested will certainly be embittered by the experience, especially as there appears to be no claim that they were doing anything other than peacefully carrying out the kind of activity that is legal almost everywhere else and under almost any normal circumstance. Under the Texas statute, I suppose that the people who protested against the Stamp Act could have been arrested and charged with violating strictures against mass picketing.

The Texas laws also make it illegal to have a closed shop contract. This sort of statute makes it very difficult to maintain a union, even if one is organized. I can remember very well that before this law passed in Texas, all of the major garment makers in San Antonio were unionized; since then I believe every union contract in the city's garment industry has expired, and no plant remains effectively organized.

Aside from the illegality of a closed shop contract, Texas laws do not allow a dues checkoff, which makes it doubly difficult to maintain a union once it is organized. Texas up until very recently did not even have a minimum wage law, and its industrial safety code was distinguished mostly by its complete absence.

All of this has made Texas labor relations among the most primitive in the country. Texas still has the bitter kind of strife that the rest of the Nation has largely forgotten.

I believe that if the Texas labor code were modernized, if the repressive State laws were abandoned or at the very least modernized, it would be possible to avoid much conflict. Certainly a great deal of the conflict that exists in the State today is needlessly complicated by the existence of statutes that serve no real purpose, and which in the long run only serve to damage the interests of both industry and labor.

It has been the State's reluctance to act that has been responsible for many needless arrests and harrassments, and responsible for so much simple harassment, that has more and more led to Federal legislation and control. Perhaps that is the answer. Certainly, enforcing antiquated and patently unjust statutes is no way to obtain strike settlements, but it is a sure way to guarantee a bitterness that will only harden the way to settlements, whether it be the Farah dispute or any one of so many others that have taken place over the years.

A related article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 22, 1972]

FARAH OPERATING LOSS OF $1.2 MILLION POSTED FOR APRIL 30 QUARTER

EL PASO, TEXAS.—Farah Manufacturing Co. said it had an operating loss of $1.2 million in the second quarter, ended April 30, compared with net income of $1.7 million, or 31 cents a share, in the like period last year.

In the latest quarter there was a $248,000 special credit, resulting from a write-down of the prior year's royalty accrual, which narrowed Farah's net loss for the period to $942,000. Sales were up slightly to $44.2 million from $42.6 million.

For the fiscal first six months the company had an operating loss of $2.7 million, compared with net income of $3.3 million, or 60 cents a share, in the 1971 first half. The same $248,000 special credit brought the net loss for the latest half down to $2.4 million. Sales rose to $78.2 million from $73.4 million.

The company didn't give reasons for the loss. But it did say it expects results in coming periods to be hurt by a continuing strike at its El Paso and San Antonio operations. According to Farah, "The disruption of the company's business is of uncertain duration. The effect it will have on results cannot yet be measured, but it will have a severe effect on earnings. There have been no interruptions of deliveries to customers."

The strike, effecting 12% of the slacks maker's 9,500 workers, is 19 days old. Farah said that "about one-third of those who walked out have been replaced. There appears to be sufficient number of applicants to replace all of them when and as needed." Warrants for the arrest of 177 picketing Farah employes were issued in a local justice of the peace court. The workers were charged with violation of a city ordinance prohibiting mass picketing.

Sheriff Mike Sullivan Jr. of El Paso said that as of late last Thursday over 150 of the people named in the misdemeanor warrants had voluntarily been booked and had bond set at the county jail. "I expect that the rest of them will be in soon," said the sheriff. "Bond of $400 has been set and has been paid

by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America for each person charged," he added.

A sergeant in the jail division of the sheriff's department said yesterday that "roughly 205 to 210" picketing Farah employes had been booked and released.

Antonio Sanchez, a spokesman for the union, said the workers are "only exercising their constitutional rights and trying to establish decent wages and conditions," including recognition by Farah of Amalgamated as their union.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers said it plans to picket stores carrying Farah slacks in cities throughout the country. And the represenative of the El Paso local of the Teamsters union said the Teamsters would honor the picket lines at Farah plants.

CONGRESSIONAL ATTENDANCE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the public is being spotlighted on attendance on rollcall voting in congressional sessions. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH'S bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, to amend the Constitution by requiring 60 percent attendance by Members of Congress at all sessions, and similar legislation introduced in the House, has made the American people conscious of the Members' attendance in the Congress. This is a good thing. The American people have a right to expect that their elected representatives will attend congressional sessions and vote regularly as possible.

However, not too many of our citizens are aware of the complexity of the job of their Congressman or of the Senators. Sometimes conflict arises between two equally important functions. The importance of each duty must then be weighed by the Member with the benefit or detriment to his or her home district, and he must then choose which is the more important. No matter which alternative is picked, the Representative might be criticized, although both might be functions of his position.

Surveys show that the average Congressman spends approximately 60 hours a week at his job when the Congress is in session. This is average and some Congressmen spend much more time, although others spend less. I feel that the average tips in favor of the greater. This is 20 hours more per week than most Americans spend on their jobs. An average Congressman's workweek breaks down approximately as follows:

Fifteen hours on the House floor; 7 hours on legislative research and reading; 7 hours in committee; 7 or more hours in answering mail; 5 hours in handling constituent problems in Washington; 4 hours on committee work outside of committee; 2½ hours with various individuals or groups that visit; and 2 hours on miscellaneous work.

In addition, the average Congressman spends about 6 days per month in his district even during times when the Congress is in session.

The crux of the problem is that America has changed a great deal since 1789. The change in the workload of the Congressman has been most dramatic since World War I. Before World War I, Congress was in session usually only 6 to 8 weeks each year. However, since World War I, and especially since the late 1920's, the myriad of problems faced by the Nation has forced the Congress into longer and longer sessions. Today, Congress is in almost continuous session from January to December.

Many of the activities of Members of Congress are traditional but many others have been acquired. They range from the most elementary to the most sophisticated; from sending baby books to young mothers; responding to quorum and rollcalls; obtaining tours of the Capitol; answering letters on any and all subjects; writing legislation; testifying before committees; and attendance and the participation in floor debate on legislation directly affecting those whom they represent. True, many in the Senate, in this Presidential election year, have been remiss in attendance for rollcalls.

However, the situation in the House of Representatives is much different from that in the Senate. Most House Members have attained good attendance records despite the many demands on their time. My own attendance record was 94 percent for the first session of the 92d Congress despite the fact that I was ill for 14 days. My attendance has been 96 percent overall since I came to Congress in January 1967. Nevertheless we should not underrate the requirement of being called upon to be in two places at the same time. Thus the opportunity of having a perfect score is not good. In fact it is unfair to use this score to judge the responsibility of a Member of Congress because his legislative duties fairly require more than attendance on the House floor.

During the first session of the 92d Congress from January 21, 1971, to December 17, 1971, there were 472 recorded votes in the House, 152 quorum calls, 212 yea-and-nays votes, and 108 recorded teller votes.

But there are many kinds of votes also. There are voice votes, division votes, teller votes, and yea-and-nay votes. Of these only the recorded teller votes and the yea-and-nay votes are recorded. The other recorded procedure is the quorum call. For the House to conduct business 218 Congressmen must be present, and for the Senate to conduct business 51 Senators must be present. If there is an insufficient number the Chamber must recess. I know but one instance since I have been a Member that the House could not muster a quorum.

Because the House is in full year session my personal schedule as Congressman must generally be set up 6 months in advance and this is subject to cancellation due to legislative business scheduled in conflict thereof. This creates a problem, both to the Members of Congress and to organizations which asked the Congressman to address them. Frankly, until internal procedures are established, which will allow Members to be notified in advance of the days when there will be votes, this conflict of duty will not be diminished. Legislative business on the House floor is presently announced only 1 week prior to the consideration of the legislation.

A constitutional amendment to my mind is not necessary to call attention to the attendance problem of some Members in the Congress. The problem is an administrative problem and one that should be worked out by the respective leadership of both the House and Senate. There always will be a few individuals who will not by design or otherwise fail to serve their constituency by voting regularly. However, I think it is time that the public become aware that the large majority of Members of Congress are diligent and responsible individuals, who work hard to fulfill their assigned roles as members of their respective bodies and to the best of their ability do a conscientious job.

THE GREAT FRANKFURTER HOAX

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, this begins a series of articles aimed at alerting American consumers to the inferior content of many popular food items.

Consider the American hotdog, beloved of America in song, story, and digestion for decades. Alas, it has fallen upon hard times, indeed, mainly because the Federal agencies in charge of overseeing how it is produced have decided to put private interest ahead of public safety.

Once in the long ago of the Great Depression, the hotdog was a feast. Today it has become close to a public health menace. Yet nowadays, because the cost of most meats have joined our satellites in orbit, millions of unsuspecting American families consider it a staple of their diet. If they knew what really goes into the average frankfurter, their indigestion would only be matched by their indignation.

Consider the following tidbits of information. Consumers Union, the most respected organization of its kind, observes that frankfurters are being padded with such nutritious items as excess fat and water. Almost all franks contain approximately 30 percent pure fat.

Many franks, again according to Consumers Union, are contaminated by bacteria, preserved with chemicals that may lead to cancer, and are only 60 percent as nutritious as their depression counterpart.

A recent study by the General Accounting Office revealed that the Food and Drug Administration, charged with enforcement of food preparation and inspection legislation, is not doing its proper job. Its shortages of qualified inspectors allow most food preparation plants to operate on the edges of the law with impunity.

Consumers Union further reports that the protein content of frankfurters has

fallen from 19.6 percent in 1937 to 11.7 percent today.

All 32 brands tested contained "a compound of either nitrate or nitrite as an additive." Chemical and bacterial action turns the nitrates in meat to nitrites. Nitrites can be highly toxic.

About 5 grams of sodium nitrite is lethal for an adult, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture standards. An adult eating two hot dogs would ingest about 0.02 grams of nitrite. By itself, such a dose poses no danger. A child, however, has less tolerance to nitrites, and accordingly, its safety margin is appreciably lower.

Dr. Charles Edwards, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, has said that nitrites may be a factor in development of cancer in people. Consumers Union suggests that FDA act swiftly to ban nitrites.

The hot dog is also found guilty of other charges by this same survey. Among them are the following:

Forty percent of tested samples had begun to spoil. Almost 19 percent of the samples had evidence of insect and rodent contamination.

As the protein level of franks has fallen, the fat level in them has risen.

Of 32 brands examined, 12 proved to contain water content beyond the 10 percent maximum established by the Department of Agriculture. Yet the Department seems loathe to enforce the laws forbidding such violations. This scandal, for such it is, highlights the sorry state of Federal food inspection, particularly in respect to meat.

The 1967 Wholesome Meat Act was designed to close the loopholes through which plants processing meat for intrastate use and sale was often laxly inspected. Under the act, States are permitted to retain inspection control for intrastate plants, which sell products only within borders of their States. But this would be only as long as the State inspection system is equal to that of the Federal Government. Otherwise the Department of Agriculture must take over a State's intrastate inspection.

Many State-operated inspection programs are inferior to the Federal program, although the Agriculture Department has given them "equal to" ratings. Accusations have been leveled that State programs fall short because of low pay for inspectors, political interference by State officials, aging plants, and inadequate funds.

Last summer we had the great botulism scare in soup episode, plus mercury in swordfish, and PCB chemicals in poultry. These were not rare happenings. Rather, they were just spectacular occurrences of widespread and longstanding problems.

What it all boils down to is that the food we eat is less often inspected than we would like it to be—that the Federal Government is not enforcing pure food and drug laws as we somehow believe it is doing on our behalf—and that in some instances, such as in the frankfurter, industry has been allowed to take great liberties with contents of such products at the expense of public health.

So we can temporarily look askance at the good old American hot dog. Once a staple of the American family diet, it has now been brought into doubt and question. What price digestion?

Simultaneously, it is only fair for us to ask why a product as basic as this is far less nutritious and safe than it was in 1937. And why the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration, charged with responsibility for this product, should have done so lax a job. And why the public has to learn by exposé.

Finally, it is evident that even though most people believe that in some way the Government protects them from such a situation, this in fact is not true.

Hot dogs, anyone?

JOEL LAFAYETTE FLETCHER

HON. PATRICK T. CAFFERY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Joel Lafayette Fletcher, the Nation has lost one of its most respected educators, and the thousands of students whose lives he touched have lost an old and dear friend.

Joel Fletcher served on the faculty of the University of Southwestern Louisiana from 1920 to 1940 and as president of that university from 1941 until his retirement in 1966.

He shepherded Southwestern's growth from a small rural college into the great, vibrant university which today bears everywhere the marks of his gentle and scholarly influence.

In the sterling qualities of his life he stood as one of the finest men Louisiana has ever produced. Honor. Diligence. Truth. Tolerance. Courage. These were the words which guided his life and to which he held with quiet and unswerving devotion. But he did more. He gave these words new meaning, and through him they became living thought and unselfish action.

In his early service as president, higher education in Louisiana was at a premium. In the 1930's and 1940's the struggling economy of the largely rural, greatly impoverished South gave little encouragement to many young men and women who looked to the halls of higher learning, and the families who could afford to send a son or daughter to college were few.

Joel Fletcher said: Send them to Southwestern. We will find a way.

He found a way. He put them to work. The small college operated its own farm and produced its own milk and butter and cheese and vegetables that were served on the table. The boys worked in the fields and milked cows and raised crops. The girls worked in the offices and held the jobs they could. The students operated the laundry and worked whenever and wherever they were able—to buy, through their work, their own learning.

After the second war, with the return of the veterans and the beginning of the building of south Louisiana as a petrochemical giant, the economy prospered and a thriving people now gratefully sent their sons and daughters to Southwestern by the thousands, and looked to Joel Fletcher for leadership in the academic excellence he never failed to provide.

His counsel was always spare but strong. I remember in 1953 when I was beset as student body president by the weights and woes of my administration which seemed then so serious and large, I turned to President Fletcher for advice. He gave me no advice. He simply looked at me and said smilingly:

> Heavy is the head that wears the crown.

I worked out whatever problem it was. He had driven home his lesson in a dramatic way.

It is said he would never permit a student to resign without a personal interview to discover why. If it were for financial reasons, he would try to find work, or a loan. If a personal or an academic problem seemed to loom as a barrier, more often than not he would ferret it out and seek a solution with the understanding guidance which was his hallmark.

The intellect and compassion of this rare man drew no lines on things such as poverty or wealth or color, and perhaps one of the most brave pages in the unstinting annals of his life has never been generally known. It made no headlines. There were no stories. No camera crews. No interviews. But the fact is that at a time when in many regions racial integration occurred only with violent upheaval and dislocation, Southwestern's doors in the early 1950's quietly opened to the blacks. His handling of this social transition stands today as a model of leadership. Although his words were never recorded I believe he must have simply said:

> You are welcome here. Enter into these doors the young minds of every race, creed and color who thirst for knowledge, and we shall share with you the books and pencils and paper of a new tomorrow. You who have shared with us your sweat in the sugar cane fields in the wet, black soil to the south and the red clay cotton fields to the north, come, it is time. Share with us your minds, for we shall be together the inheritors of a sweet land.

There was no trouble. There were no riots or disturbances or parades with confetti. It was done, and the pages of history closed and moved on, without a word.

The other night while returning to Louisiana for the weekend I met my friend Willis Ducrest on the plane. He is the able head of the Southwestern music department. He told of how, on the night of Mr. Fletcher's death, word was received at the university shortly before a choral concert that the beloved former president had fallen. Professor Ducrest told a stunned audience the sad news but said:

> If he were here, President Fletcher would want us to sing and be happy.

I know the clear voices of Louisiana's sons and daughters rang in special tribute that night, to the memory of a man whose worth was as large as the

love and gratitude we all feel toward him.

It is with sadness that Louisiana says goodbye to a man who was great and good.

"ON REASON AND THE OPEN SOCIETY"

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a wise and timely conversation with an eminent thinker, Sir Karl Popper, appears in the British publication, Encounter, of May 1972. It follows:

ON REASON AND THE OPEN SOCIETY—A CONVERSATION

Q.—You are primarily a philosopher, but can you tell us a little about your "political" biography?

POPPER. I became a Marxist in about 1915, when I was thirteen years old, and an anti-Marxist in 1919, shortly before my seventeenth birthday. I remained a socialist until I was thirty, although I began to doubt more and more whether freedom and socialism are compatible.

The incident that turned me into an anti-Marxist was of crucial importance. It occurred in my native Vienna. Shooting broke out during a demonstration by young unarmed Socialist and Communist workers, and several of the youngsters were killed. I was horrified and indignant at the police, but also at myself because I felt that, as a Marxist. I bore part of the responsibility—at least in principle—for the tragedy. Marxist theory demands that the class struggle be sharpened and intensified. It asserts that an intensification of the class struggle speeds our approach to socialism and that, although revolution may claim some victims, capitalism daily claims more victims than the whole socialist revolution would ever do.

That was the Marxist analysis. I now asked myself whether we could ever rationally defend such a calculation. I began to read Marx critically, and I discovered what scant foundation there was for the Marxist beliefs in the historical inevitability of the coming of socialism, the prevalence of a malignant social system, and in such notions as that of so-called *Spätkapitalismus*.

What really exists is people, their joys and sorrows. I was, and I still am, an individualist in the sense that I realised that what mattered was that justice should prevail between individuals, and that concepts such as Mankind—let alone Class—are abstractions, perhaps important in some theoretical context, but sometimes exceedingly dangerous. What are we to say, for instance, of those Marxists who are prepared to sacrifice concrete individuals for the sake of an abstract Humanity—who believe that the worse human beings fare, the better it is for the inevitable Social Revolution, and thus for Mankind? Of course there are conflicts of interest in society, but it is extremely doubtful whether the intensification of these conflicts would lead to a better society or to a worse one (such as, for example, a fascist society).

My critical attitude towards Marxism did not, at first, shake my socialist convictions in the least. To me, socialism was an ethical postulate—nothing more or less than the idea of justice. A social order which managed to combine abject poverty and great affluence struck me as both inequitable and intolerable. However, my growing realisation that institutionalised socialism renders the state too unwieldly and bureaucrats too powerful *vis-a-vis* citizens prompted me to abandon my youthful convictions. I have never regained my belief in the compatibility of socialism and freedom. I have become convinced, moreover, that every simple formula is misleading. If "socialism" means "the socialisation or nationalisation of the means of production", then it is clear that this is not a remedy for all social evils, but rather—and this is most important—a threat to the freedom of the individual.

Q. But still, politics of another sort changed your life.

POPPER. At the age of twenty-eight I was appointed as a teacher at a secondary school in Vienna. I had written a great deal in the interim, but had published virtually nothing. Encouraged by friends, I now wrote two books. The second of these, published in 1934 under the title *Logik der Forschung*, propelled me, almost against my intentions, into academic life. Austria at that time was ruled by a fascist dictatorship, and I realised that Hitler would soon invade the country and make it part of Germany. Being of Jewish descent, I decided to emigrate. My book brought me an invitation to give lectures in England, and on Christmas Eve, 1936, I was offered an appointment as a University lecturer in New Zealand. It was there, in March 1938, that I learned of Hitler's entry into Austria and decided to publish my two critiques of Fascism and Marxism, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* and *The Poverty of Historicism*. In the spring of 1945 I was offered a post in England, and left New Zealand. I taught at London University from 1946 to 1969 with intermediate spells as a Visiting Professor in America and, for brief periods, in Austria, Japan and Australia. I retired—if that is the right word—three years ago, but I am now working harder than ever.

Q—How, and where, during these travels did you come to a new view of society?

POPPER. I first visited England in the years 1935–6. Coming from Austria, which, while governed by a comparatively mild dictatorship, was menaced by its National Socialist neighbours, I now found that I could at last breathe freely. It was as if the windows had been flung open. The term "open society" (which, as I later found, had been used by Bergson in a different sense) derives from this experience.

What do I regard as the characteristic features of an open society? I would quote two. First, that free debate and especially debate about the wisdom or otherwise of governmental decisions, should be possible within a society and should exert an influence on politics; and, secondly, that institutions should exist for the protection of freedom and the protection of the poor and the weak.

To take the second point first, the state protects its citizens from physical violence by means of legal and social institutions, and can also shield them from abuse by economic force. This is already happening, and it is susceptible to improvement. We must, in fact, construct social institutions which protect the economically weak against the economically ruthless. Political power can control economic power. Marxists underrate the potential of politics and, in particular, of what they disparagingly term "formal freedom."

I, therefore, stress the central role of political institutions in social reform. It is far less important who governs than how governments are influenced and controlled. The old question "Who should rule?", which was regarded as being the central question of political theory from Plato to Marx, is wrongly put. This brings me back to my earlier point, namely, the major significance of public debate. The United States is the most important of those countries which possess a relatively open social order; all the rest are dependent on its fate. Little more than a century has passed since the emancipation of America's Negro slaves, since the conclusion of almost five years of Civil War between North and South. It was a terrible national crisis; a crisis of conscience. Now the United States is, once again, going through a terrible crisis of conscience with regard to the Negro problem and simultaneously with regard to Viet Nam.

This clearly shows us what is most relevant to the openness of a society: freedom of speech and the existence of an influential opposition. America's major newspapers and the most influential television commentators are sharply critical of government policy. The opposition calls for the withdrawal of American forces from Viet Nam; and the Government has indeed accepted this as its programme at the prompting of the opposition. We encounter here a unique occurrence which would be inconceivable save in an open society; after a war lasting for years, the Government concedes, under the pressure of public debate, that the war was a grievous mistake and should be terminated as soon as possible.

I would not, of course, want to represent American democracy as an ideal. Far too many crimes and acts of violence take place in America. Furthermore the country seems to have changed with remarkable speed since the assassination of President Kennedy. Before that, the mood was one of hope, and of confidence in America's moral superiority. Now, the country is in the throes of a spiritual depression which has been deepened still further by the murders of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy and by the war in Viet Nam. The Americans are no longer certain that their country and form of government are the best. These acts of violence may, in part, be a consequence of some American frontier traditions, but they are not a consequence of the form of government or of a so-called authoritarian system. Life styles and convictions do, in fact, change very rapidly in America: open societies are not very stable, precisely because they are exposed to critical discussion. Dictatorships are more stable, and are utopias, which are always represented as static.

Q.—You say the state can protect its citizens from economic violence, by means of political institutions. It certainly could do so—but Marxists argue that these same institutions are manned by the ruling groups and therefore become ineffective.

POPPER. I think this is a gross exaggeration. Every institution in a democracy is manned by different groups—often opposed—at different moments of time. That much is obvious. But the idea that institutions in a democracy are, so to speak, permanently controlled by the bourgeoisie is simply a version of the Marxist myth of class dictatorship: that every state is a dictatorial state and that so-called "formal democracy" is nothing more than a class dictatorship. To repeat, I regard that as a fantasy.

Q.—But isn't that evidence of at least elements of class dictatorship when, as in the West German Republic, 70% of newly created private wealth accrues to the smallest group of "self-employed" persons whereas the seven times larger group of employees is fobbed off with the remaining 30%? When the tax system one-sidedly favours a small section of society? When owners of capital continue to amass wealth without personal effort while most employees are compelled to expend their entire income and can therefore never become owners of capital themselves?

POPPER. You are posing several questions at once. The word "class" can have many misleading connotations. Marxists claim that all democracies are disguised class dictatorships, but this misleading assertion has little to do with the existence of wide variations in wealth. One can, for example, conceive of a free society which grants equal opportunities to all—all enjoy the same education, and death duties distribute all wealth equally—but which nonetheless exhibits great contrasts in newly-created wealth. Provided there

is no poverty, this can scarcely be accounted an evil: large fortunes are almost entirely invested and make it possible to innovate. The same kind of society might also contain extremes of poverty and wealth. And while I should regard this as a great evil, rich and poor would not constitute *classes* in the Marxist sense.

But your remark was aimed at the West German Republic, which you reproached for great inequality in the distribution of newly-created wealth. This proves little about its class character and nothing about a class dictatorship. You also assert that the tax system one-sidedly favours a small section of society. If that be so, democracy has a *remedy* of a sort which can be observed in the British and even in the American systems of taxation. Marx believed that a progressive system of income tax was incompatible with "capitalism", but in Great Britain, a very large part of the national income goes to the state in the form of taxes: income tax, corporation tax, and indirect taxes. (Besides, there are nationalised industries.) But the burden of taxation can become so great that the entire economy—including the lowest-paid—suffers in consequence.

This demonstrates the untenability of the Marxist doctrine that all democracies are disguised dictatorships. And although it may be possible to speak of "elements of class dictatorship," as you did, one may claim with equally strong arguments that the various democracies embody differing degrees of approximation to a classless society.

Q.—Don't you believe that the formally democratic political structure must be based on democracy and equality in the economic sphere before it can become fully alive?

POPPER. Allow me to restate your question in a slightly more primitive form. "Is the coexistence of wealth and poverty an intolerable social evil?" My answer is, yes, poverty is a great evil and becomes still more iniquitous when it coexists with great wealth. More important than the contrast between poverty and wealth, however, is the contrast between freedom and its absence—the contrast between a new class, a new ruling dictatorship, and citizens in disfavour who are banished to concentration camps or elsewhere.

Thus I regard the possibility of free rational discussion and the influence of such critical discussion upon politics as the greatest virtue of a democracy. This places me in diametrical opposition to those who believe in force or violence, particularly to the Fascists and to some adherents of the New Left. Similarly, I am opposed to those revolutionary Marxists or neo-Marxists who assert that there is no such thing as an "objective" discussion: before engaging in a debate with someone they have to be certain that he shares the revolutionary Marxist approach to society—in other words, that he radically rejects the so-called capitalist society of today. This precludes any serious discussion of central problems.

Fascist anti-intellectuals and these revolutionary Marxists are, thus, agreed that one cannot and should not debate with an opponent. Both groups reject all critical discussion of their own standpoints.

But consider what this rejection means. It implies that, once in power, one suppresses all opposition. It implies a rejection of the open society, a rejection of freedom, and an adoption of a philosophy of coercion.

Being influenced by such considerations, Marxists and neo-Marxists are blind to the achievements of democracy, which alone permits them to disseminate their ideas without persecution. Their theory teaches them that political liberties are worthless, or almost so, because they are no more than a cover for a sinister dictatorship.

But this is wholly unrealistic, as one can see from the fact that the recent revival of Marxist ideology has occurred in all the open societies of the West. Democracies are always open to ideas, especially dissenting ideas. Far from being disguised dictatorships, these democracies are always prepared to doubt themselves: they know perfectly well that much is not as it should be. Only in an open society do ideas have a chance to prevail, and Marxists, who believe that democracies are merely disguised dictatorships, fail to see that all dictatorships, whether of the Right or Left, are fundamentally similar to each other, and dissimilar to democracies.

All this stems from false theories which are liable to blind us to the importance of the critical battle of ideas, to intellectual debate.

Q.—Your "open society" presupposes a pluralism of forces and universal equality of opportunity which is embodied in the constitutions of the Western democracies. But it does not necessarily form part of political reality. Do you believe that the "open society" already exists, or has it still to be built?

POPPER. I believe it to be both a reality and an ideal. There are, of course, various degrees of openness. In one democracy, society may be more mature, evolved, and open than in another. How good or bad it is will depend on several factors: on its prior history, its traditions, its political institutions, its educational methods and, finally, on the human beings who alone can bring these institutions to life. I would suggest that a fairly sharp distinction should be drawn between democracies and dictatorships. People live in a democracy if institutions exist which enable them to oust their government without using violent means; in other words, without shooting it down. That is the characteristic of a democracy. Even in a democracy, however, the road to a widely open and pluralist society may remain a long one. It is a gradual process; and it is always in danger of a setback.

Q.—Do you believe, then, in the fundamental power of reason?

POPPER. I do not, of course, believe that an attitude of reasonableness is easy to adopt, or that all human beings are consistently rational: they are only rarely so. Nor do I believe in the "force" of reason or the "power" of reason. Rather, I believe that we have a choice between reason and force. I further believe that reason is the sole alternative to the use of violence; and I regard as criminal the use of force or violence where it could be avoided.

But Marxists nowadays do not believe in reason because they think that all arguments merely conceal or "rationalize" social interests. It is, of course, true that interests—and economic interests in particular—play a major role in politics. It is equally clear, however, that a role is played by very different factors, such as the wish to be just and equitable.

Because it is based on an extremely shrewd speculative theory, Marxist practice is not quite as anti-intellectual as Fascist practice, but it only too often amounts to the same thing: it is, in effect, anti-intellectualistic and irrational, despite its dependence on a somewhat over-intellectualistic and dialectical theory.

Violence embroils one ever more deeply in violence. Violent revolutions kill off revolutionaries and vitiate their ideals. The sole survivors are those who specialize most efficiently in survival.

One certain result of a Revolution of the Left would be the loss of the freedom to criticize and oppose. (Whether the resulting dictatorship is of the Right or Left, reactionary or radical, depends partly on chance, and is often only a difference in nomenclature.) I claim that only a democracy, an open society, gives us a chance to remedy evils. If we destroy a democratic social order by a violent revolution we not only incur responsibility for the heavy casualties that a revolution inflicts but we are also likely to establish a new social order in which it will be impossible to struggle to abolish social evils, injustice, and oppression. As a believer in individual freedom, I am second to none in my detestation of bureaucratic powers and official arrogance. But government is a necessary evil. Total absence of government is an impossibility, and —another regrettable truth—the more people, the more government. Humanity can be very easily destroyed by violence in our time. What is required is that we work for a more sensible society in which our basic conflicts are resolved in an increasingly rational manner.

I said "more sensible". There are, in fact, no sensible societies, but there is always one which, being a little more sensible than the existing one, we should aspire to. That is a realistic demand and not one which is utopian.

Q.—In your "Logic of Scientific Discovery" (1959) and in "Conjectures and Refutations" (1963) you developed a scientific-theoretical approach which has been called "critical rationalism." Another name you give to your views is "fallibilism." Can you explain these ideas?

POPPER. Socrates remarked in his wonderful *Apology:* "I know that I know nothing, and scarcely that—yet the Delphic oracle describes me as the wisest of men." After some reflection, Socrates hit upon the following solution: "I am aware of my ignorance. Perhaps it is this awareness of my limitations which makes me a little wiser than the others, who do not even know that they know nothing." Socrates also said that a politician or a statesman should be wise. What he meant was, a politician ought to be even more aware of his ignorance because a heavy responsibility rests on him. This responsibility should lead him to an understanding of his limitations and so to intellectual modesty.

I agree with Socrates, and this is the point at which I can best formulate my basic quarrel with modern Marxists. Modern Marxists believe that they know a great deal. They are wholly lacking in intellectual modesty. They flaunt a little knowledge in an oversized terminology.

My reproach does not apply to Marx or Engels. They were formidable and original thinkers who did have new ideas, many of which were not easy to formulate. The man who has something fresh and important to say is concerned to be understood. He will attack the utmost value to writing as simply and comprehensively as he can, though he may not succeed. Difficult language is the easiest thing in the world to write. What I dislike most in contemporary Marxist intellectuals is their love for the big word, their parade of learning in highly pretentious verbiage. Nothing could be further from their minds than intellectual modesty. They take their cue from Hegel, not from Socrates or from Kant. I believe, like Socrates, that we know little or next to nothing. Our ignorance is vast. But that is clearly not all: we cannot, of course, overlook the existence of the natural sciences and their brilliant successes. Yet when we examine these sciences somewhat more closely we discover that they consist not of positive or certain knowledge, but of bold hypotheses which are continuously improved—or even eliminated altogether—by rigorous criticism. This produces a gradual approximation to the truth. We have, then, no positive or certain knowledge. But there is such a thing as hypothetical or conjectural knowledge.

Above all, there is scientific progress. In critically discussing our hypotheses, we always evaluate them from a definite aspect—we favour those which strike us as a closer approximation to the truth, those which can better withstand our efforts at refutation. Thus there is no point of rest in science, no point at which we can say: "Now at last we have got hold of the truth!" There are only daring hypothetical theories which we en-

deavour to critcise and to replace by better ones. The more scientific revolutions the better—that is the rule of science. So the Marxian battle-cry—"permanent revolution"—has at least this validity.

Q.—So you are, at least in this sense, a revolutionary?

POPPER. I have been charged with inconsistency on the grounds that my revolutionary theory of science ought logically to turn me into a political revolutionary. But this is a grave misconception. Radicalism in the theoretical and moral domains—the bold theoretical devising of new revolutionary theories and the subversive critical overthrow of theories old and new—is just what may enable us to avoid all acts of violence in the political domain. To illustrate my thesis more clearly, permit me to compare the struggle for existence in the animal and plant worlds with the "struggle for existence" of our hypotheses.

Plants and animals throw up changes or mutations, and those rare mutations that facilitate better adaptation to the conditions of life are those likely to resist elimination by natural selection. Less well-adapted mutations are eliminated by the extinction of the plants and animals which are the carriers of such bad mutations: they either fail to survive, or produce so few offspring that they ultimately die out. A hypothesis may be compared with a mutation. Instead of producing new mutations, human beings sometimes advance new hypotheses or theories. If they are uncritical, those who support ill-adapted or bad hypotheses are eliminated.

But rational critical discussion enables us to eliminate bad hypotheses and to dismiss them as erroneous without exterminating their authors or proponents. That is the major achievement of the critical method. It enables us to recognise the falsity of hypotheses and to condemn them—without condemning those who support them.

Critical debate is a method which permits our hypotheses to die for us—whereas the uncritical method of the fanatic demands that we testify as martyrs to our hypotheses: if they are faulty, we perish with them. Rigorous criticism, revision, and re-examination of our hypotheses can thus replace the violence of the struggle for existence. In the same way, a revolutionary change in our ideas, theories, or hypotheses can deputise for the violent revolutions which have claimed so many human lives.

It is interesting that I should recently have been labelled a "positivist" in Germany by my Marxist opponents, obviously people who don't quite understand what they are talking about. Positivists are philosophers who oppose speculative theories: they try to adhere as closely as possible to what is "given" or can be perceived. But I try to teach: "be bold in advancing speculative hypotheses but merciless in criticising and reexamining them thereafter."

Q.—You call for revolution in science and thought—but not in practice. You also say that science itself can never provide certain knowledge, only hypotheses which have not—for the moment—been refuted. How does that look from the point of view of social problems?

POPPER. Very similar. We also have ideas and theories in the social sphere. We are deeply indebted to revolutionary social ideas. We evolve theories for the elimination of social ills, try to work out their consequences critically, and then assess our theories accordingly.

Q.—But what do "social ills" mean in this context? Surely, social defects of this type can only be measured against conceptions of value. How can one prove which of these values are correct and which are not?

POPPER. One cannot, any more than one can prove anything in the natural sciences. But one can discuss the question, and compare various social attitudes and their real effects. In the last analysis the adoption or repudiation of a social value is a matter for decision.

Q.—So one can't ultimately prove one's social or political axioms—only make a personal decision for or against them! Then your idea of the "open society" is founded on a basic decision of this sort, namely, a decision in favour of rationality?

POPPER. Rationalism esteems argument, theory, and empirical examination. But one can't justify one's decision in favour of rationalism by recourse to argument and experience. Although even this problem is open to debate, it ultimately demands from us a human decision—some decision in favour of faith in reason and the value of human lives. This decision in favour of reason is moral and not simply intellectual. It influences our entire attitude to other people and the problems of social life. Closely connected with it is a faith in the rational unity of man, in the value of every human being. Rationalism lends itself better to association with a humanitarian approach than does irrationalism, with its doctrine of the chosen elite. Individual human beings are unequal in many respects, of course; but this does not militate against the claim for equal treatment and equal rights. "Equality before the law" is not a fact but a political demand based on a moral decision. Superiority creates duties rather than rights.

Faith in reason—the other man's reason included—implies the idea of impartiality and tolerance, and includes the rejection of all claims to authority.

Q.—In conclusion, a question of principle: do you regard revolution, or the forcible imposition of that which is held to be better, as altogether unthinkable?

POPPER. We must distinguish between revolution against a democracy (including the kind which Marxists call "purely formal") and revolution against a real dictatorship. This, although a legitimate revolution, regrettably seldom succeeds in eliminating it. What is more, the word "revolution" can signify non-violent upheavals as well as violent ones. Marxism has left this ambiguity open; but the historical consequence of violent upheaval has often proved to be a dictatorship. Thus it was with the English revolution of the 17th century, which led to Cromwell's dictatorship; with the French revolution, which led to Robespierre and Napoleon; and with the Russian revolution, which led to Stalin. Violent revolutions which succeed in realising their aims are rare: the American revolution is perhaps the one great exception, but even some of its ideas have been doubtful blessings. I greatly admire, as I made very clear in my *Open Society*, the ideas which inspired the French in 1789 and I am aware of our indebtedness to them. But revolutionary ideas and their supporters are almost invariably destroyed by the revolution itself. Non-violent changes are altogether different. They enable us to watch for the unintended and undesirable consequences of our social policies and to modify their effects in good time when they become manifest. They thus create an atmosphere in which pertinent public criticism of existing social institutions need not be forcibly suppressed, and a social framework which affords human scope for humane reforms.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM C. DENNIS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to the father of one of our Members.

The late William C. Dennis, father of Congressman DAVID W. DENNIS, has recently been chosen to join the ranks of illustrious names in the Indiana Academy.

The academy was organized near the close of 1970 to pay tribute to the men and women of Indiana's past and present who made outstanding contributions to society.

The following is a brief biography of William Dennis which was published in last Sunday's Indianapolis Star:

WILLIAM C. DENNIS

Born Dec. 22, 1878, at Richmond; died Sept. 14, 1962, at Richmond. He was president of Earlham College from 1929 to 1946 and won international recognition as an attorney. He received preparatory education in Germany and Scotland before being graduated from Earlham and Harvard University. He was admitted to the bar in 1902 but served as a professor at the University of Illinois, Stanford, Columbia and George Washington universities. Beginning in 1906 he also was an assistant solicitor in the United States State Department. He was the U.S. agent in arbitration involving Venezuela and a steamship company in 1911 and took part in boundary disputes in South American countries in 1917. In 1918 he was legal adviser for the Chinese government at Peking. After retiring from Earlham, he practiced law at Richmond and also had a private practice in Washington, D.C. He was a Quaker by birth. He received honorary degrees from Indiana and DePauw universities, and served as vice-president of the American Society of International Law.

LENNA YOST

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to pay a final tribute to a longtime and devoted friend of mine, Mrs. Lenna Yost, who died recently in Alexandria, Va.

Mrs. Yost was admired and loved by all who knew her, and I believe our colleagues as well as her many friends throughout the Nation will be interested in the article in the Washington Post concerning her many and varied political activities.

The article follows:

LENNA YOST, PROMINENT IN GOP, DIES

Lenna Lowe Yost, a leader in the Republican Party as well as in the women's suffrage movement and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, died Friday at Jefferson Memorial Hospital in Alexandria. She was 94.

Mrs. Yost had lived at the Hermitage, a Methodist home in Alexandria, for the past 10 years.

Born in Marion County, W. Va., she headed the Women's Christian Temperance Union in West Virginia from 1908 until 1918. President Warren G. Harding appointed her U.S. representative to the International Congress Against Alcoholism in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1921 and in Copenhagen in 1925.

Mrs. Yost was president of the West Virginia Suffrage Association from 1917 to 1919 and helped lead the fight for that state's ratification of the 19th Amendment.

After adoption of the Women's Suffrage Act, she organized the Republican Women

of West Virginia and was the first woman to preside over a Republican state convention and the first woman to act as a counting teller during the Republican National Convention in Chicago in 1920.

Mrs. Yost was chairman of the platform committee at her state convention in 1922, was chairman of the executive committee of Republican Women of West Virginia in 1920–1922 and a member of the executive committee of the Republican National Committee from 1928 to 1932.

In 1930, she was named director of the women's division of the Republican National Committee.

She served as the first woman on the West Virginia state board of education from 1921 to 1933. She was also a trustee of her alma mater, West Virginia Wesleyan College.

Mrs. Yost backed laws for establishment of juvenile courts, child labor regulations, public library legislation and other similar reforms.

She worked for a federal prison for women, which eventually was located by Congress in Alderson, W. Va. She was the widow of Ellis A. Yost, a former member of the West Virginia legislature and chief examiner of the old Federal Radio Commission.

She is survived by a son, Leland L. Yost, of Alexandria, a granddaughter and four great-grandchildren.

VALUES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I talk so much about the joys and fulfillments of countryside living that some of my colleagues may think I am playing a broken record.

But I am not the only one who voices praise for countryside living.

With your permission, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Madison Press in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District which speaks eloquently of what we like to refer to as "the good life." The editorial follows:

VALUES

A lot of people living in our so-called sophisticated urban societies enjoy looking down their collective noses at their country-cousins. Many big city folks think that small town morals are so funny that laughter about them can often drown out the tinkling of glasses at a cocktail party, the cry of a neighbor being assaulted a few doors away or the peal of sirens answering a robbery call a few blocks away.

Cities are populated for the most part by strangers. Few people know much about their neighbors and could care less. This makes for an atmosphere of easy morality. This isn't true in small communities where everyone knows everyone else and who is getting into what kind of sin.

In our cities it would be easy to point an accusing finger at our institutions: the schools, the churches, and so forth and say, "they sure are falling down on the job."

It would be easy, but it would not be putting the blame where it belongs.

There are two primary areas of failure.

One is the family.

The old business of bending a twig in the right direction is still a pretty good rule of life to follow. Parents either do the job of providing their children with the fundamental principles of honesty, integrity, loyalty, and duty or the job doesn't get done. The traditional family circle has gone by the boards.

There is no such thing as instant morality. You can't buy a child a set of values to pack along with his or her clothes when they finally leave your bed and board. If they haven't found them in your own day-to-day living, they aren't going to come by them when they start rubbing shoulders with strangers.

The other aspect of this crisis concerns the community and community leaders.

There are far too many older people of influence around today who advocate an "anything goes" approach. They argue young people should be allowed to try anything once. They preach that experimenting is the way to live and that society's rules aren't important. They also argue that being poor and staying clean is just asking too much. To this group, doing an honest day's work for an honest day's pay is exacting too great a price and finally that loyalty to family, to friends, to employers, to the community, the state and the nation is questionable at best.

They take great delight in ridiculing anyone who dares suggest we return to some of our old-fashioned ways of living.

There was a lot of yesterday we don't need today but some of it was worth hanging on to.

Because we've failed to keep what should have been kept, we are going to pay the moral piper a higher and higher price as time goes by.

POINT OF VIEW ON THE BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated a number of times before, I have a real concern about the present, very apparent inadequacy of the Bicentennial Commission. I have written in some detail to Mr. Mahoney about these, but I shall not speak of them for the record until I have a chance to hear from Mr. Mahoney in response to some questions I am raising.

Mr. Speaker, however there is continuing evidence of concern among people who are interested in history. A recent example of this is an article by Louis Leonard Tucker, State historian of New York, entitled "A Point of View." This perceptive historian does have a point of view and I suggest its perusal by my colleagues and any and all who are interested in America doing what we could and should do to properly, thoroughly and adequately commemorate the bicentennial.

The article follows:

A POINT OF VIEW

During the past two years I have seen many documents which list "goals" for the American Revolution bicentennial. They really "cover the waterfront." They include such items as: alleviating air pollution, purifying our lakes and rivers, rehabilitating our cities, improving our transportation system, eliminating racism—and so on *ad infinitum*. Practically all of these goals come under the rubric of improving the quality of life.

There is one goal I have yet to see listed, and I find it to be a surprising omission: educating the American public on the "true" American Revolution. As a former teacher and a student of early American history, I submit that the general American public has a faulty knowledge of the critical Revolutionary era. Few have studied this period intensively. Most Americans have a thought structure which is saturated with myths about the Revolution. They regard this period of American history as Nathan Hale writ large. They have been victimized by the shoddy scholarship of the nineteenth century romantic nationalists who portrayed the Revolution as a simplistic saga of "good guys versus bad guys," of virtue triumphing over evil. Tom Paine's characterization of George III as the "Royal Brute" lives on in America.

Let's clean up our air and lakes and rivers. Let's rebuild our cities, develop rapid transit systems, abolish racism—and so on. But let's not forget the Revolution itself. Let's institute a massive educational program on the "true" history of the Revolution. Let's strip it of its myths. Is this not a laudable goal for the bicentennial? Would not the eradication of myth improve the quality of life in our nation?

LOUIS LEONARD TUCKER,
State Historian of New York.

PERFORMANCE OF F–111 IS PRAISED BY AN EXPERT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the May 1972, issue of the Armed Forces Journal contains an article written by Benjamin F. Schemmer. The article, relating to the F–111 fighter-bomber, contains a fair and responsible appraisal of that plane.

The author was formerly connected with a competing manufacturer which failed to win the competition for the F–111. This adds to the objectivity. Typical of his attitude is his statement at the beginning of the article that—

Had the aircraft I flew at Nellis AFB early in April been in Southeast Asia when North Vietnam poured through the DMZ on 31 March, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird might not have had to spend such long weekend hours in the National Military Command Center sweating out the biggest Vietnam crisis since Tet 1968.

That statement, and the whole article for that matter, confirms my own belief, and one shared by a rapidly growing number in the Congress, that whatever else may come about in our defense structure the F–111 production line must be kept going. It is the only aircraft of its kind in this country, or in the world.

The article in its three parts and the chart which accompanies it are as follows:

"I LIKE MY JOB": AN F–111 CREW SHOWS WHY

(By Benjamin F. Schemmer)

Had the aircraft I flew at Nellis AFB early in April been in Southeast Asia when North Vietnam poured through the DMZ on 31 March, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird might not have had to spend such long weekend hours in the National Military Command Center sweating out the biggest Vietnam crisis since Tet, 1968.

In the first three days of the North Vietnamese offensive, bad weather limited tactical air strike sorties to an average of only 23 a day near the DMZ, one-seventh the number of strikes flown daily as weather cleared on 3, 4, and 5 April and one twenty-third the daily attack sorties being flown in all of SVN as this issue went to press. From 31

March through 2 April, the only "all-weather" system that could put the heat on NVN troops heading for Hue, Dong Ha, and Quang Tri Province were a few Navy A-6s.

The airplane American taxpayers have spent a fortune building for just all-weather and night interdiction work—the F-111 wasn't there.

The plane turns out to be a fortune well spent, even in the view of one of its bitterest, most outspoken critics. Put the F-111 where the heat is and the odds of blunting another North Vietnamese invasion or avoiding another July 1950 Korean War near-disaster are bound to change in our favor. Put another way: if your son got tagged with flying a strike near Hanoi, you'd want him to make it in the plane Tactical Air Command let me fly three weeks ago.

It took about 2½ hours in the F-111 to understand why. Taking off with 32,500 lbs. of full internal fuel on full after-burner, Air Force Captain Joe Cabuk—an instructor pilot from the 442nd "Black Bat" Tactical Fighter (Training) Squadron—showed what the F-111 is all about as he eased into a 200-mile low-level ride on automatic terrain-following 500' above Nevada's desert floor and headed North for the White Pine/Ruby Mountain range at about eight-tenths the speed of sound.

Somewhere in our side-by-side but crowded cockpit, a dial I couldn't find told him we were flying 812 feet-per-second—which may explain why F-111 crews worry more about bird strikes than they do the airplane not working. Birds don't focus very well on objects moving that fast. But if the terrain-following radar malfunctions, the F-111 automatically goes into a 3 "g" pull-up. Thus, chances of hitting a bird are better than hitting a mountain, even with hands-off flying.

The F-111's swing wing was swept about 45 degrees (versus 72½ degrees for take-off)—and the ride was smooth. Unbelievably smooth. Even as we started to climb up (and then nose over) the 10,000' bumps that punctuate Nevada's desert southeast of the Bonneville salt flats. Turning northwest and then south over the Tonopah live firing range, Cabuk showed what the F-111 feels like at 200' and "hard ride" (you just dive over the reverse slope of each crest a little faster)—still smooth.

Look out the cockpit, though, at the chase plane tucked in under your right wing and you see him bumping up and down like a nervous porpoise. Cabuk explains that we're riding the same way—you just don't feel it.

By now you've covered about 300 miles on the deck. Cabuk climbs to 37,000 feet, sweeps the wing to 16 degrees, lites the afterburner, and shows you what four "g" maneuvers at Mach 2.1 feel like. That F-111 you've heard criticized so much can maneuver. Cabuk tells you, "This equates to the best." Whatever it is he does to keep the aircraft from stalling, he does more smoothly than my secretary changes typewriter ribbons. "No big deal," Cabuk tells you; "It's just one more edge."

He tells our chase plane crew, Majors Jim Walbridge and W. S. Gustafson, to take the lead and lets you feel what it's like to fly formation, rolling and turning and God knows what else at 3-4 "g"s with the planes so close together a mid-air collision seems inevitable.

But Cabuk is relaxed—not careless, not flip, just sure of the plane he's driving and the training he's had in it. Enough to trust it with his life and train other TAC crews to trust it as well—all the way from 200 feet "hands-off" to 39,000 feet playing tag with another pilot who swears by the plane everyone was swearing at not long ago.

Talking with the TAC pilots and crews who fly and maintain the controversial TFX does a lot to soften the impact of years-long criticism of the plane's cost overruns, schedule slippages, and early, well-publicized performance problems. Flying with them, you end up damned glad that the Air Force and General Dynamics stuck by their guns and brought the F-111 into being. Doing so was no small miracle.

"Little Orphan Annie" was the most over-managed development program in American military history. Former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara insisted on acting personally as the plane's mid-wife. He barely escaped becoming an abortionist.

In the words of Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark), "The program was headed for disaster" when McNamara assumed personal management of it in August of 1966 under the code name Project Icarus. He "managed" the program "without advice and counsel" from the Service program managers. It was months before he let military experts even attend the Icarus meetings (and then only as "observers"). As Sen McClellan summed it up when he reported in December of 1970 on the "longest and most unpleasant inquiry ever conducted" by the Senate, the net effect of Project Icarus was "to waste the time of the contractors and the services' technical experts." Five months after McNamara took over as the F-111's mid-wife, McClellan noted, "the President of General Dynamics complained at an Icarus meeting that he did not have enough time between meetings to solve the problems of the airplanes."

McNamara was so frantic to get *some* plane that worked in order to blunt Congressional criticism of the program that he invented new versions of the aircraft—before its basic design was in workable shape—like an oversexed rabbit trying to re-populate the prairies. What started as a hairy-enough Air Force challenge to build a common F-111A for TAC and F-111B for the Navy soon became an engineering/production nightmare. In quick succession, ten different configurations were in work:

The Navy's F-111B (canceled by Congress in 1968 after seven aircraft were built at a cost of $378-million);

Four attack versions for Tactical Air Command: 141 F-111As, operational now in Nellis' 474th Tactical Fighter Wing; 94 F-111Es, with a new air inlet, now operational at Upper Heyford, England; 96 F-111Ds with an uprated engine and new avionics system, being delivered to the TAC wing at Cannon AFB; and the F-111F with the 35% higher-thrust, Pratt & Whitney P-100 engine and simplified avionics for TAC's wing at Mountain Home AFB.

A SAC version, the FB-111 (ordered first in December of 1965 as a 263-plane buy, but since cut to 76 aircraft);

A British version, the F-111K (50 were ordered in 1966 but canceled in 1968 after a cost of $27-million);

Two reconnaissance versions, the RF-111A and RF-111D (only one was built before the idea was scrapped after $118-million had been spent);

An Australian version, the F-111C (first ordered in October, 1963, the 24 aircraft buy was almost canceled: Australia announced last December that it would take delivery and its crews are now training at Nellis).

Ten configurations being designed—and in some cases, produced—concurrently makes for a bad case of indigestion. Somehow, the Air Force survived it. Even the earliest model, the F-111A1 flew at Nellis, is a helluva credit to the Air Force officers and civilians who, and the General Dynamics team which managed the program—under the handicap of what Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash) once called "shoddy leadership at the highest levels of government."

The crews like it as much as the pilots. I expected to find in the 100-odd F-111As at Nellis just about that many different configurations. Not so. Despite the rash of Pentagon-ordered "fixes" to get the F-111 airborne, Nellis' F-111As comprise only three different configurations, and the differences are so small you could probably call it two. (Nellis is now averaging about 30 flight hours a month on each of its F-111s.)

Ask Airman First Class Perry D. Norris of the 429th Tactical Fighter Squadron, our crew chief, what it's like to maintain Little Orphan Annie: "It's great."

"How long have you been in the Service?"

"A year and a half."

"Are you going to stay in?"

"Yes, Sir."

"Why?"

"I like my job."

You can't give an airplane a better compliment.

A Coward and Bitter Critic Becomes a Convert

(By Benjamin F. Schemmer)

For some years, Armed Forces Journal was one of the F-111's more pejorative critics. Our views softened ten months ago when then Pentagon Editor George Weiss took a detailed look at the program, talked to the men who were flying it, and convinced the editors to run an article in July, "Turkey or Tiger? The F-111: The Swing-Wing May Surprise You Yet." At least one Journal staffer, its editor, was still skeptical; recently I asked the Air Force to let me talk with the crews at Nellis and then "show me."

Turning this critic into an F-111 believer has got to be one of the most ironic and remarkable about-faces the Air Force has brought about. For one thing, I'm a coward in an airplane. Not just a "white-knuckle" flyer, but—ever since a DC-8 caught fire over Chicago in 1962—what psychologists call a "phobic flyer," one of those nuts who clutches the arm rests in morbid anxiety when a 747 sashays gently into an easy three-degree bank.

For another thing, I was Chief of Customer Liaison (sales manager, if you will) for Boeing's Military Aircraft Systems Division during the TFX competition. After we won four successive source-selection board recommendations, but lost the contract, I became somewhat bitter. (In 1965, an assistant secretary of defense asked me during our first meeting—it turned out to be an interview leading to three years in the Pentagon—what I "really thought" of the TFX. I blurted out instinctively: "TFX stands for "Terrible ——— Experience" in my book; you made a horrible mistake, but we never challenged your privilege to make it.") My anti-F-111 bias grew as I watched dedicated and honest officers work night and day in the Pentagon inventing "good news" Mr. McNamara could take to Congress about the program when there really wasn't any. They were hard pressed enough getting airplanes built for Vietnam—and their words too often were twisted by others into testimony that, as one Senator remarked kindly, served only to "suppress the truth at all costs." (I remember screaming "Hooray!" one night when another assistant secretary called me about 10 p.m. in the final throes of the budget cycle and told me to "Get that paper canceling the F-111" up to his office "fast." He became slightly incoherent when I protested that he had the wrong guy on the phone and he found out that the right guy had already left. The paper, I was told, went up the next day—but never came out of McNamara's office.

From 1962 through 1970, I read so many lies about the TFX from Presidential appointees that the F-111 in my lexicon added up to nothing more than a sorry episode in Air Force history. Even when George Weiss talked with TAC crewmen last summer and found them uniformly enthusiastic about "Little Orphan Annie," doubts still lingered

that it was a "put up" front to make the best of a program hopelessly screwed up at higher echelons.

All it took to turn a coward and a critic into a convert was a few hours at Nellis flying that airplane with the men who trust their lives to it every day. First flight I've *enjoyed* in ten years. Little Orphan Annie turns out to be a chapter American airmen should be intensely proud of.

About that 747 ride back to Washington: It was terrifying, as usual.

BUILT TO FIGHT

The Air Force knew years ago, when the first TFX models were getting their worst press, that the aircraft could probably break about five world's records in quick order and pull off a stunt or two bound to make some front page headlines. But the F-111 was built to fight, not "entertain".

It's not just a "great" airplane to ride over Nevada in. Everything it does contributes to combat capabilities TAC hasn't had before. In most fighters, low level flight is hard and brutal punishment on the pilot—like riding a bicycle over railroad ties. The F-111's high-speed, low-level agility and its unique suite of black boxes are going to save lives and let TAC "carry the mail" farther, more accurately, and safer if the aircraft ever has to deploy for the crunch for which it was designed.

Had the F-111 not suffered so many program delays from so much over-management, there might be far fewer American air crewmen on the POW/MIA rolls today.

ACCIDENTS AT 150,000 CUMULATIVE FLYING HOURS

	F-100	F-101	F-102	F-104	F-105	F-106	F-4B	A-7	F-111
Accidents	118	67	65	98	60	40	71	51	24
Destroyed	59	34	31	71	45	19	34	49	18
Fatal	11	12	9	27	12	7	17	8	9
First flight	5-53	9-54	10-53	2-54	10-55	12-56	5-58	9-65	12-64
150,000 hours	3-57	3-60	9-58	11-62	6-63	12-62	4-64	2-69	2-72

CREATIVE FARMING

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which was printed in the April/May issue of the American Farmer. The story of the Fritz Meyer family and their unique promotion of the fruits of their orchards is typical of the kind of hard work and creative thinking evident in American agriculture today. The Meyers will soon celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of their farm.

The article follows:

PUT SOME ZIP INTO YOUR FRUIT SALES

(By Herb Kinnear)

They dream and they innovate, but above all, they work. That describes the folks who make things hum at Waldo Orchards, known as the "Go Place" of Sheboygan County.

It's a family affair for Frederic "Fritz" Meyer, his wife, Lola, and sons, Jeff, 16, and Tim, 15, at their Waldo Orchards located on Highway 28 west of Waldo, Wisconsin. In 1973 they will celebrate the family's Golden Anniversary in the fruit-growing business.

"We were born into the business," Fritz explains. The Meyers are helping carry on an "orcharding" tradition established in 1923 by Fritz's father, the late Arno Meyer, former president of the Wisconsin State Horticultural Society.

On their 110 acres, they have 75 acres of orchard, including 4 acres in pick-your-own cherries and 2 acres of Bartlett pears. The remainder of the orchard is in apples.

One of the big promotional items of this Wisconsin Farm Bureau member family is a 9-foot red apple made of fibre glass. It's much in demand for display at such spots as shopping centers, fairs and parades. Some of the Meyers' other promotional ideas are displayed in the pictures on this page.

These charter members of the Wisconsin Roadside Marketing Association appear frequently on TV and have an orchard movie which receives widespread showing.

One of their unique products is known as an "Apple Lick!"—frozen cider on a stick. This is one of the countless items sold at their on-the-farm country store featuring homemade apple jelly, plum jam, carmel apples and a host of other delicacies and curios.

The Meyers from their "Go Place" of Sheboygan County continuously preach the "Goodness of Apples" in countless ways. And, if the old adage, "an apple a day keeps the doctor away" is true, the Fritz Meyers and their converts will surely live forever.

NATE ROBERTSON—AN HONOR RICHLY DESERVED

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1970, it was my great privilege to bring to the attention of this House the memorable appearance of the Boys' Clubs of Scranton, Pa. at the White House for the President's reception for Congress.

I pointed out at that time not only the excellence of the Gleeboys, as they are called, but their great popularity nationally. I am sure that some of my colleagues at that time took a good look at the Boys' Clubs in their own congressional districts and must have asked themselves: Who is it who has done such outstanding work in promoting such outstandingly worthwhile enterprises like these Boys' Clubs?

Mr. Speaker, the work of nurturing these fine organizations is done by a group of outstanding Americans, distinguished citizens who give their time, their devotion, and their contributions to make the Boys' Clubs of America the outstanding institutions they have become.

One such outstanding man, Nathaniel G. Robertson, Jr., has just been honored for his more than 50 years of unusually devoted service to the Boys' Club of Scranton, and has been awarded the national silver medallion by the Boys' Clubs of America.

For more than half a century, Nate Robertson has served the boys in northeastern Pennsylvania. He has worked on the camp, finance, personnel, program, and property committees. He has been chairman of the camp, finance, and property committees. He has served as president of the Boys' Club. And throughout all these years, his wise and often humorous counsel has been an inspiration to the successive executive directors of the Boys' Club.

This has not been his whole life. In fact, during the years he was devoting so much time to the work of the Boys' Club, he served also as secretary, vice president, president, and board chairman of the Scranton Lace Co. He served also as a director of Scranton's Northeastern National Bank, and as a director of the Virginia Coal and Iron Co.

We often wonder how we can crowd into the limited time at our disposal all the things which must be done. From those early days in his life when he served as a first lieutenant pilot in the aviation section of the U.S. Signal Corps in Europe, Nate Robertson has given all of us the model of how a man can have an overwhelmingly successful career in business, while also giving a portion of his life to the service of the young boys in America.

I know all of my colleagues here in the House will join me in offering our own warmest congratulations to Nate Robertson on the occasion of his receiving this award. By the work of such men will the lives of the young of our Nation always be made richer.

A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today sponsored legislation to give added impetus to the fight against multiple sclerosis, the disease known as the "great crippler of young adults."

This legislation, authored by our colleague from Massachusetts. Mrs. HECKLER, would create a National Commission on Multiple Sclerosis. The Commission would be charged with making a thorough study of current research in the field of multiple sclerosis to determine the most productive avenues of approach toward finding causes, cures and treatments for MS. The Commission would have 1 year in which to complete its investigation and report back to the President and Congress its recommendations for needed legislation, funding levels, and means by which the Federal Government can best participate in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, there is reason to hope that a concerted and coordinated attack

against multiple sclerosis at this time may produce profound results. I commend Mrs. HECHLER for developing legislation that will give new momentum and direction to the fight against MS, and it is a privilege for me to add my support to this effort.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN PARKINSON, JR.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1972, the many friends of John Parkinson, Jr., will honor him for his years of service and dedication as assistant general manager of the Los Angeles Harbor Department.

A native Californian, born in Palo Alto, John is a veteran of half a century of experience in steamship operation and transportation; first with Norton Lilly and Co., and later with Pope and Talbot, Inc. Mr. Parkinson also served with the U.S. Engineers during World War II.

Drawing upon his experience and knowledge in the field of maritime affairs, Mr. Parkinson joined the Los Angeles Harbor Department on April 25, 1955. He started as traffic manager, but two years later, on August 1, 1957, he was appointed assistant general manager.

A member of the World Trade and Harbor Affairs Committees of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, John has been on Trade Missions to both the Far East and Europe.

As a founder of the Foreign Trade Association of southern California, he has served as director, secretary, and vice president of the Los Angeles Transportation Club. Mr. Parkinson is a former member of the Department of Commerce Export Expansion Council, and presently serves as a member of the Mayor's Council for International Visitors.

Active in community affairs, he served as harbor district chairman for the Boy Scouts of America in 1964, and has been a member of the Los Angeles Council Executive Board since that time. In 1967, he was awarded the Order of Merit by the Harbor District, and in 1970 he received the Silver Beaver from the Los Angeles Boy Scout Council.

As a resident of San Pedro, Calif., Mr. Parkinson has involved himself in activities designed to improve the area, and the business fraternity. He served as a member of the board of directors, vice president, and in 1969–70, president of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce. He was also president of the Propeller Club of Los Angeles-Long Beach, 1969–1970, and a member of the board of directors of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities. In 1970, Mr. Parkinson was the recipient of the World Trade Week Bronze Plaque.

In 1968, he received the Award of Merit from the Catholic Maritime Clubs, where he served as president for 3 years, and a member of the board of directors for 5 years.

Last year, he was elected executive vice president of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities, a position he will continue in after his retirement from the Los Angeles Harbor Department.

Mr. Parkinson is a member of the San Pedro Lodge 966, B.P.O.E., and the Stanford Alumni Association.

He and his wife, Margaret, are the parents of a daughter, Cynthia.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to pay tribute to John Parkinson, and to the many outstanding contributions that he has made to the "Cargo Capital of the West," the Port of Los Angeles; to his community; and to his State. It is the personal dedication of those connected with the harbor, exemplified by John Parkinson, that has made the port the thriving enterprise that she is today.

So, to John Parkinson, the retiring assistant general manager of the Los Angeles Harbor Department, in behalf of all who appreciate the devotion and the expertise that he has brought to his position, I say, "Thanks, John," for a job well done.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY BY WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that throughout the free world strong support has been expressed on President Nixon's determination to see that the open North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam does not succeed and that true peace and freedom can be established in Southeast Asia.

A very significant statement in support of President Nixon's Vietnam policy was issued by Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, honorary chairman of the World Anti-Communist League, in Taipei on May 10, 1972, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY WACL HONORARY CHAIRMAN DR. KU CHENG-KANG ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM POLICY

As the war in Vietnam is entering a crucial and decisive stage, President Nixon of the United States has resolutely moved to mine the entrances to North Vietnamese harbors so as to keep external military supplies from reaching the Hanoi regime by sea. This action, the like of which should have been taken long ago, will certainly exert a tremendous influence in checking Vietnamese Communist aggression.

The future of the Vietnam War will decide not just the fate of the Vietnamese. It is inseparably related to the security of the Asian and Pacific region and the entire world as well as the destiny of free mankind as a whole. For this reason, all the free peoples should not only support President Nixon's move but, more importantly, also positively unite all the free nations in a policy to uphold the independence and freedom for the Republic of Vietnam. In particular, we earnestly hope that Asia's free nations will take joint actions to protect and preserve their common security.

PELHAM PARKWAY HOUSES

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, since the maintenance and improvement of public housing is such a crucial need in our urban society, I thought my colleagues would be interested in seeing this report of mine on improvements recently made at Pelham Parkway Houses in the Bronx:

DEAR FRIENDS: I am happy to be able to report to you on the results of several meetings with the New York City Housing Authority concerning the problems of Pelham Parkway Houses.

Several months ago I met with several of the residents of Pelham Parkway Houses including Selma Messinger, Financial Secretary; Paula Katz, Liaison-Tenants-Management Housing Authority; Santina Alberti, Treasurer; Fay DeMaio; Marilyn Salberg, past vice-president of Pelham Parkway Tenants Council and Mr. Holmes, the current Vice-President, to discuss some matters of concern to you.

After this meeting, I called Simeon Golar, Commissioner of the Housing Authority, and requested a meeting with him and his administrative staff.

On December 20, 1971, I met with Maye Shaw and five residents of Pelham Parkway Houses, and Commissioners Golar, Fried, and Gomez, Chief Daley, head of the Housing Authority Police, and several other relevant department heads. Marcus Levy, General Manager of the Housing Authority, chaired the meeting. We discussed several problems, including the improvement of wiring, an increase in police patrols and better maintenance. At the end of the meeting, the Housing Authority agreed to study the problems and meet with us again after my return from Russia.

At the second meeting, on March 10, 1972, after much discussion, the Housing Authority agreed to take the following steps:

1. Provide a scooter for patrols at Pelham Parkway Houses, giving more range and flexibility to the police and allowing quicker responses. This will be available as soon as the training of the officers is completed;

2. To add another maintenance man for the next six months, with the possibility of making him permanent;

3. Improve the outdoor lighting system during the summer;

4. Increase the lighting by the elevators (this has already been done as a result of the meeting);

5. Consider adding police protection from 12 A.M. to 8 A.M. in addition to the current 8 A.M. to midnight patrols;

6. Install a shower on the children's playground by July 1st;

7. Install new 14 cubic foot refrigerators for 5 room apartments now, rather than in several years, with an additional charge;

8. To study the costs of increased wiring to allow for air-conditioning and greater use of modern appliances.

I was told that the existing apartment entrance lock is a very durable, dead-bolt lock and that although the Housing Authority does not encourage tenants to install their own second locks, no tenant will be evicted for installing such a lock. However, it must be remembered that the tenant will bear any cost (generally no more than $5.00 for a brass plate when the lock is removed) rather than impose this expense on the Authority.

I was also told that an intercom system can be installed at a cost of $2.85 per month, per tenant.

Commissioner Fried told me that the Housing Authority is committed to keeping Pelham Parkway Houses a middle income project.

If I can be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Yours,

JAMES M. SCHEUER,
Member of Congress.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S DECISIVE RESPONSE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past week, I have received many letters and wires expressing support for the President's decisive response to the current North Vietnamese offensive in the South, but few are as poignant as the words of a young man stationed at Phu Bai, recently published in the Salt Lake Tribune. With the current hue and cry of the antiwar protestors, we must not lose sight of the most important people in the present controversy—our remaining troops stationed in South Vietnam. Their welfare is uppermost in the President's mind and I am certain the strong support of the men in the field is very meaningful to the President. I am pleased to share Mike Sweeney's letter with my House colleagues:

LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Editor, Tribune: What with all the outcries and demonstrations being created in respect to President Nixon's current decision concerning Vietnam, you might be interested in a May 2 expression contained in a letter from one of our Utah boys, my son, Mike, who is stationed at Phu Bai, South Vietnam, which is several miles south of Hue and is our northernmost outpost. Mike wrote in part:

"I want to say how I feel and maybe 85 to 95 percent of the guys over here think about the reaction to the bombing of the North.

"Most of us feel if President Nixon hadn't had the guts to bomb the North there would have been some very sorry parents of all the soldiers who would have died. He really did save our lives. As you can see, the North, even with bombing, is doing a good job of cutting up the South, and they could have done a better and faster job if it weren't for the bombing. That is our only protection.

"But the attitude of some American students and people is there are no American brothers, sons, etc., over here and it is unjustified for us to bomb . . . Bunk. It wasn't Nixon or the South that invaded the North. I wonder what they would say if the police (example) would come busting into their homes? Would they fight back? I'll bet they would. The South isn't using other countries to station its troops in while they're trying to overthrow governments and kill civilians so that it can raid the North.

"The sad part about this mess is you can't really feel or know what's going on because the American press has a slanted viewpoint about this place. They're trying to sensationalize the things that happen.

"You tell me if we're not doing the right thing. Why don't those so-called 'know it alls stop the bombers' ask my Mama-san why the NVA killed her husband and baby? Why have they killed so many civilians since they came to the South to take over and free the people? Maybe freedom of a life not to live on this planet is the freedom they are giving them.

"The point is, if South Vietnam falls, will North Vietnam withdraw its troops from Cambodia, Laos and Thailand? Or do the American people care if these countries have thousands of people killed? Well this one does. If staying in Nam and stopping the North from taking over the South will help, which it will, I would stay. But the bombing of the North's supplies will do more good than my staying, so I can't see stopping the bombing. I would hate to see Thailand fall or any of the other countries. But it could happen.

"This place is a mess. Politics have screwed everything up. Don't get me wrong. I think this war should have never happened, and if we had had leaders with some insight, we would have never let this happen. But this is neither here nor there."

Mike had a low draft number and has completed about 10 months of his tour in Vietnam. He is married and is a recent graduate of Westminster College.

JACK SWEENEY.

NEW CITIZENS OF AMERICA

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 4, 1972, a most moving ceremony was held at Germantown Academy at Germantown, Pa., at which the students of grades 9, 10, and 11, were present when a number of people formally became American citizens.

A more meaningful ceremony can scarcely be imagined and the remarks of Mr. Edward J. Peszek, the famous Pennsylvanian industrialist and principal speaker of the day, so aptly describe the profound nature of American citizenship, that I include them in full at this point in the RECORD:

New citizens, young citizens of Germantown Academy, and the rest of us experienced citizens, our new citizens have come from 15 different countries. How fortunate we all are that our honored guests chose freely to join us as citizens of the United States. We are also fortunate that they will share with us their experience, their knowledge and their culture.

We often hear the term "cultural exchange." This ceremony is an example of the ultimate in culture exchange—it is truly a marriage of cultures.

Less than 200 years ago all the people who lived here were English subjects.

America is the land of the immigrant. Only the Indian is native here.

We all are familiar with the melting pot theory, where all immigrants were to completely forget the land of their origin and become a homogenized whole.

In this great age in which we are living, many former beliefs and theories are being reassessed. So too the melting pot theory. Many now are viewing the diversity of the American people and the realization of their identity as a mosaic, where differences in harmony produce beauty and strength.

For example, to obtain added strength and durability for a building, the use of pure cement is not sufficient—sand, pebbles and steel reinforcing bars must be added—or—to obtain steel with unusual properties, more than pure iron is needed. Carbon-manganese-nickel, and other elements are needed, so we see differences in harmony creating greater strength and versatility.

It seems to me that America's diversity of its people is not a weakness, rather a latent and secret strength.

James A. Michener points out in his book *Quality of Life:* "The United States has the oldest government in the world without a basic change in its system". Yes, it's also older without change than the governments of England, Sweden or Switzerland.

One of the principal reasons for the long life of our system of government is that it can change by amendment its *own* constitution by its *own* people.

America is like the Mississippi River, the Father of Waters, which is composed of the Ohio River, the Missouri River, the Illinois River, the Kentucky River, the Tennessee River and others all joining together to become the mighty Mississippi, forever one and inseparably flowing on together. This has been the history of the American people because, no matter how varied the contributions, they all merge into the American mainstream of life.

We have a right to be proud of our tributaries from which we flow into the American mainstream of life. Our principal duty to the Republic however, is to concern ourselves not so much from where our ancestors came, but how our children and our grandchildren can all go surging forward together as Americans.

You have indicated by your presence, that it is a high privilege to be an American citizen. I assure you, as an American, it is an equal privilege for us to welcome you.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS' STATEMENT WELCOMING THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to place in the RECORD today the statement of 18 religious leaders of every denomination concerning the recent report of the President's Commission on Population Growth.

I concur with this statement and commend the individuals for their leaderships in this vital area.

The statement follows:

As individuals concerned with the religious life of this nation, we welcome the report of the President's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future as an important contribution to the search for solutions to the growing ecological crisis facing all nations today.

We regret the immediate condemnation of the report by some on doctrinal grounds, because of specific recommendations such as those on abortion law reform or wider access to contraception. Perhaps none of us may agree with all the recommendations in the report, for they deal with complex issues of ethics, cultural and religious attitudes, and public policy which cannot be lightly resolved. Controversy over these points should not be allowed to obscure the need for discussion of the Commission's call for a national population goal and policy.

We call on the President and other national leaders to give this report serious consideration and to publicly encourage other Americans to do the same. Only thus, in a pluralistic society, can a national population

policy emerge consistent with moral principles, social justice, and democratic ideals, and sufficient to meet a crisis which threatens the well-being of people everywhere and of generations to come.

SIGNING THE STATEMENT*

Dr. Cynthia Wedel, President, National Council of Churches.

Mrs. David M. Levitt, President, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Mr. John Coventry Smith, an American President of the World Council of Churches.

Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., Bishop Coadjutor, Episcopal Diocese of New York.

Rabbi Henry Siegmund, Executive Vice President, Synagogue Council of America.

Mrs. Marcus Rohlfs, President, American Baptist Convention.

Dr. Robert N. West, President, Unitarian-Universalist Association.

Dr. Carl E. Thomas, Executive Secretary, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America.

Dr. Foy Valentine, Executive Secretary, Christian Life Commission, Southern Baptist Convention.

Dr. Maurice Eisendrath, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Dr. George A. Chauncey, Director, Office of Church and Society, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.

Bishop John T. Walter, Suffragan Bishop of Washington, Episcopal Church.

Albert Vorspan, Director of Commission on Social Action, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Bishop John Wesley Lord, Past President, Council of Bishops, United Methodist Church.

Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Director of Commission on Interfaith Activities, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Dr. A. Dudley Ward, General Secretary, Board of Christian Social Concerns, United Methodist Church.

Dr. David Colwell, Moderator, United Church of Christ.

Mrs. Lois Stair, Moderator, United Presbyterian Church, USA.

*Organizations listed for identification only.

POLLUTION CONTROL IN INDIANA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the essential aspects of the Federal Government's efforts to bring about better water and air pollution controls is a continuing assessment of the effectiveness of the legislation we already have on the books.

It is only with this kind of monitoring that we can effectively gage new legislation or the impact of old legislation. With this in mind, I offer the following report on air and water pollution control programs in Indiana:

POLLUTION CONTROL IN INDIANA

I. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Funding. Administration of water pollution control programs and construction of control facilities in Indiana are funded separately.

(1) Administration. Under funding for administration of control programs, Indiana appropriated $432,255 in FY 1971 and the Federal government provided an additional $232,927 for a total $665,182.

In FY 1972, Indiana provided $535,024 for administration, the Federal government $350,000, for a total of $885,524.

The Indiana General Assembly has appropriated $535,024 for administration of water pollution control programs for FY 1973. Congress has not completed appropriations for FY 1973, so total funds available for administration purposes next year are not available.

(2) Construction. Under existing law, in order to receive federal funds for construction of water pollution control facilities, State and local government appropriations must match the federal share. The basis of the fund matching formula is: federal share, 50 percent; State share, 25 percent; and local share, 25 percent.

In FY 1971, the State Legislature appropriated $11.4 million to take full advantage of $25 million in Federal funds.

Since FY 1971, however, State appropriations for construction have decreased significantly.

In FY 1972, the State Legislature appropriated only $3.6 million for construction purposes, enabling Indiana to utilize only about $7.2 million of $41 million in Federal funds made available to Indiana that fiscal year.

For FY 1973, the State Legislature appropriated no funds for construction of water pollution facilities. Unless a special session of the legislature is called to appropriate funds, Indiana will receive no federal funds under the matching funds formula.

Staffing. The 1971 General Assembly authorized the Stream Pollution Control Board to fill existing vacancies and employ six more people for environmental control programs. This increase in the Board's staff provided 30 specialists, six secretary-typists and five laboratory technicians for water polution control activities.

Still, personnel on the Stream Pollution Control Board believe that the present staff should be increased to provide adequate monitoring. Consideration is being given to requesting an Environmental Protection Agency study of Board manpower needs.

An Environmental Protection Agency office in Evansville, part of the Chicago regional office, provides technical assistance to the Stream Pollution Control Board. The Evansville office employs 31 people and has an annual budget of $580,300.

Quality Standards. The Environmental Protection Agency approved the proposed interstate water quality standards submitted by Indiana in 1967. In 1971, approval was given for revisions which made the earlier standards more stringent. Indiana was one of the first ten states to have such approval.

Water quality standards serve as guidelines for industries and municipalities in their waste treatment efforts, and can be used by appropriate State agencies and the Justice Department in enforcement proceedings against polluters.

Enforcement. Since January 1970, the Stream Pollution Control Board initiated approximately 100 actions against polluters. Half of these actions have been resolved, the others are pending with completion dates reaching into 1974.

Actions against twenty-five municipal governments and eighteen industries were initiated in 1971. In twelve cases, orders for action have been prepared or pollution has been abated or controlled.

Needs. The needs assessment for FY 1972 has been estimated at $164.6 million cost for 142 projects with a Federal grant share at $82.3 million dollars.

Although approximately 98.5 percent of the sewage from the 3.25 million citizens served by municipal sewers receives treatment, improvements are needed: twenty-five of the 275 municipalities provide only primary treatment facilities; secondary treatment facilities are needed. Primary treatment facilities merely initiate the process of cleaning sewage by reducing its pollutant effect. Secondary treatment facilities treat chemically the liquids from primary facilities, removing some 80 to 90 percent of the remaining pollutants.

Sixty to seventy municipalities are located on streams that do not provide adequate year-round dilution for secondary effluents. Municipalities with effluent discharges upstream from lakes and impounds must yet provide nutrient removal facilities, as must municipalities with effluent discharges into streams with high algae content. Pollution from combination and storm sewer overflows must be controlled.

In many areas regional sewer and treatment systems are needed to solve problems of sewage disposal in suburban areas.

Generally, most industries are taking action to provide adequate treatment facilities. But continuing water pollution control programs are required to keep pace with industrial developments. Although confined animal breeders are making progress in waste control, efforts must be continued to minimize pollution problems from point sources and nonprofit sources from agricultural operations and erosion.

II. AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Funding. In FY 1971, Indiana received $570,000 from the Federal government for air pollution control. The bulk of this—$482,000—was divided up among the localities for operation of local air pollution control agencies.

Staffing. The State Air Pollution Control Board had a total of fifteen people assigned to monitor air pollution as of December 31, 1971. The Board's staff will be increased to thirty-six in July of this year, and to seventy-five by July of 1973.

Quality Standards. Seventeen air quality control regulations have been adopted by the State Air Pollution Control Board, limiting particulant emissions, sulfur dioxide emissions, hydrocarbon emissions, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide emissions, and attempting to control smoke and open burning.

Enforcement. In calendar year 1971, five enforcement actions were initiated: two against municipalities, both of which resulted in cease and desist orders, and three against industries, one of which resulted in a cease and desist order.

Needs. The foremost need of the State Air Pollution Control Board is adequate funding. Last year the Board spent 3.1 cents per capita on air pollution control, an amount which many state environmentalists consider only one-third of what is needed.

Secondly, state and local efforts at enforcement of air quality standards should be increased. A strengthening of the present enforcement procedure may be necessary if the 1975 air quality standards are to be met.

Third, state motor vehicle inspection laws should require that pollution control devices be checked for efficiency.

Ninth District. With the exception of the Columbus area, a number of Ninth District interests have not compiled with Indiana's air pollution regulations. If compliance is not forthcoming, legal action will be initiated, according to the Air Pollution Control Board.

REMEMBER OUR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, America has been derelict in showing appreciation for its war veterans, particularly those who are disabled or ill. Thank God

there are those who remember and who help to make life brighter for these veterans.

Today I pay tribute to all volunteers in America who serve at Veterans Hospitals. The VA Hospitals would be much less pleasant without these volunteers.

The volunteers who serve at the Lincoln, Nebr., Veterans' Administration Hospital are among the most dedicated, unselfish, and thoughtful people in the world. At the annual recognition ceremony at the hospital on May 7, 1972, two of the volunteers were honored for 20,000 hours of service. This service is equal to the amount of time that the average worker puts in during 10 years of employment.

At the Lincoln VA Hospital, volunteers sponsor recreation activities, give donations to provide extras at the hospital, serve coffee to those waiting to be admitted, aid in the work of the hospital, help conduct religious services, and provide assistance in counseling and social work. These volunteers do personal things for the veterans, such as visiting them regularly and helping them with their letter writing. The volunteers even go beyond the hospital, providing transportation to and from treatment clinics and visiting former patients now in community care facilities.

It is with pride that I call your attention to the individuals honored for voluntary service at the Lincoln Hospital on May 7, 1972:

INDIVIDUALS HONORED FOR VOLUNTARY SERVICE

Regularly Scheduled Volunteers receiving awards at the annual recognition ceremony at the V. A. Hospital, Lincoln, Nebraska, on May 7, 1972:

James H. Parke Achievement Award—20,000 Hours of Service:
Mr. Nathan Grossman, VFW.
Mrs. Helen Russell, AIA.

VA Silver Pin—2500 Hours of Service:
Mrs. Mattie DoRan, ALA.
Mrs. Bertha Jackson, ALA
Mrs. Gladys Schaefer, MOCA/VFWA.
Mrs. Myrtle Smith, USAM.
Mrs. Bertha Stalder, ALA.

VA Bronze Pin—1750 Hours of Service:
Mrs. Iris Porter, ALA.

Certificates of Devotion to Volunteer Duty—1000 Hours of Service:
Mr. Ray Bauman.
Mrs. James Delehant, WW I.
Mr. James Hutchinson, AL.
Mrs. Jessie Robertson, ARC.

Certificates of Outstanding Service—500 Hours of Service:
Mrs. Barbara Auer, ARC.
Mrs. Shirley Baker, NCCS.
Mrs. Berneice Boisen, VFWA/MOCA.
Mr. Louis Brown, VFW/MOC.
Mrs. Ila Coslett, VFWA.
Mr. Don Desch, MOC.
Mrs. Dorothy Dietz, DAVA.
Mr. Morell DoRan, ALA.
Mrs. Dorothy Kennedy, ARC.
Mrs. Leola Kreimer, ALA.
Mrs. Marie Kuska, ARC.
Mrs. Leona Opfer, ALA.
Mrs. Doris Schreiner, ALA.
Mrs. Wilma Slama, MOCA/VFWA.
Mrs. Eileen Slaughter.
Mr. Charles Spalding, MOC.
Mrs. Alice Wiles, ARC.
Junior Woman's Club.

Certificates of Merits—300 Hours of Services:
Mrs. Barbara Auer, ARC.
Mrs. Ruby Brington, ALA.
Mrs. Ann Brodecky, VFW/MOCA.
Mr. Tom Brown.
Mrs. Neva Copes, ALA.
Mrs. Goldie Green.
Mrs. Cleo Horstman, ALA.
Mrs. Dorothy Kennedy, ARC.
Mr. Joseph Klingel, MOC/WW I.
Mrs. Lulu Kruse, ALA.
Mr. Ervin Schmidt, WW I.
Mrs. Lydia Scott, ALA.
Mr. George Slama, MOC.
Mrs. Alice Wiles, ARC.
Mrs. Pat Williams, MOCA.

Certificates of Appreciation—100 Hours of Service to Youth Volunteers:
Matt Babcook.
Vance Kramer.
Jim Rhoades.
Rodney Shafer.
Burdette Slam, MOC sponsored.
Bill Sword.

Certificates of Appreciation—100 Hours Service to Adult Volunteers:
Mrs. Belle Benson, DUV.
Mrs. Jeri Brown.
Mrs. Marie Burd, ALA.
Mr. Thomas Clift, DAV.
Mrs. Pat Desh, Ala.
Miss Florence Ewing.
Mr. Charles Horstman.
Mrs. Helen Hovey.
Mrs. Iva Mae Hull, VFWA.
Mrs. Mickie Kirk, ALA.
Mrs. Kathryn Leseberg, VFWA.
Miss Rebecca Lewis.
Mrs. Agnes Llewellyn.
Mrs. Delpha Luhr.
Mrs. Lela McGurk.
Mrs. Gladys McNeil, ALA.
Mrs. Clara Magee, VFWA.
Miss Mary Martin.
Mrs. Hattie Rogers, ALA.
Mrs. Reva Roland.
Mrs. Dorothy Scheuman, ALA.
Mr. Ervin Schmidt, WW I.
Mrs. Barbara Seglin, ARC.
Mrs. Katherine Stoner, ALA.
Mrs. Aurelia Thomas.
Mrs. Catherine Vahle, NCCS.
Mrs. Florentine Walin, ALA.
Mr. Tom Weber.
Mrs. Reba Wroth.

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER SPEAKS—ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave accorded, I am including as part of these remarks, a poem bearing the title above indicated, and written some years ago by Maurice H. Thatcher, who was a Member of this body for five terms—1923–33.

The poem is altogether appropriate and timely for Decoration Day; and it applies to the original Unknown Soldier and to the other unknown soldiers as well:

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER SPEAKS—ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

I am the Unknown Soldier! Here I rest
Beneath this white and stainless monument:
Above all others is my mem'ry blest,
I am the Nation's symbol; in me are blent
Ideals of valor and sacrifice.
Before the Day of Judgment none may know
My name or race, or hold the least surmise
Of who I am; or whether high or low.
"Rest!" did I say? Alone my dust is here:
My spirit ne'er may find respose until
There is an end to sceptred force and fear;
And man shall cease to ravage and to kill.
War's victims, all, must haunt a stricken world
Till war itself is dead; its banners furled!

NASA SKYLAB PROGRAM

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the next phase of the U.S. manned space effort will build on the enormously successful Apollo program. I refer, of course to the NASA "Skylab" project which is scheduled for its first mission on April 30, 1973. This first mission will send three astronauts into earth orbit for a period of 28 days. During this mission, and two longer missions to follow, the astronauts will perform scientific experiments which will greatly expand the frontiers of human knowledge and demonstrate beyond dispute the utility of manned space flight.

My good friend, Mr. Robert J. Boylan, of Washington, D.C., has written an excellent review of this important program which was published as an article in the April 1972 issue of Seapower magazine. Mr. Boylan is a writer with years of experience in the newspaper field and with the USIA. He is a retired Foreign Service officer and a former naval officer with service in World War II.

The article follows:

WARDROOM IN THE SKY

(By Robert J. Boylan)

It's true the job site is rather remote, but there are some attractive fringe benefits: a trip over China every week—look at the coverage the President got—a daily change of underwear with no laundry bills; quarters as big as a two-story row house with hot water bath and beds; regular, even *haute*, cuisine; and music and games.

There are, however, some hardships, seeming or otherwise, such as sleeping in a sack, missing golf, the Lucy Show, the Game of the Week, and not seeing the wife and kids for an extended spell.

Whatever the pros and cons of creature comfort, there have been no dearth of qualified applicants, and the final selection of nine out of 73 astronauts included seven military officers—four Navy, two Marine, one Air Force—and two civilians. The job? The next major program in space, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's earth-orbiting Skylab.

Just how great an advance in many areas Skylab is can be inferred from a few simple comparisons. The first Mercury launches of the 1960s—remember how long ago that seems—were as close to returning to the womb as we are apt to get technologically. The astronaut was "tucked" into a capsule festooned with sensor wires in about as much space as a racing car cockpit. Even Apollo offered its three-man crew only 210 cubic feet of space; walk into your closet to get an idea how big that is. Skylab has about 13,000 feet and will offer all the amenities of home. And that is exactly what it will be for four weeks on the first mission and eight weeks on the second and third.

Perhaps because all three commanders of the three Skylabs will be officers of the naval service, the three-room craft has taken on some traditionally nautical designations. No

dining room here, instead a wardroom. If it is the smallest ever to bear that distinctively naval designation, and will lack the time-honored green baize covering during off-duty hours, it will afford the main functions of the tradition it follows in name. For the first time, American astronauts will be able to sit down—or stand—at a table and eat a hot meal using knives and forks. At 2,500 calories per day and with a broad selection of menus, they will have fare many an earth-bound executive might envy, including lobster newburg, filet mignon, brownie snacks and shrimp cocktail. (On moon flights the chow was modified C-rations eaten on their couches.) To work off those calories there will be a stationary bike in the "exercise room."

NO WORRY ABOUT "HOLE" CARD

And there will be the expected wardroom pleasures: good cassette and reel recorders with a wide range of music; up-to-date books and magazines; a dart board and cards. (No worry about lack of gravity. Skylab works with and against it. The cards have little clips to keep that "hole" card covered; and the darts have snuck something from fashion that threatens the zipper. The dart tips will be covered with those tiny plastic "hooks" while the board will be covered with the tiny "eyes.")

Now about those sacks which sound like something from a Charles Addams cartoon. Actually the bedrooms are narrow compartments containing a kind of restraining bag into which astronauts crawl at night. Since there is no up and down or weight . . . well, it's like sleeping on air.

Sound interesting? The first launch is scheduled to be televised in the best NASA tradition on April 30, 1973 and will consist of a two-stage Saturn V booster sending aloft as its unmanned payload Skylab—composed of the orbital workshop and living space, the airlock module, the multiple docking adapter, the Apollo telescope mount, and an instrument unit.

On the following day a smaller Saturn 1B will launch the command and service module to rendezvous with Skylab for docking and transfer of the three-man crew. Crews will return to earth by command module at the end of each flight period.

Over a period of eight months there will be a total of three manned earth-orbiting space flights in Skylab. The first manned flight is for 28 days, and the next two are for 56 days each, in the summer and fall.

NAVY COMMANDERS

For the first mission, the crew will be commanded by Captain Charles "Pete" Conrad, Jr., USN. Other members are Commander Joseph P. Kerwin of the Navy Medical Corps, an astronaut-scientist, and Commander Paul Weitz, USN. Captain Conrad is a true veteran—having been selected in the second group of astronauts nearly ten years ago. Most recently he was commander of the Apollo 12 lunar exploration mission.

Another veteran, Captain Alan L. Bean, USN, who explored the moon with Captain Conrad in Apollo 12, heads the crew for the second SKYLAB flight. With him will be Dr. Owen K. Garriott, a civilian, and Major Jack R. Lousma of the Marine Corps. For the third mission, the commander is Lieutenant Colonel Gerald P. Carr of the Marine Corps along with a civilian physician, Dr. Edward C. Gibson, and Lieutenant Colonel William R. Pogue of the Air Force.

The strong naval service presence on the important Skylab continues the excellent contribution of Navy and Marine officers to the pre-lunar and moon landing programs, Mercury, Gemini and Apollo.

They include such pioneers as Rear Admiral Alan Shepard, Jr., the first American launched into space (in a sub-orbital flight), who came back after a disability to command the highly successful Apollo 14 landing on the moon; Colonel John M. Glenn, the first American astronaut to orbit the earth; Neil Armstrong, the first man to land on the moon (although then a civilian, he earned his wings as a naval aviation cadet and flew many combat missions in Korea as a Marine aviator); Captain Scott Carpenter, USN, both an astronaut and an aquanaut; Captain Walter Schirra, Jr., USN; Captain James A. Lovell, USN; Captain John W. Young, USN; Captain Eugene A. Cernan, USN, Captain Richard F. Gordon, Jr., Captain Conrad and others.

The Apollo 16 moon landing mission is scheduled to be commanded by Navy Captain Young, with Commander Thomas K. Mattingly, II, and Colonel Charles M. Duke, Jr., USAF, as crew members. Apollo 17, the last moon flight, has Navy Captain Cernan as skipper and Commander Ronald E. Evans, and civilian scientist Harrison H. (Jack) Schmitt as the other members of the crew.

Skylab will follow the final two Apollo flights, scheduled for this month and next December. It will not truly be a substitute for the now abandoned Air Force Manned Orbital Laboratory (MOL), as Skylab was originally planned as an "Apollo Applications Program," but it will be a manned orbital *laboratory*, as distinguished from the earlier lunar space *vehicles*, operating for considerably longer periods in space, for both scientific and, we are confident, some military experiments in near space.

And it will be a prelude to NASA's Space Shuttle program, recently ordered by President Nixon to carry on the U.S. space program. When the latter flights begin, it is expected that astronauts and others from the naval service will continue to play major roles in the program.

LIVE AND WORK IN SPACE

The Space Shuttle is visualized as a system of reusable rocket boosters and spacecraft able to fly routinely into and out of space—much like conventional aircraft—vehicles that would be good for at least a hundred missions. Boosters in the past have been one-shot operations, as have command modules, the vehicles in which astronauts return to earth.

What is Skylab? Actually there are two definitions. One is that it is the name of the entire five-component space-train that will orbit the earth from a height of 235 nautical miles. The other definition is that it is essentially the two-story laboratory for work and living space—a cylinder 48 feet long and 22 feet wide—the first United States vehicle specifically created to enable man to live and work in space for extended periods.

For Skylab, NASA says it is planning these four types of investigatory missions to be carried on during the long periods aloft:

1. To increase man's knowledge of the biomedical functions of living organisms, human and other, by making observations under weightless conditions for long periods. For this purpose there will be a collection of white mice and insects (including the vinegar gnat) aboard for laboratory experiments and observation.

2. To increase man's knowledge of the sun and its importance to man's existence.

3. To develop techniques for observing earth phenomena from space in the areas of agriculture, forestry, geology, geography, air and water pollution, land use and meteorology, and the influence man has on these elements.

4. To develop improved techniques for space operations in the fields of how a crew lives together, the inter-relationships of men and machines, the feasibility of the space vehicle as a place for living over a long period and how supporting mechanisms work in making space livable over long periods.

Skylab may lack some of the glamor of moon flights but should produce a variety of useful scientific experiments, particularly with its Apollo telescope mount. Skylab will pass over the United States, much of Europe, all of Africa, Australia and China, almost all of South America, and the oceans between those areas. There will be a "window on the world" from which astronauts can have an excellent view of the terrain.

Three NASA authors writing for *Astronautics and Aeronautics* have this to say about Skylab:

"Designers had the luxury of 90 years from the invention of the steam engine to the introduction of the Pullman car, some 70 years from the introduction of the automobile to the current models and about 50 years from Kitty Hawk to the advent of the jetliner.

"A man first entered space in 1961 and now, just 12 years later, we are called upon to provide him with the facilities to combat a variety of unusual circumstances, such as weightlessness and vacuum, while performing the most complex set of space investigations yet defined: to look up and study the sun, to look down and study Earth, to look out and measure the surrounding contamination, to look in and evaluate his ability to work in zero-gravity and to truly delve deep into himself, to appraise his physiological fitness in this still relatively novel environment of space."

They conclude their article and answer the question "Wouldn't machines be preferable?" by pointing out, "We don't have any unmanned research laboratories, commercial aircraft, or medical clinics here on Earth. Computers are our servants, not the other way around. On Skylab, we hope to demonstrate this fact beyond controversy or cavil."

One of the three authors is certainly speaking from strength and conviction. He is Commander Joseph P. Kerwin of the Navy Medical Corps, who is going along on the first Skylab mission. The other authors are Edward J. McLaughlin of NASA and Colonel Stanley C. White of the Air Force.

In contrast to the manned moon flights and farther out stellar, unmanned flights, Skylab and the follow-on Space Shuttle will be earth-orbital missions. Thus they will not only provide an opportunity for a wide variety of scientific and technical experiments of immediate and later advantage to mankind, but could have important military implications. While NASA says little about this, the Pentagon in the past has pointedly noted the vital military aspects of much of the Soviet near earth space experiments. Indeed, the now-abandoned Air Force MOL largely was designed to determine whether military aerospace activities were necessary to American survival.

In an article in *Astronautics and Aeronautics* last year, Deputy NASA Administrator George M. Low said that man explored space "first as an adventurer, and then as an explorer . . . and [then] because his security and even his survival depend on it." Many Air Force officials have made even stronger statments along this line.

Beyond the immediate scientific experiments to be made by the first Skylab team, there are possible early applications for industry. Manufacturing techniques not possible on earth may be possible in zero gravity. They include, says NASA, casting of spheres, growth of crystal structures, development of foamed high strength materials, including ways of processing various materials, from crystals to pharmaceuticals to high strength structures. This could provide a major payoff for better living on earth.

THE ROMANCE OF AMERICA

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard about the "American Dream," where an immigrant

could come to this country with only his strong willingness to work, and find success. In my district lives a man who personifies that dream. He is Peter T. Campon. Mr. Campon arrived in this Nation from Italy at age 10.

His love for this, his chosen country, is best illustrated by the fact that he has, for many years, been speaking to numerous groups about the meaning of Americanism. Despite his age of 96, he still has a rather active speaking schedule.

In the past I have inserted Mr. Campon's speeches in the Extension of Remarks. His wisdom can teach all of us a lesson. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in inserting a recent speech of his so we can further benefit from his guidance.

The speech follows:

THE ROMANCE OF AMERICA

(Formation-Colonization: Development and Progress Compiled by Peter R. Campon, 1934 (Revised—1971))

"Cherish the spirit of our people and keep alive their attention. Be not too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them."

Those words are said to have been Thomas Jefferson's final message to his countrymen, and I take the liberty to use them as a text for a message on better understanding of each other as fellow Americans, with the request that you be not too severe upon my audacity, as my purpose is not so much to enlighten as to remind you of our responsibilities.

As Americans we seek spiritual union with all those who love liberty. Of many bloods and diverse national origins, we stand before the World as one people, united in a common determination to uphold human society which makes conscience superior to brute strength and maintain that ideal of freedom based on liberty and justice, rather than on tyrannical force in the governments of nations.

The discovery and settlement of America did much for the ideal of Democracy. Indeed, it is doubtful if this ideal could have been possible elsewhere had not America been discovered. The promise of freedom in the far away land, the sense that somewhere there could be independence for the common man, made common men everywhere more independent, and the discovery of America has long since been regarded as a rebirth of humanity.

Following the discovery, European needs sent out bold men in frail craft to search the seas, bent on discovery of further lands unknown. European ambitions equipped adventurers for their expeditions of conquests, which eventually led to establishment of New World colonies. The economic exigencies and political struggles of Europe sent floods of settlers to people them.

The settlers from Spain, France, England, Holland, brought all their home life, their institutions and their religions to the new Continent, and the English Colonists being the most numerous and the most active, established and shaped the basis of this great Nation which has gained so distinct a primacy on this Continent and in the World at large.

And so, out of the European lands to which the vast majority of us trace our origins, came millions of men and women—missionaries, pioneers, adventurers, farmers, artisans, men of commerce, rich and poor, old and young, all drawn irresistibly by the magnet of the New World. Victims of oppression, political and religious, made their way here from the four corners of the earth to find, as they still find, safe refuge and heartening hospitality. Here was new space for living and, infinitely more important, opportunity for all in a new way of life—based in liberty under law, and all men equal under the law.

Out of the rich virgin soil, a new Nation was founded and a new race of men grew up, courageous and strong in the invigorating air of freedom, a bold and independent people who scoffed at the idea of "divine right of kings"; but rather firmly believed in the divine right of men.

There foreigners who colonized the land, gradually lost their alien identities through their adoption of the typical Colonial Code of behavior and standards of living. Intermarriage too did much to obliterate the customs of their parents' home lands. Those who were less clannish and more pliable by nature were more readily accepted as "Americans," and so these people settled in many parts of the land—most of them had gone into some field of endeavor for which they seemed especially qualified, and had done some outstanding thing to enrich the New Nation.

A century and half later when some of our hard-boiled citizens expressed the fear that our "pure" American stock was in danger of contamination from European immigrants, Theodore Roosevelt reminded us "that our blood is no more mixed today than it was at the dawn of our Country," then added that "in every generation since our government was founded, men of foreign birth have stood in the foremost rank of good citizenship, not only in one, but in every field of American activity."

No one particular nationality created and developed America. It was the vision and the courage, the brain and brawn of men of many nationalities, working together as Americans, that accomplished it.

In 1924 the late President Coolidge rendered a service to both historical perspective and patriotic concept, when in addressing the American Legion at Omaha, he said, "Whether one traces his Americanism back 300 years to the Mayflower, or back three years to the steerage, is not half so important as to whether his Americanism of today is real and genuine. We all should realize that there are true Americans among us who do not happen to be born in any part of our Country, who do not attend our place of religious worship, who are not of our racial stock or who may not be proficient in our language. Divine Providence has not bestowed upon any race a monopoly of patriotism or of character." And as an immigrant who came over on the steerage, let me add, that regardless of when or what type of craft we came over on, we are now in the same boat. Let us be careful not to rock it, particularly in these critical days when solidarity and unity are so essential.

No nation in the history of the World has ever opened its gates so wide, to welcome into citizenship, people of other lands as our own United States, nor has any nation ever received such lavish treasures in return as has come to us from immigrants of other nations.

This is not a nation of any one particular nationality, but a combination of many nationalities, and tongues, and races and creeds from every corner of the earth, of men and women who left their native lands, their loved ones, friends and homes to cross strange seas, to where a language is spoken that is alien to them—To start life over again and begin at the very foundation, if they could satisfy the quest for what their spirits craved, knowing that whatever the customs, whatever the speech, there is but one longing and utterance of the human heart, and that is for liberty and justice, and they brought with them, their arts and hand craft and hands with which to work, and minds that could conceive, and hearts filled with home, stout hearts to drive willing hands, with the sunshine and music of their ancient and noble heritage and have laid them at the altar of our America.

We in the United States are amazingly rich in elements with which to build our culture. We have the best of man's past brought to us by people from every corner of the earth, and as we weave these precious fibers into a national pattern of beauty and strength, let us keep the original fibers intact that the finest of each, will manifest themselves into one harmonious whole.

We have the best standards of living in the World, past or present. We are better housed, better clothed and better fed, more luxuries, more comforts and more conveniences than any other nation.

We hold a position of moral and spiritual influence. We have more hospitals, more charitable institutions and more churches than any other nation, and yet, because of a War we should not have gotten into, we have been plagued with destructive demonstrations in disobedience to lawful authority, engineered by Radical agitators evidently indoctrinated with a foreign cankerous ideology used to "brain wash these gullible smart protestors" who become contaminated with this subversive propaganda, rather than hold fast to that which is good.

We have a governmental system that we know is good. It does have faults of operation which we endeavor to correct through experience, as we advance toward unknown horizons, but the faults are not traceable to the structure itself, but to the selfishness and greed of individuals and groups. The fundamental principles have been proven to be the best form of government for the welfare of all, and the finest instrument for human freedom, liberty and justice ever devised or tried by men.

Let them realize that we cannot smugly expect to be preserved by the valor and sacrifices of the founders, to whom the ideals of this young nation were dearer than life itself, that to each generation there comes a sacred responsibility and a patriotic duty and that only in our own willingness to sacrifice and endure as those before us have sacrificed and endured rests our national unity and hope for the future.

Let us hope from the lessons of the past several years, when the use of free speech and civil liberty seemed like "Donnybrook free for all", affairs that the eventual result might be, *free for none,* reflect on what happened in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and I also remind you that this country was founded on majority rule, therefore, the rights of the minorities should end where the rights of the majorities begin.

All these facts prove the contrary of the protests and propaganda being fed into the minds of our youth so forcefully and so relentlessly. The facts really are that with only about 10% of the world's population, we have more young children in primary schools and older ones in high schools and colleges, more musical and literary organizations, than all the other 90% combined.

Let us end this casual acceptance of our benefits, and bring to life, with full appreciation, our blessings, our opportunities, and our responsibilities, and the exercise of our personal responsibilities is the golden key to a healthier and greater America.

If we are to preserve our Democratic form of government, we must simply and sincerely believe—but not in smugness or complacency—that the qualities which have brought America through the storms of the past will just as surely prevail against all storms of the present and of the future; and, the late President Roosevelt had said, "The state of this nation is good; the heart of this nation is sound; the spirit of this nation is strong; the faith of this nation is eternal".

And in these days of unbelievable chaos and confusion let us hold fast to faith. Faith in ourselves; faith in Divine assistance; Faith in our nation; Faith in our American way of life.

Americans who think and serve alike, pos-

sess a unity of interest which transcends all artificial barriers of Race or Creed, therefore in our world's present great confusion let us resolve to improve our own individual selves. To better know and help our fellow men: To prove tolerant, sympathetic and neighborly: To make our community and nation better known and loved: To leave something of ourselves in everything we do: To try our best to be our best and to do our best in all things and at all times.

The task before us may not be an easy one, but is not impossible of achievement. With minds attuned to each other's thinking, with hearts beating in unison for the common cause, there is no goal or no ideal too lofty of attainment; but one thing is absolutely necessary—it all depends on you, and you, and all of us to awaken in the minds and hearts of all Americans, (of whatever Nationality, Race or Creed) that we have a glorious future within our grasp—the future of a land in which any human being of whatever Nationality, Race or Creed may live in dignity, in comfort and in contentment—if one has the will to do so.

The late President Coolidge has written "that to be a citizen under the Constitution of the United States is the greatest privilege ever accorded the human race". To be born an American is a splendid distinction, but to those who come to our shores from other lands, and are honored with citizenship, it is a wonderful privilege and a cherished dream come true.

I am proud to say that I am a naturalized citizen—that I have taken an oath of allegiance to the U.S.A.—an allegiance to a great body of principles, to a great hope of the human race. I came to the United States as a 10 year old boy with no knowledge of the English language and with little opportunity for schooling, eventually pulled myself up by my own bootstraps and when I was elected President of our City Council in 1946, I accepted the gavel—60 years to the day I landed in New York—with the following statement: "To me this honor epitomizes the American spirit of our Democratic possibility and opportunity, for in no other country can a man so completely mould his own destiny, and I remind you that it is of equal importance for America to be born in a man as to have a man born in America".

Arguments have frequently been advanced on the superiority of one racial or national group over another. This question was recently put up to a head football coach of a prominent University. I quote to you his reply: "In the past 30 years I have had 58 different Nationalities on my teams; some of these of course were mixtures, but there were 58 different breeds, and it is my opinion that no one nationality can lay claim to any superior hold on courage or intelligence or competitive spirit. They all average about the same. Most of them are game enough and most of them can be taught by proper teaching. Of course, some years we have had much bigger men and faster men—natural athletes—but these are equipped by nature, not by any racial gifts". If we look over the line ups in baseball, football, basketball, etc. around the country, his statement seems to be verified. The lists are full of unpronounceable names and many of these boys of foreign extraction are splendid athletes and spendid Americans, taken from any angle you might name, which is further proof that the Melting Pot (God's Crucible) is functioning in a big way.

We frequently hear the question "What is an American?" I know of no better answer than the one depicted in a poster used extensively during the first World War to promote one of the Liberty Loans. It portrayed a figure of Peace holding in her hand a laurel wreath, poised to place on a monumental shaft, on which were inscribed such names as Nelson, Ostrodowski, O'Brien, Cohen, McFarlane, Martinelli, Cizka, Conimikas, Knutson, Polasek, and others difficult of pronouncing, but bearing this caption, "Americans All!!"

And, if we observed the honor rolls in our cities during the Second World War, we found them full of unpronounceable names, and yet these young men were Americans All, whether they descended from the adventure ships, the Mayflower or the steerage! They fought and they died that our American Way of life might be preserved. If we regard them as anything but fine upstanding young Americans, their fight for liberty and justice shall have been in vain.

America is heir to all of the World! We should not lose any part which is rightfully ours. We should not fear lest this Pantheon of many nationalistic ideals will turn into a pandemonium, for the American spirit is big enough to harmonize them all; and if Americanism declines to observe and interpret its characteristic environment, it may achieve certain cultural greatness; it may erect well equipped gymnasiums wherein to engage in dialectical exercises; it may clothe itself in literary and other arts, but it will not afford illumination or direction of our composite citizenship and complex civilization. These can only come from the spirit that is interested in material realities and courageously faces them frankly and sympathetically.

As Americans we have a two-fold task to perform for our own benefit. First, we should learn to understand and appreciate the best characteristics and aspirations of the rest of mankind. Secondly, we must avoid the destruction of the priceless heritage which the immigrants from the older nations bring to the Melting Pot of America. All true culture, to be true must be conscious of the process which induced it, and in the process of assimilation must not destroy the self respect of the immigrant or his descendants.

The America that arises from such a process of human conservation, and realizes such attainment will inevitably keep its place at the Zenith. What a glorious opportunity! America is great because it has received and absorbed much from all other Nations of the World. We must not lose this. The children of immigrant parents must remain proud of the language, the history, the art and the culture of their parents. If the false spirit of 100% American makes any single boy or girl forget the greatness of their parents' native country or be ashamed to speak their language, then America is robbed and made so much the poorer.

We all should be more friendly to our foreign born citizens. We should encourage their music, their handicrafts, their ancient experiences, their soulfulness. We should welcome every spiritual influence, every cultural urge, and in turn we should ask them to love America as we love it because it is holy ground—because it serves the World and humanity. Tell him and ourselves that America is not perfect, that we are striving to improve the bad conditions, that it is not a finished country, that it has possibilities that shall never end, and that their chances here and of their children and our children shall be in ratio to our zeal, ambition and devotion to our ideals.

I brought from my Motherland what I regard as the best of her spirit, surrendered everything material of the old life and cast my lot without reservation into the new—and while I have never ceased to love the land of my birth, as such memories are sacred and ought not to be put out of our hearts, because no man can ever amount to much who is not linked with the highest aspirations of his race, or who would despise the noble traditions of his father and mother. Nevertheless, I have sincerely dedicated myself to America, am proud to be the father of American children, and rejoice in my heart of the great ideals which have made America the hope of the World.

Our quest after ideals is the main central reason of life. Only the greatest of minds living in an age of tyranny could have foreseen the portrait of a free people, hence the Declaration of Independence which gave birth to our ideals and our great nation. And this was the First Declaration of Government by Men—the corner stone of a new structure, destined to do away with government based on conquest and subjection. And to throw into the discard the accumulated garbage of centuries of servitude and tyrants.

True love of country is not mere blind partisanship. It is regard for the people of one's country and all of them. . . . It is a feeling of fellowship and brotherhood for all of them. It is a desire for prosperity and happiness for all of them. It is kind and considerate judgment toward all of them. The first duty of self government is individual self control. The essential condition of true progress is that it shall be based on ground of reason—not on prejudice.

Lincoln's noble sentiment of "Charity for all and malice toward none" was not an exclusive specific for the Civil War alone, but a living principle of patriotic action. What our part may signify this living principle, we may not understand, but we are here to play it and now is the time with our Country at the cross roads of her destiny. This we know, it is a part of action, not of whining; it is a part of love, not of cynicism. It is for us to understand and cultivate each other as fellow-Americans, regardless of Race or Creed or terms of human helpfulness.

We all came to America, either ourselves or in the persons of our parents of one or more generations back, to improve the ideals of men, to make them see finer things than they had ever seen before; to get rid of things that divide and make sure of things that unite. It was but an historical accident, no doubt, that this great Nation was called the "United States of America," but we should be thankful for that significant title, and the man who seeks to divide man from man, group from group, class from class in this great Union is striking at its very heart. Rome endured just so long as she remained Roman. America will endure just so long as she remained American in spirit and in action.

Unless it be the Indian, there is no such thing as a 100% American. Let such self styled citizen boast as much as they please, they themselves come from all the Races of the Earth. Intelligence and thoughtful living and good citizenship comes out of all the Races. We should be proud of our ancestors, but not fret or brag about them either. Think of our own record here and now, because Americanism is not so much something that we inherit at birth, but more an attitude of mind. It is the way we look at exalted and worthwhile things and properly exemplify them, that makes us truly American, and Americanism too, is like charity—it begins at home.

The preservation of Democracy is of serious concern to our American people, and while Democracy in other parts of the world has been dealt vital blows, the best way to preserve it in our America is to make it work by practicing it in the home, in the schools, in the Churches, in the clubs and in the community, because while we frequently hear the facetious remark that "the first one hundred years are the hardest", we should have no illusions that the years ahead of us will be less easy. To the contrary, they will be years of challenge, years of social upheaval, years of changing tastes in all forms of daily living, particularly in the social, moral and economic life of our advancing nation.

This is our country! This is the land which we, in our admiring love for it—we, the men,

women and children of this great Commonwealth, from all corners of the earth, are want to call not a country of any superior race or nationality, not a country of any favored denominational religious group,—but the land of the living God who bestowed the blessings upon it as a haven for oppressed humanity.

These impressions of Americanism, personal and of Americans, native and foreign born, have been assembled and presented to you as a sort of a mirror whereby we might see ourselves as others see us, and while they may some how reflect the soul of an immigrant, I believe, and hope that you will agree with me, that I have presented Americanism in its true light.

What America expects from all of us is everlasting pride of country, simple, honest and ever present—a pride that should be compatible with a sympathic regard for people of the Old World, whose civilization we have inherited. If we have that pride and keep the faith, we shall more appreciate our own responsibilities, and to the blessings and privileges of the great institutions which we enjoy we should pledge to each other the firm resolve that only in Americanizing ourselves can we truly serve America. Such self-education and application is our highest contribution to human progress and enlightenment.

If we can earnestly dedicate ourselves to such a standard of citizenship, then we can indeed merit the noblest title any man can bear, "An American Citizen".

Let us therefore revel in all the blessings we enjoy or goodness and grandeur, which we so frequently take for granted and be ever thankful that we are citizens of this great republic.

Let us go forward and onward with abiding Faith in Our Creator, and re-dedicate ourselves to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, which so eloquently spells out the magic of America.

FOOD STAMP ABUSES

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I keep receiving reports of obviously well-to-do people going into grocery stores, purchasing commodities with food stamps, and so often going away in expensive automobiles. This is an abuse of welfare privileges which must not be tolerated. Those who administer the program should put a stop to it.

I included in my remarks an article from the May 14 issue of the San Antonio Evening News, which refers to another example of what I have referred to. The article follows:

STORE SCENE

How rich or how poor must a resident be to draw Food Stamps here?

"The other afternoon," writes a northsider, "I was in a supermart as a well-dressed lady produced some stamps to pay for her order at a checkout counter.

"Turned out she didn't have enough stamps," the letter goes on.

"So she opened her purse, out came a check book, and she proceeded to write a check for the unpaid balance.

"I was fascinated enough to stand outside the store and observe this lady as she left the parking lot. She was driving a nifty Chevrolet Impala."

Note: And the letter-writer was obliging enough to enclose the Impala's license number, in case welfare authorities are interested.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN MEMORIAL

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this coming Memorial Day will mark the 50th anniversary of the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial. One of this Nation's best known and loved monuments, the Lincoln Memorial was authorized by act of Congress on February 9, 1911. Daniel Chester French, whose studio is located in Stockbridge, a part of my First Massachusetts Congressional District, was commissioned to sculpt the Lincoln figure for the memorial. Henry Bacon of Watseka, Ill., was chosen as the architect of the memorial.

I need not describe the beauty which resulted from that collaboration. For half a century, the Lincoln Memorial has attracted more visitors than any other monument erected in the District of Columbia. I, personally, am impressed by the magnificence and grandeur of this memorial each time I pass by or visit.

My old and dear friend, John G. W. Mahanna, has published a book on the memorial and on the statue, entitled "The Seated Lincoln." I would like to share with my colleagues his description of the dedication ceremonies on May 20, 1922:

A crowd of more than 50,000 gathered around the memorial for the dedication ceremonies.

Chief Justice William Howard Taft, chairman of the Lincoln Memorial Commission, had decreed that the dedication ceremonies be kept completely simple. After the opening prayer, the colors were presented by the Grand Army of the Republic.

Sharing the speakers' platform with President Warren G. Harding and Chief Justice Taft was Dr. Robert R. Moton, the Negro president of Tuskegee Institute.

Chief Justice Taft gave a short account of the labors of the Lincoln Memorial Commission.

Characterizing the memorial as "a shrine at which all can worship, an altar upon which the supreme sacrifice was made for liberty," he added, "it represents a sacred religious refuge in which those who love country and love God can find inspiration and repose."

President Harding, in accepting the memorial for the people, laid particular stress upon Lincoln's steadfastness under criticism.

"No leader was ever more unsparingly criticized or bitterly assailed," the President declared, adding, "he was lashed by angry tongues and ridiculed in press and speech until he drank from as bitter a cup as was ever put to human lips, but his faith was unshaken and his patience never exhausted."

And then, quoting Lincoln, President Harding recalled these words when the storm of criticism directed at the 16th President was at its height:

"If I were trying to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the best I know how, the very best I can and I mean to keep on doing it to the end. If the end brings me out all right, that which is said against me will not amount to anything. If the end brings me out all wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

The program, as described in Mr. Mahanna's book, concluded with Edwin Markham reading his poem to Lincoln. The last stanza reads:

And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout up on the
hills
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable that the National Park Service has no plans to commemorate the 50th anniversary of that historic occasion. But perhaps that is not necessary: the greatness of the man, and the beauty of his memorial are commemorated daily by the millions of Americans who have visited this shrine.

I would also like to extend an invitation to each and every one of my colleagues to visit Daniel Chester French's studio in the Berkshires, which is one of only six national historic landmarks in the painting and sculpture category in the United States.

The studio, which is maintained by his daughter, the gracious and talented Mrs. Margaret French Cresson, is open to the public from the middle of June until late in September.

Among the many works of art in the studio are the three models of the seated statue of Lincoln.

I would also suggest that this 50th anniversary might be an appropriate occasion for each of us to again visit the Lincoln Memorial and ponder anew on the unique greatness of Abraham Lincoln and of the country for which he gave his life.

ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the President begins his international negotiations with the leaders of the Soviet Union in Moscow, the intricacies of international diplomacy and the areas of agreement and disagreement between the United States and the Soviet Union will be constantly analyzed. One of the most penetrating and significant commentaries I have seen is that of Harry Homewood, news analyst for WAIT Radio, which was carried in the Economist of Thursday, May 18, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

NEWS ANALYSIS—COMMENTS BY HARRY HOMEWOOD

President Nixon will be holding one major trump card when he goes to Moscow on May 22: the Soviet Union's need for detente with the West.

The Soviet wants to make some sort of arrangement with President Nixon that will guarantee peace along its western borders with Europe. The need for such an arrangement arises from the danger the Soviets face in the east, from China. If there is a Soviet weakness in this position it is that the Soviets have already taken considerable measures to protect their eastern borders before they accomplished the fact of a detente with the West.

There are now 44 Soviet divisions in place along the long border with China, almost half a million men supported by air power, light and heavy artillery, nuclear armed missiles and other weapons.

Across the border, on the China side, there are even greater numbers of Chinese troops equipped with nuclear missiles that can reach every major city in the Soviet Union including Moscow. The Chinese also have about 30 aircraft that can carry large nuclear bombs.

The increasingly belligerent display of the military might of the two nations is caused not only by a major ideological difference about Communism but also by a deeper division that is rooted in history.

In the 13th century the Empire of the Golden Horde, sometimes called the Khanate of Kipchak—Genghis Khan's empire—encompassed most of what is now Eastern European Russia and extended down to the borders of old Persia.

Many of China's leaders believe that what once belonged to Old China should belong to the China of today. They bristle as well about the loss to the Soviet Union of hundreds of thousands of square miles of their territory, gained by the Soviet Union in the past 100 years through the medium of defaulted treaties. The border fighting that broke out along the Ussuri River in March, 1969 was evidence of the continuing Chinese belief that their land had been stolen from them by the Soviet Union.

It was those border clashes that decided Chineses leaders to approach the United States, in order to neutralize if possible any intention the Soviet Union might have had about joining forces with the United States.

President Nixon's Peking visit literally stunned the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders moved as swiftly as they could to mitigate any danger from the West while they armed their China border. That was the reason for the rapprochement with West Germany, the reason for talk of a nuclear arms limitation treaty with the United States and, of course, for President Nixon's visit to Moscow.

All of this weighs in President Nixon's favor, of course. But even so, the Soviets will not be easy to bargain with. The determined Soviet backing of North Vietnam's aggression into South Vietnam is a sign that the Soviets mean to be as tough as possible when Mr. Nixon sits down at the bargaining table.

WHY CAN THEY NOT PRAY?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a long-time personal friend of mine, Mr. W. H. M. "Bill" Stover, who formerly headed the Dale Carnegie Courses in the District of Columbia and nearby Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, recently composed an article concerning prayer in public schools, entitled "Why Can't They Pray?"

As I believe my colleagues may find Mr. Stover's commentary of interest. I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

WHY CAN THEY NOT PRAY?

(By "Bill" W. H. M. Stover)

1. Why, indeed? In 1962 the Supreme Court, by 5 to 4 vote, struck down prayer in the public schools. A year later the Court also banned Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's prayer in classrooms. People rose up in protest to little avail. Over 200 bills to correct this miscarriage of justice were allowed to die in House and Senate Committees of arbitrary chairmen.

When a bill was finally forced out of the Judiciary Committee, through discharge petition signed by 218 outraged Members of the House, a former staff employee of that Committee was paid with Federal funds to lobby against it. On November 8th the amendment failed to reach the required ⅔ by 28 votes—thanks largely to—guess who didn't want the little children to pray! It was (if you'll pardon the expression) the clergy. These were joined by the ever-present in times of putrifaction—the American Civil Liberties Union, etc. 240 Congressmen voted for and 162 voted against the right of the people to decide this vital issue for themselves.

2. Why were the chief executioners of school prayer the very men who claim to speak for the churches of America? "Incredible, but undisputably true," says one Member of Congress. "The amendment was scuttled by an hysterical lobbying campaign of church groups. They put on one of the best orchestrated lobby jobs I've ever seen" . . . against prayer in schools. Said another Member, "They have become so concerned with secular and political goals as to forget the purpose for which they are supposed to exist: to acknowledge and serve God."

Since when are loaded dice any more excusable when in the hands of clergy? Said one Catholic Congressman, "A 5 man executive committee testified against the amendment, presuming to speak for 300 bishops and the entire Catholic church in the United States—whose views were not even sought in advance." And two Protestant clergymen—one from the National Council of Churches, the other a staff employee of the American Baptist Convention—testified against the amendment, falsely claiming to represent 40 million Protestants.

Yet Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen and Dr. Billy Graham, each speaking only for himself, said they believed prayer should be restored to the classroom, and estimated that 85% of the people did also. Subsequent polls have not disproved this estimate. In fact, some estimates now go as high as 96%. One can only conclude that if the 85% estimate of these 2 pro-men is at all accurate, then the 2 con-men represented only 6 million of the 40 million Protestants and misrepresented the other 34 million.

Who authorized a few so-called religious leaders to misrepresent the people on the prayer issue? Was it by majority vote of the clergy, or of the people? Certainly not. No such vote of either was ever taken. So, by what right do these bureaucrats set themselves up as a religious Supreme Court and vote against the wishes of the people?

3. Was not the Constitution meant to protect the people's rights, rather than prevent them? Yes, says the Editor of the Indianapolis News. But, "The Supreme Court has taken the language and intention of the founders and used them to do exactly what the founders wanted to prevent. The Court has used a prohibition against Federal interference with religion as a pretext for causing Federal interference with religion."

The Constitution was not expected to be infallible. Provision was made in its terms for change, as the need arose, by the will and vote of the people. The prayer amendment was legally sought in what some bleeding hearts termed an "abortive effort to overrule the Supreme Court." What about the abortive effort of 5 of the 9-man Court to literally throw God and religion out of the public schools? Why should such fuzzy thinking go unchallenged in so vital an area as the religious life of a Nation's children? Why shouldn't attempts be made to restore legally the Constitution which has been so misapplied?

4. Why all the nonsense about the dire consequences of doing violence to the first sentence in the Bill of Rights? Which is more important, the first amendment, or the first commandment? As one reporter wrote, "The House, like the country, is full of people who trace the outbreak of promiscuity and violence to the Supreme Court's anti-prayer decision." And one Member on the floor of the House accused the anti-prayer forces of having cobwebs in your heads," as he chided, "Don't be concerned about what earthly judges will say, but about the Supreme Judge above."

5. Why all the phony flack about "Separation of Church and State?" For over 100 years, before the Supreme Court began to legislate, children were allowed to pray or not pray in school, and the world didn't come to an end. Why should it do so now if prayer and Bible reading are rightfully and constitutionally restored to the classroom through the will and vote of the people?

6. Why did 162 Members of Congress deny 200 million people the right to decide this controversial prayer issue for themselves? Why should 162 Members of Congress misrepresent and frustrate the will of 170 million people? If 85% of the people in America want prayer and the Bible restored to the classroom, then these 162 misrepresented 170 million people.

Furthermore, the prayer amendment did not seek the personal views of any Congressman on the merit of prayer in school or elsewhere. It sought only to give the people their Constitutional right to decide and vote on whether the children of this Nation should again be allowed to pray and read the Bible in school. What's wrong with that?

7. Why, in the first place, did 5 of the 9 Supreme Court Justices presume to banish religious belief and the recognition of Divine providence from official life? If atheism, communism and pornography aren't barred, why outlaw religion? Schools where prayer is prohibited have in effect established secular humanism, or agnosticism, if not atheism, as their religion.

8. Why is the educational system in such disrepute and disarray today? Isn't it due in large part to lack of morality? Integrity? Discipline? Religion? As one Congressman reminded his colleagues, "Surely today's students would be better engaged in prayer than in some of the anti-social activities which so many Members of the House think are a direct consequence of the Supreme Court's actions." At any rate, few could disagree with the Congressman who said, "I don't know of any case where prayer has spoiled anyone, physically, mentally or morally."

9. Why all this hullabaloo about prayer, anyway? One wonders, who really cares about prayer today? Who really prays? As one reads all the current bitter statements—even after its failure—of those who opposed the prayer amendment, we're reminded of the United Nation's fiasco after the expulsion of Taiwan.

Even after the prayer amendment was defeated, one so-called Man of God called the House Chaplain's prayer on the day of the vote "a pitch to the 40 Congressmen present." Then he added, "The issue is like a snake with its head cut off, but its tail continues to wiggle." If by that he means that

Godly forces will not be so easily overcome, he may be more prophetic than he knows.

Certain it is that had more prayer and less venom been poured into the prayer issue, better results might have come out of it.

10. So what do the people do now? Shall decent, patriotic, God-fearing people be overcome by an increasingly Godless, confused, lawless society? Shall the will of a few frustrate the will of the many to return to the faith of the founding fathers of this Nation?

Shall America travel down the broad road to that inevitable destruction which awaits any people who commit spiritual suicide? And shall little Godless children lead them? God forbid.

Instead, let not one of us—neither those pro or con—rest content without rethinking this matter through on bended knee, then rise to take such further action as his best self dictates.

Let us remember how the Lord appeared to King Solomon and said, "Solomon, I have heard thy prayer . . . If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and then turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from Heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

May the God who reigns over all men bless this people and this Nation, today and in the days ahead.

May the words of our mouths, and the meditations of our hearts, and the deeds of our hands, be acceptable always in thy sight, Oh Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

A SENSIBLE COMPROMISE

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, each of us comes to this Chamber to speak for about half a million people; and each of us has certain firm convictions about what is good for the country, and what is bad.

If we are to succeed as a legislator, we must mold those firm convictions—which, of course, differ widely—into useful compromises. Oftentimes in a compromise, nobody gets what he wants and we have to be satisfied with an agreement in which nobody has to take too much of what he does not want.

Good laws necessarily entail compromise.

I have just served on the conference committee on S. 659, the Education Amendments of 1972. We have worked hard for 2 months and a little more, and we have worked particularly hard to find language which was agreeable to us and to spokesmen for the other body on the busing of children to achieve racial balance.

If I were given the privilege of writing this section of the bill, I would write it differently; but I shall not have that privilege, and neither will any other Member of this House.

I look upon this as a sensible compromise, with language that is close to that upon which the House twice insisted. I think it is as close to the House consensus as we can be. If we are to try to nudge the compromise a little closer to what the House has demanded, we are inviting an impasse; and I doubt that would gain us anything.

Mr. Speaker, soon after the conference had made public its report, the Chicago Tribune treated the subject in its wise editorial columns. I include its editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 18, 1972]

SENSIBLE COMPROMISE ON BUSING

A joint conference committee of the Senate and House has arrived at a sensible compromise of differences in the language about busing in the pending higher education bill as passed by the two houses. The compromise would suspend, until Jan. 1, 1974, application of court busing orders until appeals were exhausted.

It adopts the Senate position permitting funds for busing to overcome segregation if such spending is requested by local schools or if ordered as required by the Constitution. House amendments would have flatly prohibited use of federal money for busing to mitigate segregation.

It is clear that the Supreme Court of the United States will have more to say about busing and segregation than it has yet said. Arguments on a case originating in Denever are already scheduled, with a decision confidently expected well before Jan. 1, 1974. The Supreme Court can be more effective, as well as more orderly and rational, in forming a national position on the subject than can a series of local and state campaigns for elective offices not charged with interpreting the federal Constitution. Until the Supreme Court clarifies the subject, the legal status of busing for desegregation can hardly become clear.

After the Supreme Court has spoken, the opinion of the court can provide guidance for subsequent action as nothing else can. Suspending the application of court orders, past and future, until the Supreme Court rules would defuse the issue until well after the 1972 elections; and this is a further recommendation for the congressional compromise.

Leaving the way open to use federal money for carrying out locally initiated action or to implement a Constitutional mandate from the Supreme Court is surely better than trying to screw down the lid even if one of those two conditions is met. In the busing furor as in every other major legal controversy, the structure of government is involved as well as the particular matter at issue. Especially when emotions run high, Congress should be careful not to tear the fabric of government, or to establish bad precedents which may be applicable to later and altogether different issues.

Thanks to both prejudicial and thoroughly respectable considerations, busing is a big issue. Even so, it is possible to exaggerate its importance. Busing hardly provides an adequate basis on which to choose a Presidential nominee. Nor does it serve law and order to resist unwelcome court directives on busing to the point of limiting judicial jurisdiction.

The House and Senate conferees have managed to agree on a compromise, tho we may be sure that individual senators and representatives still differ on the subject. The House and Senate as wholes should accept this compromise, and thus suspend a conversation that can hardly be advantageously pursued further before the Supreme Court speaks.

BLACK LEADERS IN A BLACK CAUSE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the 1970's have been designated as the decade in which black Americans will attain the political and economic power that have been withheld for far too long. This is an expression of fact. It is not idle rhetoric.

A large element in our assuming this dual power involves the rejection of white leadership. While we will continue to welcome white support of our goals, we intend to lead the battle for political and economic power.

We recognize that this is not easily understood by the white liberal and that we risk the loss of many potential allies. On the other hand, we know that the test of a true friend of the black struggle, is his willingness to accept black leadership and direction.

On May 9, 1972, my colleague from Missouri (Congressman WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY) expressed his views on this matter in the Boston Globe. He exposed the transparent hypocrisies that are often mouthed by whites. And he asked this important question:

Now blacks are planning, directing and leading the onslaught. The question is: can the white liberals follow the lead of blacks who have followed them for so many years?

He said that black Americans will no longer accept one black man here in this important position, another there. He wrote:

To be the first black "anything" in the decade of the 70's is not an accomplishment.

I would like to share my colleague's perceptive analysis with the other Members of this Chamber. I, therefore, include the column, as it appeared in the Boston Globe:

[From the Boston Globe, May 9, 1972]

CAN WHITE LIBERALS FOLLOW THE LEAD OF BLACKS NOW THAT SHOE IS ON OTHER FOOT?

(By William L. Clay)

Black leaders have progressed to the stage of saying not what whites want to hear, but what whites need to hear. They view their role not as one of appeasement but one of education.

Many whites are shouting about so-called opportunities for black people. Government officials release statistics which say we never had it so good. The private business sector spends thousands of dollars trying to prove that they are "equal opportunity" employers. But when you look behind the rhetoric the results are not there. Black people still are the last hired and the first fired. No real commitment has been made to bring us into the mainstream of American life.

Some look at me and say—"Well, you made it, surely others can make it if they want to." And I say that my being the first black congressman from Missouri is not a verification of a system of opportunity, it is a tragedy.

To be the first black "anything" in the decade of the 70's is not an accomplishment. In my case, it inherently implies that millions of blacks have been denied legitimate representation.

When blacks look at American government and at American society, we see a structure of which we are not really a part. We hear white voices—telling us what we should do, or telling us why we must be more patient, and telling us why there can be no response to our needs and problems. This is what we have heard for more than a century.

In recent years, the new black politics has put the traditional white liberal in a new and perhaps uncomfortable role. For many years the white liberal planned, strategized, organized the fight for racial justice in this country. He determined the priorities, the issues,

the battle plan, and the time of execution. He provided dedicated leadership in helping to create the national climate for racial change.

Now blacks are planning, directing, and leading the onslaught. The question is: can the white liberals follow the lead of blacks who have followed them for so many years?

The emergence of a black identity came much too slowly. The name of the game has been to stand and wait.

We waited for the end of slavery, waited for the extension of American citizenship, waited to be seated in movie houses and served at lunch counters. We have stood in line for education, for jobs, and for food. We have waited for decent housing, waited for white politics to deliver.

It is a question as to whether impatience gave birth to black pride and black power or whether the latter gave birth to our impatience. What is important is that the truth of our situation has been clearly established and recognized, and that, in the absence of black initiative, action and leadership, there can be no real progress for the black populace.

As a black man, I have been taught that there is no virtue in patience. The patience of black Americans has come to an end. We have learned that when the struggle for essential human rights is injected with patience, the struggle is only prolonged. America's Christian image, illuminated in a black light, is as hypocritical as her constitutional guarantees.

If we must become "irritants" in order to stir the consciences of all Americans, then "irritants" we must become.

When black men and women are elected to public office today, it is not a sign of tokenism, even though our numbers still make it appear so. They are elected because they have as much to offer as they do to gain.

Through the effective exercise of black politics, black Americans shall finally make their impact upon American law, American social policy, and American economics.

UNITED STATES COURTS COMMUNISTS WHILE LOSING REAL SUPERPOWER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while our President junkets to Moscow and Peking for summit meetings with the new "superpowers," the two powers capable of truly being superpowers, Japan and West Germany, are being betrayed.

I insert reports from the Japanese political newspaper and a West German petition to the Congress of the United States to follow at this point.

[From Liberal Star, Published Monthly By The Liberal-Democratic Party Of Japan, Vol. 1, No. 2, February-March, 1972, Tokyo, Japan]

JAPAN SHOULD NEVER FORGET CONDITION FOR HER EXISTENCE

(By Yasuhiro Nakasone, Chairman, Executive Council, Liberal-Democratic Party of Japan)

In July last year, the news that President Nixon of the United States had decided to visit Peking, completely going over the head of Japan, heralded the arrival of the age of multi-polar diplomacy. To me, however, the news brought back memories of the historical developments of April 1962 when the German people were shocked by a rapprochement between the United States and Soviet Russia in respect to the Berlin problem, a step which was taken over the head of West Germany.

At the time, Prime Minister Konrad Adenauer of West Germany expressed his deep dissatisfaction to the United States. Since then, however, West Germany has been exerting efforts to adjust herself to the world trend toward peaceful co-existence between East and West. Today, she recognizes the need to maintain a status quo of the borders of Europe, and thus she has gained the trust, not only of her neighboring countries, but also of the world in general. It is even rumored that this autumn, both West Germany and East Germany will be admitted into the United Nations.

For his work in contributing to the peace of Europe through the status quo policy, West Germany's Prime Minister Willy Brandt last year was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace.

On the part of Japan, she follows a policy of self-restraint, not being bound by such treaties as Germany is, although she may receive the same sort of shock as Germany. If Japan should stray from this policy, she would be thrown into a state of isolation and crisis. There is also even the extreme opinion which expresses the fear that the situation may lead to the possibility that Japan may again become extremely militaristic or may desire to possess nuclear arms.

In comparing the conditions of Japan and West Germany in respect to their international positions, it is noted that they have in common the same caution and fear of a state of militarism such as they experienced in the past and of any revival of it in the future.

Where the two countries differ is in the fact that in the case of West Germany, there is a strict vigilance against her ever becoming militaristic again imposed by the multi-national Treaty of Paris, while in the case of Japan, there is no such international treaty but she is carrying out a strong restriction on any such possibility in her domestic policy, including the provisions of her Constitution and the Three Principles of never making, possessing or using nuclear weapons. Consequently, with Japan becoming so powerful economically, it is only natural for the world, in particular the neighborhing countries, to have unusual concern of what would happen if Japan should ever stray from the self-imposed policy.

At this time I believe that it is necessary for Japan to reflect again on the condition for her existence and on this basis, strive to eradicate the suspicions of the world. What is the condition of which I speak? It is the fact that the Japanese are a maritime race.

Being an island nation, Japan must depend on trade for her existence. There is no other way. And in order to engage in trade, there must be freedom to sell and to buy. For this, ships must be free to go where they will without interference; people must also be able to come and go freely. That is to say, freedom and democracy are necessary to Japan. In the past, countries of this type were maritime nations owning large merchant fleets backed by powerful navies. Continental countries like China, Russia and France, which controlled large territories and had huge populations, usually sought to become self-sufficient on the strength of huge possessions of natural resources. They preferred to do everything on their own without trading. In efforts to become self-sufficient, however, the economy was bound to become a controlled one. This made it easy for the advent of totalitarianism and isolationism. The army became stronger. This was the trend in China, in France and in Russia.

In the War in Asia (culminating in World War II), Japan, which was an island nation which had to depend on trade, tried to become a continental nation, in addition to being a maritime race, by trying to take over Manchuria and China. Such an idea led to failure. In the process Japan saw her merchant fleet destroyed. She became lost.

No country should ever try to assume that sort of double standard. The welfare of our nation must always lie in keeping the Pacific Ocean peaceful. The main emphasis of our efforts is always to be directed to keeping commerce and trade free throughout the world. And to achieve this condition, the greatest factors are Japan and the United States. These two nations must both follow the basic guideline of keeping the Pacific a peaceful ocean through point efforts.

China undoubtedly holds a deep interest in the Pacific. In other words, it should be the goal of our diplomacy to work positively to have all the countries bordering on the Pacific to be in accord that the ocean is to be kept in peace. It is my belief that nothing should be allowed to disrupt the relations between Japan and the United States, both of which follow the same creed of life and have the same interests in trade. One of the manifestations of this joint effort is the Security Treaty. On the other hand, it should be recognized that conditions change and so will the contents of the treaty. Whatever else may change, however, the basic ties which are necessary to keep the Pacific peaceful are not to be disturbed.

It is for this reason that as Director General of the Defense Agency, I once stated that the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty is necessary on a semi-permanent basis. I was referring, of course, to our basic friendly relations. The results of the last war showed us what unhappiness can occur if we should deviate from the basic guideline. To prevent such unhappiness is one of the fundamental policies of the Liberal-Democratic Party and a basic national policy as well.

Without this basic guideline, our position in respect to China or Russia would be greatly weakened.

What can we present as our "sales point?" In diplomacy, some sort of trump card is always necessary. In the world today, nuclear weapons constitute a powerful trump card. We don't have such things, but what we do have is the capacity to trade. We offer economic assistance. But we must remember that without relations based on cooperation with other countries, our diplomacy cannot hope to succeed. It is our friendly relations with the United States which forms the core of such relationships.

Without the basis of this relationship between Japan and America, our voice would become weak. And it is on the basis of this basic relationship that we should establish new relationships between Japan, China, Russia and America.

[From Liberal Star, Feb.–Mar., 1972]

MULTI-POLAR INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY AND PROBLEMS FACING JAPAN

(By Shigeru Hori, Secretary General, Liberal-Democratic Party of Japan)

The year 1971 was one which will go down in history as having opened the way for the materialization of the reversion of Okinawa to Japan, an event which will actually take place officially in May 1972. At the same time, it was a year which raised the curtain on what is called the age of multipolarization in world politics.

In order to ensure Japan's continued prosperity and security in the multi-polar age, the most important factor will still be our relations with the United States, more so than with any other nation. To guarantee the security of our nation, maintenance of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty is an indispensable condition. Moreover, it has been

our economic exchanges with the United States which have played a vital role in the achievement of our present-day economic well-being, and this role will undoubtedly continue to hold sway in the future.

Last year, various frictions were seen, mainly in the economic field. It is my deep conviction, however, that the path toward placing Japanese-American relations on a permanent and stable basis will only be one which will lead to the building up of a state of mutual trust and a spirit of equal partnership. In order to attain this, it will not be enough merely to hold negotiations whenever a problem arises. Rather, what is desired is that a powerful movement of popular diplomacy be launched which will enable the exchange of unreserved views and which will serve to deepen mutual understanding between the two peoples.

Elsewhere, one of the greatest problems which Japanese diplomacy will face hereafter is that of the normalization of relations between Japan and China. The People's Republic of China, indeed, is our largest neighbor. With the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, it becomes highly unnatural for our nation not to have diplomatic relations with her. Such a state is most undesirable from the standpoint of establishing peace in the Far East. It is my aim to make every effort for the normalization of such relations. But we must remember that Sino-Japanese relations in the past have been marked by various unfortunate conditions which have resulted in a situation of distrust. One is not able to deny the existence of such problems as Taiwan, the differing political systems, the gap in ideologies and the difference in the process of economic development through history.

On the Chinese side, there are undoubtedly many conditions to be laid down. On the Japanese side we have our own position to consider. It means that Sino-Japanese relations must be established on a basis of mutual respect for each other's position. Problems which are of common concern should be discussed frankly and honestly. Such true and stable friendly relations must be realized as soon as possible.

We need hardly to stress the fact that our nation is part of Asia, and in Asia, there are many countries in the process of development. Being underdeveloped as yet economically and socially, these countries are still unable to extricate themselves from the yoke of poverty. Within Asia, too, there is much strife—the Vietnam war, a divided Korea, the confrontation between India and Pakistan. With full understanding of these fellow nations of Asia, it is Japan's role to provide every aid and cooperation possible to bring the permanent peace and economic stability which are the hope of these various countries.

Improvement of our relation with the Soviet Union, overcoming obstacles raised by difference in ideologies among all countries of economic and cultural exchanges, working for world peace and prosperity—these are also the tasks to which we must strive without letup.

Within Japan, we are faced, politically, with the continued confrontation between Left and Right. Regrettably, however, it must be admitted that none of the opposition political parties, including the Japan Socialist Party, has the ability to take charge of the government. It is to be expected, therefore, that for a considerably long time to come, the Liberal-Democratic Party will have to continue to govern.

Despite the narrow confines of Japan, the economy of Japan has built up a highly intensified society which finds its gross national product rating as the third highest in the world. However, with the so-called "dollar shock" last year as the impetus, we have come to reflect deeply on our economy policy of giving priority to production and export. This has led to a transformation of great importance, shifting weight to quality over quantity, with such new aims as improving the living environment, more effective use of the land, and raising the level of social welfare. We have also become more strongly conscious of the importance of our position and responsibility in the world economy.

At this great turning point in history, I believe that the Japanese economy with its tremendous energy should prime itself to meet the future as a truly peaceful nation which has overcome innumerable obstacles and has established a superlative society such as has never been seen in the world before. And making full use of this great store of energy accumulated, we should like to advance forward strongly to contribute to peace and prosperity for all mankind.

Betrayal by the USA Thrusts Germany Into the Bolshevists' Camp

(By Friedel Unger)

The honorable members of Congress and Senate of the United States of America.

The betrayal of Berlin is the separation of West Berlin from the Federal Republic of Germany by the USA under the four powers agreement. Through this agreement Berlin loses its right to free communications with West Germany. The renunciation of power by the USA "in this area" will serve as a passport for the annexation of Berlin by the Soviet zone of occupation (see enclosure I). This is kept secret from the German people.

The USA's insistence of the Moscow treaty is a betrayal of Germany.

According to the Bonn-Conventions of 26.5. 1952, Article 2c, this treaty needs the agreement of the USA. Why does the USA agree to this treaty which is against all German interests?

Economic, scientific and technical co-operation with the Soviet Union is planned in the treaty. The Moscow treaty gives Russia what she herself does not have for her armaments industry—contact with modern technology, patents, know-how, computers, steel welding apparatus, war materials, motors for trucks, for armoured vehicles, for atomic rockets—and all on credit, which is naturally a great help to underdeveloped Russia.

But the USA is bent on arming Russia.

The Moscow treaty gives half of Germany to the Bolshevists—and this will then be legally binding. It makes Germany and Europe smaller and weaker in a dangerous way. It leaves Germany at the mercy of Soviet blackmail, exploitation and propaganda. All this is hushed up from the German people and shown them in a different light. Newspapers and radio stations in Germany are already red. Anyone who resists the Moscow treaty gets called a Nazi or a right-wing radical. The victors of 1945 broke up our press and built up a new left-wing press to stamp out the nationalism and racialism they ascribed to us. Under a red government the press is moving even more to the left. The red leaders of public opinion are too strong.

That the USA with the little protection it offers and with a reduction of its troops stationed in Europe is forcing the ratification of the eastern treaties, is the reason given by our red government, press and part of the opposition.

The people are afraid that the USA will leave us in the lurch, just as it betrayed us when the Berlin wall was built.

Betrayal is the reward for our remaining loyal to the alliance.

Our soldiers will not defend western Europe. Doubtful allies stand behind them, atomic rockets are in front of them—against which they are defenseless.

The USA is paving the way for Soviet advance.

"No" from President Nixon to the division of Berlin from West Germany and to all the eastern treaties would overthrow our red government and free us. Fairness, the alliance with Germany, your security and our security all call for this "No". You would show great courage against your communist-influenced press.

Germany is dependent on the USA. It would bow to President Nixon's' demand immediately if a guarantee were given for the security of Germany and Berlin. The German people would be willing to make great sacrifices for real security which at present is denied by the USA and for genuine help towards peaceful reunification.

The USA could make a lot of money through deliveries of arms to us. The USA could increase its own security and power if it would safeguard Germany and lead it. There was no need for the USA to devalue the dollar.

Up to last summer the Federal Republic accepted the dollar as payment at an excessive rate. By doing this it let Americans buy up large parts of its industry too cheaply. The Federal Republic supported the overvalued dollar by buying up—with great losses for our country which is already being exploited by France and other countries.

It would be able to break up the Common Market which is detrimental to all sides and which we were forced to join by the USA. The Common Market will not lead to a united Europe, which is turned down in any case by France, Great Britain and Denmark. The Common Market forces Germany to import agricultural produce from France and other member countries to pay double the world-market prices.

With German economic power—weakened in this case by the red elements—the USA could lead Europe. Germany is the most trustworthy ally in the world. It exploits no-one. It is exploited in a dreadful way itself.

The anti-German policies of the USA are also policies against the USA, as the two wars of the USA against Germany were wars against their own people.

The people of the USA ought to remember that they are of Germanic origin even if they descend from Northern Europe or from England. If the USA betrays Germany, it is betraying its own relations.

The USA has destroyed the safe German wall of protection against the Soviet Union. Now the USA is handing defenseless Germany over to the Bolshevists.

Because the USA disarmed us and gave us no security our red government is running right into the Communist net—simply out of fear.

Lenin said, "Whoever has Germany has Europe. And whoever has Europe has the world." How does the USA want to guard against atomic threat when large areas of the rest of the world are ruled by the Soviet Union? When an atomic war makes the world inhabitable.

Our downfall is your downfall.

Your betrayal of Germany is a betrayal of your own people.

I—The Betrayal of Berlin

(By F. Unger)

The four powers agreement on Berlin of September 3rd 1971 lays down about Berlin's western sectors: "that these sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it." (Part 2, Paragraph B). This means that Berlin is split off from the Federal Republic for ever and can never again be part of the Federal Republic of Germany.

But according to the constitutions of the Federal Republic and Berlin and according to decisions made by the Federal Constitutional Court Berlin is still a state ("Land") of the Federal Republic.

Only if Berlin is a part of the Federal Republic has it the right to free communications to the rest of the Federal Republic by land, by water and by air for all times.

According to valid international law and the decision of the International Court of Justice in the Hague this holds true for all separated parts of a country.

Should the Soviet zone of occupation break international law by disrupting traffic on the approach roads to Berlin, then the western allies and West Germany have the right to violate international law and to break treaties in respect of the Soviet zone. The same reprisals are justified in respect to the Soviet Union as long as the zone is not recognised as a country under international law.

If West Berlin is a part of the Federal Republic then all NATO allies are, according to article 5 of the NATO treaty, bound to protect Berlin and its approach roads as they would their own countries.

As a very poor alternative to West Berlin belonging to West Germany the four powers agreement offers a treaty which can be broken at any time by the Soviet Union or East Germany as soon as they can no longer use it to blackmail and exploit West Germany.

For Part 1, Paragraph 2 of the Berlin agreement contains the renunciation of force by the allies "in this area"—renunciation of force against the use of force by East Germany on the routes to Berlin, a renunciation of force against shots at West Berlin and against Russian planes over West Berlin. One day East Germany will use this renunciation of force as a passport to violent annexation of the whole of Berlin.

The renunciation of force means that the mighty USA is giving way to the government of East Germany—the elephant is giving way to the mouse. The Soviet ambassador has already forecast that West Berlin will fall into the hands of the German Democratic Republic.

The Soviet Union keeps to its treaties only as long as they have some use. To hush up this fact does not mean anything else but obscurantisme in regard to the German people.

President Nixon of the USA once said, "A four powers agreement does not safeguard the access roads to Berlin."

When the four powers agreement comes into force West Berlin will be taken by a surprise attack following a last respite or it will be cut off by a blockade until it falls into the hands of the East German dictators.

Until then the western allies can do good business with flights to Berlin. If Berlin belonged to the Federal Republic they would have to share this business with the German airlines.

But we are determined that West Berlin should always remain part of the Federal Republic, a state of the Federal Republic.

The supreme authority of the western allies and all rights of the western allies concerning West Berlin should be maintained. The rights of the western allies are above the rights of West Berlin and above the rights of the Federal Republic over West Berlin.

Because the western allies have supreme authority over West Berlin they also have the duty to respect and protect the Berliners' right to self-determination. Even Kennedy guaranteed this in his "three essentials" that the West-Berliners have a right to self-determination.

But now we can hear from Moscow "The Berliners don't want to belong to West Germany." Berliners, it is up to you to prove the opposite to the world! And it is necessary!

All four allies, even the Soviet Union, have signed the Charter of the United Nations. In Article 1, Paragraph 2 it defines that all peoples have the right to self-determination and to equal rights. According to this the Federal Republic and Berlin also have the right to self-determination.

If a treaty signed by any of the four powers is to be worth anything at all, they must adhere to this Charter and guarantee us the right of self-determination.

Fellow-countrymen, you must demand this right of self-determination, the right for Berlin to be part of the Federal Republic. Demand this right in letters to the Berlin Senate and to the Federal Parliament in Bonn.

Citizens of the USA demand from your President the right of self-determination for Berlin, the right for it to belong to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Only in this way can Berlin be saved.

Only because the West lets itself be blackmailed by the Bolshevists, will they blackmail it all the more.

Western governments have undergone a sudden change of opinion for the benefit of the Communist-orientated press and for their votegetting campaigns which has led them in times of momentary difficulties to give away whole countries. Now West Berlin with a population of two million people and East Germany with a population of seventeen million people are to be given away.

The result is that Russia is advancing all the time.

II—The Moscow Treaty

(By F. Unger)

The Moscow treaty guarantees our unlimited respect for the irrevocability of the borders between the different parts of Germany—in the valid Russian text.

The Moscow treaty gives away half of Germany—for absolutely nothing in return.

According to still valid law the stolen half of Germany still belongs to Germany—but following the ratification of the Moscow treaty this will no longer be the case.

Our government argues this point. It has found an unusual way to interpret its treaty to transfer land to other countries.

Yet the Soviet Union, all eastern block countries and France all declared immediately that the treaty is the binding recognition of the borders of the German Democratic Republic, Poland and all countries in Europe according to international law. Our government knows that all other countries, even the USA, wants to join in recognizing the Soviet occupied zone as a country in its own right. This means that all these countries want to recognise the permanent division of Germany as legally binding, they want to give up the right to self-determination to the 17 million Germans in East Germany and recognise the abandonment of half of Germany to the Soviet Union—and all as a result of the Moscow treaty. This will all happen at the latest following East German membership of the United Nations which is being planned by our government.

After that no country in the world can demand German reunification; this possibility is excluded by the legal maxim "venire contra factum proprium".

Although our government always asserts that it is maintaining the right to self-determination of all Germans, it acts in exactly the opposite manner and wants the Moscow treaty to be ratified under any circumstances.

Not even the victorious powers of 1945 who were seething with hatred committed a breach of international law by splitting up Germany. They merely divided the country into zones of occupation but keeping its legal unity. Germany will finally be divided by the present government at Moscow's command.

Is it clever to carry out Moscow's commands? To pursue Moscow's policies? Judge for yourself.

The allied powers Great Britain, the USA, Russia and France agreed in their "Declaration regarding the defeat of Germany" on June 5th 1945 in Article C, Paragraph 1 that Germany should continue within its borders of 31st December 1937. According to Article A they decided not to annex Germany. According to Article B they took over the supreme power in all matters concerning Germany as a whole.

The Atlantic agreement of August 14th 1941 which was signed by Britain and the USA was also assented to by the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a total of twenty-six nations in the United Nations pact of January 1st 1942. These powers, including the Soviet Union commit themselves to the following articles:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the Peoples concerned.

3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Our government is giving away our rights under this agreement—and without anything in return.

In the United Nations Charter of June 26th 1945 the victorious powers, including Russia, bind themselves in Article 1, Paragraph 2 to "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples." In the Moscow treaty our government is giving away this right of self-determination because it recognises the Soviet zone of occupation as a state in its own right. For according to Article 2, Paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter no right of intervention in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any country can be deduced. On recognition of East Germany as a country we have lost all our rights to it which were guaranteed us by the United Nations Charter.

It was exactly for this reason that East Germany and Russia pressed so persistently and forcefully for the recognition of East Germany as a country.

Our government was stupid enough to do this—even establishing in its declaration at the beginning of the present parliament: "The German Democratic Republic is a state in its own right"—without anything in return. We received nothing in return for this gigantic present!

When East Germany joins the United Nations, urged on by our own government, it will according to Article 2 paragraph 1 of the United Nations Charter be recognised as a state of sovereign equality by all members of the UN and by all the world—although it is practically nothing but a colony of the Soviet Union with no rights of its own.

In Article 2, Paragraph 4 of the UN Charter Russia agrees to:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations." This package contains the renunciation of force by the Soviet Union—which it has broken everywhere where it was possible in the whole Eastern block including East Germany.

Why on earth has our government made another renunciation of force of treaty with the Soviet Union?

That is the same thing over twice.

Does our government think that if the Soviet Union signs something twice it is meant more sincerely than by just signing once??

The resolution of the UN Security Council on November 22nd 1967 which was unanimously agreed upon and signed by the Soviet Union too says that following the end of hostilities the conqueror must leave the occupied areas and the expelled population must be allowed to return.

That was old international law in 1945. But it is no longer valid for the stolen half of Germany when the Moscow treaty is ratified. Because under the Moscow treaty we are giving away half of Germany.

According to the United Nations convention of November 27th 1968 which was also signed by Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia the stealing of land following a war and the colonisation of occupied areas is a breach of international law and is not subject to the statute of limitation.

Therefore we must eventually get back that part of Germany stolen from us, if we never give up our right to it and strive for our rights with all peacefull means—and there are very many means we can use.

On ratifying the Moscow treaty we give the robbers their booty. And after that half of Germany is irretrievable. That serves us right. Whoever supports the robbers, as we do, is no better than the robbers.

In the Bonn conventions of 26.5. 1952 Great Britain, the USA, France and the Federal Republic of Germany agree in Article 7 that a vital aim of their joint policies is to achieve a freely agreed upon settlement for the whole of Germany which should form the basis of a lasting peace. Until the conclusion of such an agreement the Federal Republic and the three allied powers will work together to achieve their joint aim by peaceful means: a re-united Germany with a democratic constitution similiar to that of West Germany, integrated in the European community.

The Moscow treaty frees the western allies from their obligation to work together for the re-unification of Germany. In it our government renounces al our rights to reunification. Our government made the western allies agree to this renunciation.

Our government is urging the convening of a European "security conference" to guarantee the permanent division of Germany by the USA and all European countries.

Like all treaties with the Soviet Union the planned insecurity treaty will bind our hands, not Russia.

Read the previously quoted passages from treaties with the Soviet Union in order to see how much one should believe in their signatures on treaties.

Following the guarantee that the border of East Germany is unalterable the Soviet Union is free to get even with China on its other distant border. Then it's our turn next—thanks to our policies.

Just at the time when Russia is at loggerheads with China our government renounces our rights to half of Germany—instead of using the situation to enforce our rights.

"The great victory of the Soviet Union", said Breshnev of the Moscow treaty.

"It is the binding recognition of the borders of the German Democratic Republic, Poland and all European countries under international law", said Breshnev, Honnecker, ministers of other Warsaw Pact countries and even of France. No country in the world will interpret the treaty in any other way.

Following our renunciations Moscow demanded in Pravda "Bonn must completely give up the idea of re-unification. Otherwise we shall not change our policies towards Bonn."

What use are our renunciations then?

The Soviets will never "change their policies towards us" by our renunciation policies. Why should they? Fulfillment of their demands has always encouraged the Soviets to make new demands.

The Moscow treaty will bring the economic exploitation of West Germany and political blackmail. It will lead to millions of reparation payments to the eastern block. It will lead to our economic ruin.

The co-operation in economic, scientific and technological fields which is agreed upon in the Moscow treaty will help to increase Russia's supply of arms—against us—and at our cost.

The Moscow treaty leads to credit being lent to the Soviet Union (with West Germany providing surety) which we will never get back, unless against even higher demands. Non-actionable credits are means of extortion in the hands of the debtor, just as the non-actionable four powers agreement on Berlin of 3. 9. 1971.

The Soviet Union will accuse us of breach of contract, will blackmail us and Berlin, if we refuse credit or deliveries of weapons, the surrender of patents, or scientific and technological co-operation.

Our work for Moscow, for the time being without payments, will make us all poor, will increase our inflation.

The Moscow treaty hands over seventeen million Germans forever to the terror of the Bolshevists, to pitiful communist poverty.

The Moscow treaty delivers up the men in East Germany to the Russians to be used as cannon-fodder in each of its wars—even in an atomic war against China.

Our government should at last ask: "What will the Moscow treaty bring us in concrete terms?"

Up to now nobody could say.

The people should be told the honest truth—without a smoke screen to camouflage our withdrawal and Soviet advance.

The "détente" is really only talk about a détente, delusion and deception in order to hoodwink us.

Everyone must see that, even the government and the parliament.

Everyone has the duty to tell the truth, including the government, the opposition, the parties and every journalist. It is the duty of every citizen to head off our fate.

[From the State Times, Baton Rouge, La., May 13, 1972]

SENSING THE NEWS: WEST GERMAN POLITICAL BREAKTHROUGH REMAINS RED GOAL

(By Anthony Harrigan)

MUNICH, GERMANY.—This 800-year-old Bavarian city, with its rich, comfortable life, symbolizes all that West Germany has accomplished in the generation since the end of World War II.

The citizens of Munich have lovingly restored the great churches destroyed in the last World War. Handsome new apartment houses, private dwellings and offices ring the old city areas. The city's transportation system is without parallel, including a new subway system. The old habits of the good German life persist, such as the two-hour lunch break. Yet hard work is a gospel. Labor is in such short supply that 180,000 Yugoslavs, Italians and Spaniards are recruited to man essential services.

This year, the world will discover Munich as never before when the Olympic games are held in the city.

Beyond the Iron Curtain, in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, there is keen understanding and envy of the wealth this and other West German communities have created in the past 27 years. The Communist world has not abandoned any of its ambitions with regard to West Germany, as indicated by the insistence on ratification of German treaties with the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

Recently, the Soviets altered tactics with regard to the European Common Market. In the past, the Red leadership described the European economic community as an imperialist device. The Soviets now appear to have accepted the community as an established fact and will deal with it directly.

The Soviet dealing with Western Europe, especially West Germany, has the objective of gaining access to the new technology of the West and Western economic credits. For all the Soviet successes in military projects and space, the U.S.S.R. still lags far behind the West in technological innovation, especially in computer technology. The Soviets want the new technology made available to them and they want the West to advance the money for new plants. This is one of the prime aims of the Reds' "Westpolitik."

At the same time, the Soviets hope to gain a new political foothold in West Germany. They see isolationism on the increase in the United States and a consequent gradual U.S. political and military withdrawal from Europe. Unquestionably, abrupt shifts in U.S. foreign policy and strategic theory have undermined European confidence in the U.S. as the leading superpower. This is why significant elements in Europe now look to the East.

Logically, the West Europeans, led by the West Germans, should utilize their new wealth and abundant manpower to build strong defenses against the Soivet Union. Europe has the capability of creating powerful nuclear and non-nuclear deterrents to the Soviets. But the U.S. has failed to urge the West Germans to create nuclear defenses in West Germany.

The Left parties and organizations oppose strong defenses, condemn the United States for its stand in Asia, and seek to radicalize German youth. These Left groups present the U.S.S.R. as a mellowing force.

There is only one Soviet Union, of course. The same U.S.S.R. that talks of "peace" and cooperation in Central Europe is the Soviet Union that pours arms into the hands of the North Vietnamese, encourages urban terrorism in Latin America, and builds powerful new naval forces in the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean. In short, the Soviets remain a militant Communist imperialist power dedicated to permanent revolution and the destruction of the capitalist progress achieved in Munich and other West European cities since the end of World War II. Americans need to point this out repeatedly, stressing the importance of Western economic and military solidarity.

Unfortunately, the presidential missions to Moscow may further undermine West Europe's confidence in the firmness of American resolve. The visit, furthermore, could give the Soviets a propaganda advantage—the appearance of a relaxation of tensions—that would assist the U.S.S.R. in making a political breakthrough in West Germany.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to submit a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. George E. Martin of Missoula, Mont., regarding vocational education.

I am sure many of my colleagues are aware of the problem of appropriate funding for this program. The following information, although relative to Montana, may bring some light to the problems facing our young people seeking vocational training in all areas of our country.

The letter follows:

MISSOULA TECHNICAL CENTER,
Missoula, Mont., May 4, 1972.

RON. RICHARD SHOUP.
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SHOUP: It has come to my attention that the House of Representatives will soon be considering appropriations for Vocational Education. I feel that it is my duty to inform you of the situation existing within Vocational Education in the state of Montana.

I am presently a Vocational Counselor at the Vocational Technical Center in Missoula.

While serving in this capacity I have, as a portion of my job, the opportunity to talk with many of the young people who are interested in Vocational Training. Most of these people are highly motivated and sincerely interested in training for future employment. Unfortunately, it also happens that I must tell many of these individuals that we cannot serve them due to our lack of space and teaching staff. The only solution to this problem is increased funding.

I would like to give you an idea of the types of individuals our institution serves. In September of 1971 our school accepted 605 students for enrollment. Unfortunately, we were forced to turn away an additional 250 individuals due to our lack of space and staff.

The average age of our September enrollees was 24 and over one-third were married and had dependent children. Approximately one-fourth of these students were veterans drawing benefits from the government. We also have 217 disadvantaged students, of which 63 have some form of physical or mental handicap. Of the total number of students who began in September, 128 had attended college for various lengths of time from one quarter to four years.

The aforementioned figures should give you an idea of the wide range of individuals we serve. I feel very strongly about the fact that we should be capable of serving more people who are motivated towards training and bettering themselves and their families. The only solution to this problem is increased funding.

Please consider the facts and feeling I have conveyed to you when Vocational Education appropriations are being considered by the House.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. MARTIN,
Counselor.

BOB HOPE—AN AMERICAN INSTITUTION

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Leslie Townes Hope—Bob Hope, to millions of admirers around the world—has been entertaining American servicemen and women wherever their duty has caused them to serve for well over a quarter of a century.

He has a magnificent record of unselfish devotion to bringing something of the sights and sounds of home to those serving far from home. Bob Hope has traveled millions of miles, entertained millions of soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen—and he has become one of America's best-loved and respected national institutions.

Starting in March of 1941, he staged his first show for servicemen and from that time until June of 1948 all of Bob Hope's weekly radio broadcasts originated at military installations.

He continued to visit Americans in uniform through the years of the Korean war, the period of cold war confrontation from Berlin to Greenland, and for many memorable Christmas seasons he has visited fighting men in the combat areas of Southeast Asia.

In addition to entertaining U.S. servicemen, Bob Hope has for many years been engaged in numerous activities on behalf of charitable, civic, and philanthropic groups. Throughout the country there are Bob Hope fund-raising foundations for less fortunate people—and the name Hope has come to mean just that to many a worthy cause.

America is fortunate that this talented, dedicated master of the "one-liner" came to this Nation when he was a youth—for his humanitarian and professional efforts have earned him a place in the hearts of all Americans. Years ago Bob Hope became identified with his theme song "Thanks for the Memory." For countless millions of us who have made up your audience down through the years Bob, it is our turn to say "Thanks for the Memory."

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent column by Norma Lee Browning about Bob Hope:

HOMAGE TO HOPE

(By Norma Lee Browning)

Thanks for the Memories: America's favorite folk figure and No. 1 patriot, Leslie Townes Hope [he of the scooped snoot—more familiarly known as "Ski Nose" Bob Hope] has added a new laurel to his crown, which already includes [at last count] 19 honorary academic degrees and more than 800 awards for his humanitarian and patriotic efforts.

They include the Congressional Gold Medal from the late President Kennedy, the Medal of Freedom from President Johnson, the Medal of Merit from the late President Eisenhower, and the Navy's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Award.]

Last week at March Air Force Base [near Riverside, Cal.], with full military fanfare and all four branches of the service participating, the local chapter of the Noncommissioned Officers Association was formally named the "Bob Hope Chapter," honoring Hope for his "outstanding contributions to the morale and welfare of military men and women and their families."

It was an especially appropriate and poignant accolade, for it was exactly 31 years ago at March Field that Hope put on his first show for U.S. servicemen. Since then he has traveled more than a million miles entertaining more than 10 million troops, appearing at almost every military base in the world.

Not only was the local chapter named the Bob Hope Chapter in his honor, but the N.C.O.A. International Headquarters also honored him with the first Bob Hope Award, an award to be presented annually to the entertainer who makes the most outstanding contribution to the morale and welfare of the military community. Hope himself has been named "Entertainer of the Year" by the American Guild of Variety Artists [A.G.V.A.] for the second year in a row [the highest honor from colleagues in his own profession].

Bob's wife, Dolores, attended the March Field ceremonies with him, looking younger than ever [and so did he, for that matter] in a long, multicolored geometric print gown. He was in fine fettle as he cracked his rapid-fire jokes. ["Why am I still doing military shows at my age? I guess I'm hooked on the box lunches. Those were the days of old-fashioned wars, where you fought to win."]

But he was more than usually solemn when he said, "I am not one-tenth as rich as they say, but I am rich in memories. And whatever I have done for guys like you thru the years hasn't been a sacrifice, it has been a privilege. This world owes you more and more than it can ever repay."

Later in an informal group discussion, Hope was asked if he plans to go back to Viet Nam next Christmas. "I'll go back if anyone's there," he said. "I hope it will all be cleared up by then. Whenever anyone asks me if this is my last trip, I can only say I hope this is our last war. Maybe we don't all demonstrate or join parades, but we're all antiwar—especially those guys right up close to it."

IF THEY FAIL, THEY FAIL

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 17, the Beloit Daily News published an excellent editorial entitled "If They Fail, They Fail." The editorial focuses on the growing problem of defense contractors who demand increases in the amount of their contracts. Specifically cited by the Daily News are Grumman Aircraft and Litton Industries. Both of these giant conglomerates are currently demanding huge increases in their defense contracts. The Daily News suggests that these two giants are seeking something akin to "corporate welfare." The Daily News argues that welfare for individuals is clearly more beneficial than this new form of corporate welfare. The individual welfare program at least insures the survival of a husbandless, jobless mother who must feed hungry children. The corporate welfare program only pays a company for being inefficient and wasteful.

In conclusion the Daily News suggests that—

If Grumman and Litton cannot meet the terms of their present contracts without going bankrupt, then why should they not go bankrupt?

I wholeheartedly agree with the Daily News that we may be entering an era of corporation welfare payments. Unless the Congress stops this new welfare program, the taxpayers will be asked to pay billions of dollars for the gross inefficiency and mismanagement of these corporate giants.

I commend this excellent editorial to my colleagues for their careful study. The editorial follows:

IF THEY FAIL, THEY FAIL

You know how those people are, always wanting handouts. They seem to think the world owes them a living and all they have to do is just ask for it. A lot of other people worked their own way back up when they didn't have a dime. Why can't they?

Then again, what can you expect from a defense contractor?

It was only last year that the contractors really began to realize how down and out they were. Then the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, finding suddenly that it was zooming toward bankruptcy, yelled, "Help!", in the general direction of the federal government.

After struggling through a considerable amount of congressional turbulence, Lockheed finally got a federal guarantee on a $250 million loan, thus allowing the company to continue its development of the L–1011 Tristar airbus and also allowing the company to continue, period.

Now we are confronted with two companies, the Grumman Corporation and Lit-

ton Industries, who would like to profit from Lockheed's example.

Grumman said recently it must have a revision in its $5 billion contract with the Navy to produce 313 F–14 jet fighters. Without a revision, it said it would lose so much money it would be forced to close its Long Island subsidiary, which accounts for 95 per cent of Grumman's business.

Litton, meanwhile, reportedly is seeking substantial increases in its $1 billion contract to produce five Navy assault ships that are already 19 months behind schedule.

Both companies argue that costs have risen on their defense projects because of miscellaneous circumstances beyond their control—inflation primarily. They contend that the *government* should agree to pay them more to prevent economic disaster that would ruin them and harm the national economy by creating a chain reaction of unemployment.

Grumman is even demanding a profit boost be written into the new contract it wants, even though the General Accounting Office, the federal government's watchdog agency, recently reported that the $16.8-million Grumman F–14 would be inferior in some ways to the existing F–4 fighter, which costs about $4 million per plane.

The help Grumman and Litton want amounts to a big business welfare program, the "something for nothing" dole that is usually anathema to hard core capitalists.

But there are difinitive differences between this kind of government aid and welfare that assists individuals.

For one thing, the individual programs contain an element of sheer survival not present with corporations. A husbandless, jobless mother must feed hungry children.

If a corporation, even a large one, goes bankrupt, people may be out of work temporarily, but most of them will find new jobs—and at worst they will have the individual welfare programs to fall back on. As for the corporation's bosses, they will have paid the price of inefficiency but chances are none of them will go hungry.

More important, though, are the effects of the two kinds of welfare on the economy in general. When we help an individual, we improve the chances that he or his children will return to the economy, perhaps to contribute one of those creative sparks that make the free enterprise system work.

We cannot afford, however, the wrenching disruption of the economy that would occur if the government made a habit of saving failing companies. Our economy thrives on a survival-of-the-fittest atmosphere.

Sen James Buckley, Con.-N.Y., said last year that he feared the government aid to Lockheed would "pioneer a form of government intervention that would erode the market discipline required in a free enterprise system."

If Grumman and Litton cannot meet the terms of their present government contracts without going bankrupt, then why should they not go bankrupt?

WHOSE HAND REALLY AIMS THE GUN?

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following was editorial comment at one point in our Republic's history following an act of violence:

We are disgraced as a nation by such an occurrence. What will foreigners think of us? . . . It begins to look as if we were in fact a lawless community . . . This . . . fool steps up and insults every law-abiding citizen of the land by his act.

Not after Jack Kennedy, nor Bobby Kennedy, nor Martin Luther King, nor George Wallace—but in 1881, after the murder of President James A. Garfield. Horror and revulsion at these senseless deeds—successful or not—have never been limited to any one period in history nor any one act.

And, cumulative impact of several, or of just one, many cannot help but feel, as William Butler Yeats wrote:

Things fall apart, the center cannot hold,
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst,
Are full of passionate intensity.

What can be said of assassins? Considering those in our Nation's past and present, there is no really distinguishable and predictable pattern, although a sort of composite emerges. Considering all of them, they add up to someone short, weak-sighted, white, a loner, who sees his problems in political terms, feels insignificant and powerless, is the product of an unstable home, and had a weak father.

One commentary noted that:

Except for the attempt by Puerto Rican nationalists to kill President Truman, all American presidential assassination attempts apparently have been the work of disturbed men who acted out of private and seemingly irrational reasons.

I would have to differ somewhat with this. The Puerto Ricans tried to shoot their way into Blair House to get at Truman, with attainment of Puerto Rican independence their objective. I can scarcely term either the objective or the method as "rational" in any sense of the word.

If there is any one connecting link, then, it is madness in one form or another, and in varying degrees. Much has been written already on what the attempt on Governor Wallace proved. It did not necessarily prove anything, other than to reaffirm what has been true throughout all human history: Prominent men in public life are bound to have enemies, some of whom will hate them enough to want to kill them. Some will try to kill them. Some will succeed. Some will not.

It is with much regret that I see the incident also used as a handy vehicle to once again damn our country and its citizens for abominable and horrid degrees of neglect, hate, violence, and all manner of social ugliness. True, it is a national tragedy. It is particularly and personally tragic for the victim and his family. But such tragedies are particularly inappropriate times for moralizing or comment by "The idiot who praises, with enthusiastic tone, All centuries but this, and every country but his own."

There is, of course, the renewed clamor for more gun controls. An editorial in the May 18, 1972, Washington Daily News demolished this argument:

THE SUSPECT'S GUN

As might be expected, the Wallace shooting has revived the clamor for more gun control.

For instance, Sen. Birch Bayh says if a bill he has sponsored had been law, the gun used by Gov. Wallace's assailant would have been outlawed. Sen. Bayh wants a ban on handguns except for law enforcement officers and the type of guns used only for sporting purposes.

Of course, a sporting gun can be just as deadly as a snubnosed revolver (altho perhaps less easy to conceal) if murder is the intent.

Actually, if the gun used against Gov. Wallace had been imported, it would have been illegal. But, under a 1968 gun control law, a similar gun made in this country is not illegal.

Last December, the suspect in the Wallace case was picked up in a Milwaukee suburb and charged with carrying a concealed weapon. The gun was identical to the one used last Monday, and police confiscated it.

However, when the suspect was convicted the charge was changed from carrying a concealed weapon, a felony, to disorderly conduct, a misdemeanor.

If that is the way gun laws are to be enforced, what good are they?

Moreover, when the suspect five weeks later bought the same type of weapon in a Wisconsin gun shop, there apparently was no check on his previous arrest.

The intent of the federal gun law is to keep these weapons out of the hands of criminals, crackpots, dope addicts and illegal aliens. Obviously, it isn't having that effect.

Just passing a law won't cure any crime, unless the law is workable and unless judges and law agencies make the enforcement stick. We favor any law which will solve the problem, if any will, but up to now the advance rhetoric has far outdistanced the effective results.

The antigun argument is basically what I would call deviation of aim, and certainly one of the wildest. It ignores set patterns of social violence, mass and individual, in this country and abroad, that have shown repeatedly that any means at hand will be used to achieve an objective.

Consider the 82 recorded instances in our own history of either assassination or assaults upon public officeholders, ranging from Presidents down to minor public officials. A full 10 percent of these assaults were with objects other than guns: Knives, fists, canes, clubs, dynamite, and even rope. No one is going to be deterred, once his mind is made up, just because he does not have a gun.

I believe it is pretty well established that there are definite elements of instability and irrationality in these killers and would-be killers. What does it feed upon? At what point does the more or less mildly irrational move across the line into the area of madness and steadfast determination to kill? What moves it there?

I charge that these men are bound to take some form of encouragement—yes, encouragement—from what they may see as the prevailing social attitude of the time. They will find justification for what they intend to do in what they see and hear around them.

What is a potential assassin to think

when men and women who have taken holy orders talk casually of dynamite, destruction, kidnaping, and killing as a means to make their point?

What is a potential assassin to think when an impassioned plea is made for a convicted double-murderer and rapist on the grounds that he received a death sentence only because he was "poor, friendless, and black"?

What is a potential assassin to think when he hears public figures, at mass meetings, loudly and openly—and sometimes obscenely—call for "removal" of the President of the United States? Is his mind, already twisting and contorting in the earliest throes of the madness driving him, able to make the distinction between removal by ballot—or bullet? The words are so careless, these terms, used by demagogs to whip crowds into fever pitches of writhing, shrieking hatred against their government and the men at its head. What effect does this have on our would-be killer? Does this deter him in any way?

Like the Veil of the Temple, our budding assassin sees the very fabric of our society ripped asunder. In the name of "new morality" or "intellectual progress" or "cultural advancement" he will hear, from prominent spiritual, political, intellectual, and academic leaders, a truly revolting variety of causes advocated: homosexual marriages; constitutional right to all drugs; virtually unlimited abortion; legalization of prostitution; the doctrine of "victimless crimes"; "idealism" in students tearing great universities to pieces; in short, what seems to be a general, all-out assault mounted on what this country and society have always held to be moral and upright and correct.

Today, a person can find, with no trouble at all, some particularly vicious, savage, and cutting attacks on the "Jesus people"—"Jesus freaks" their detractors call them—these young people who have openly adopted and practice an intense and passionate form of Christianity. And from the very same source that so savagely carves up youth making an honest and sincere attempt to do right, we can find pleas for tolerance and understanding for criminals, draft dodgers, and deserters, drugs, rioters, and other individuals and things that a less permissive age would term dregs and backwash of society.

In truth, such incredible contradictions are enough to make the most stable and rational doubt his senses, that they would show him such a world. What does this do to the less stable? What does this do to our potential killer?

If anything, I say it would give him support in his conviction of the rightness of his cause. With all moral and ethical guideposts either torn down and cast aside, or at the very least hammered and chipped away at, what sort of direction can he possibly have?

How about the "we are all guilty" bit? This is so nonsensical I fail to see how any intelligent person could be duped by it. Edmund Burke, the English statesman, said centuries ago that—

> I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people.

The present-day writer and philosopher, Sidney Hook, is a truly honest liberal in the finest, classical sense of the word and his credentials cannot be challenged by anyone. He is blunt and to the point in his condemnation of the collective guilt fallacy:

> The very doctrine of collective responsibility and/or guilt is self-defeating in its moral absurdity, since the descendants of the victims of any action justified by the dogma can invoke it to initiate a contemporary massacre.

Some persons simply cannot exist without constantly scourging themselves for real or imaginary crimes. Primarily imaginary; I cannot see how any but the most helplessly depraved could ever have indulged in so many sins of both omission and commission.

But I have no use at all for their attempts to involve the rest of their fellow citizens in this orgy of penance. These charges are the most repulsive and insulting drivel that could be propagated. Those advancing it have forever forfeited their right to any consideration as objective and thoughtful individuals.

Where does this leave us? First of all, there is no absolute, safe, and sure guard against assassination attempts. Not in our open democracy; not even in the most rigid and repressive totalitarian states is a public figure or head of state going to go anywhere with an absolute guarantee of his physical safety.

Russia under the czars was ruled with iron-clad absolutism. This neither kept guns nor dynamite out of the hands of the revolutionists, nor did it prevent the terrorist tactics of the period 1876–1911, when knives, dynamite, and guns struck down czar, secret police, and prime minister alike.

Nazi Germany was certainly totalitarian, with the harshest and most Draconian laws that were enforced with brutal enthusiasm. This did not deter the July 20, 1944, plot against Hitler.

And, in more modern times, even in today's Soviet Union, there was the case not long ago of a Soviet Army officer shooting at a car full of officials near the Kremlin.

We know nothing about the mental state of the officer in the case just mentioned. We do know that there was no madness in the officers' plot against Hitler, but a deep and steady determination to rid their country and the world of a madman who had caused the deaths of millions. We are less certain about the mental attitudes of the Russian revolutionaries under the czars but madness was not common among them as it has been among assassins in our country.

The unstable and unbalanced are especially vulnerable to influence from outside sources. What they observe of the movement of society around them is bound to have some effect on their behavior.

When we begin, in any way or form, to loosen, or advocate loosening, some of the restraints that have bound civilized society for centuries, we move into an area of grave danger. No matter how minor the restraints may seem, they at least have been symbolic of a collective moral force, more or less agreed upon, that sets certain limits on human action. It is as if mankind has said for centuries "Beyond this line you do not go," then the line begins to shift from its former position it has held for years, and move.

No such lines exist for assassins like, say, the German officers who plotted Hitler's death, nor for the Russian revolutionaries of the late 19th and early 20th century. This is because they are not inherently unstable to begin with. Therefore the shift has no effect. But what about others, who may need that one last angle, or idea, or justification, to convince them of the reason they should kill?

No one who speaks from a public platform may consider that he speaks only to a small and select group. Eyes that will not read his words for weeks or months hence, ears far beyond the range of his voice, may well belong to one who cannot comprehend the subtleties or sophistries of what he says.

What to one person is a rhetorical call to pick up a placard and march down the street is to another an injunction, or an indulgence, to kill. There is no way to avoid this conclusion.

So, if anyone's hand was on the gun other than the would-be-killer's, or if anyone is to share in his guilt, it must be those who have tacitly, and carelessly, and witlessly, given him this indulgence or injunction. They are the ones who must answer to a higher tribunal, somewhere, some day.

It is too much to expect them to realize what they are doing, or that they will stop, now. They are too intent upon proving their own points. In so doing, they betray a swinish insensitivity to the effect this has on others. They are morally blind to the ghastly and ghoulish spectacle they make of themselves, as they hammer out these points upon the coffins of the Kennedys, or over the probably paralyzed legs of Gov. George Wallace.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD the May 22, 1972, edition of the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I take this action to help my colleagues stay informed of developments across the country leading to the bicentennial celebration of our Nation in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the news staff of the communications committee, ARBC. The bulletin follows:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN

MAY MEETING ISSUE

The Full ARBC Commission voted on Tuesday, May 16 to reject the proposal submitted by the Philadelphia 1976 Bicentennial Corporation for an International Expo. Chairman David J. Mahoney said he would advise

President Nixon of the Commission's decision. He added that Philadelphia, as the cradle of liberty, will nevertheless play an important role in the Bicentennial.

At its Full Commission meeting in Boston, the ARBC also unanimously approved "Festival USA" as a theme representing the travel and cultural aspects of the Bicentennial. "Festival USA" replaces Open House USA.

George E. Lang, Chairman of the Festival USA Committee of the ARBC announced after his committee meeting in Boston that three Chairmen of that committee's three advisory panels of artists and cultural leaders have been appointed. The Chairman of the Invitation to the World Advisory Panel will be Joe Black, former pitcher for the Dodgers and presently Vice President for Special Markets for the Greyhound Corporation. Chairman of the Creative and Visual Arts Advisory Panel is Katherine Bloom, head of the Arts Education Program at the J. D. Rockefeller III Fund. Formerly she served as Arts Consultant for the Junior Leagues of America and established the U.S. Office of Education's Arts and Humanities Program. The Performing Arts Panel will be chaired by Howard Taubman, Journalist, author-critic of the New York Times. As music and drama critic for more than 30 years, he has maintained an interest in the arts as a total part of the society. Each will serve a term of one year commencing in June and will serve on the Festival USA Committee.

During the Tuesday Full Commission meeting George E. Lang, as Chairman of the Coins and Medal Advisory Panel, announced officially that the Philatelic-Numismatic Combination (PNC) will be issued on July 4th, through the cooperation of the U.S. Mint and the U.S. Postal Service. Mr. Lang was joined in making the announcement by Mr. Roy Cahoon, Assistant Director for Special Services of the Mint, and Mr. James Holland, Assistant Postmaster General. Orders for the official Bicentennial stamp and medal combination costing $5.00 will be accepted after July 1, and through the month of July.

The ARBC Procedures Manual was approved in principle at the ARBC meeting in Boston, with the proviso that an ad hoc committee consisting of an ARBC Program chairman. the Communications Committee Chairman and the Director would receive written comments from members for consideration in the final Manual. All written comments are to be incorporated in the final version which will be available at the earliest possible date.

The Commission endorsed a resolution expressing its support for a National Historic Records Program. The proposal came to the Commission from the Heritage '76 program committee and called for a matching grant program to assist institutions and individuals in locating, preserving and utilizing the nation's public and private records. The resolution, offered by Mr. James Biddle, Chairman of the ARBC's Heritage '76 Committee, passed with the unanimous approval of the Commission. The ARBC awards use of the official symbol of the Commission to the program.

"Call for Achievement," a new nationwide program which encourages localities and states to initiate goal setting-achieving programs, was officially approved at the ARBC Full Commission meeting in Boston on May 16th. Mr. Erik Jonsson, Chairman of the Horizons '76 Committee, who made the announcement at the meeting, stated, "Call For Achievement has the potential to touch the lives of every American citizen. It provides an effective, democratic means by which citizens can play a significant role in shaping the future of their community." "Call for Achievement" will place a strong emphasis on State Bicentennial Commissions as the coordinating agencies for the local goal setting-achieving programs, and the ARBC through the Horizons '76 Committee will provide consultation on how to conduct such programs.

On Tuesday, May 16, in a special luncheon for the ARBC at historic Faneuil Hall, Boston Mayor Kevin White unveiled preliminary plans for Boston 200, the city's observance for the Bicentennial, including activities spanning tourism, education, art and physical improvements, which will begin in 1975, the 200th anniversary of events at Lexington, Concord and Bunker Hill. "Boston 200 incorporates a new concept," the Mayor said. "We have rejected the traditional fair ground approach and have declared the new exposition grounds to be the city itself. This approach can be summarized in a phrase, 'The City is the Exhibit.' Its implementation relies not so much on new construction, but rather on what already exists—our historic resources, our institutions and our people."

During the Full Commission Meeting of State Presentations on Monday, May 15, Mr. Ronald Banks, Chairman of the Maine ARBC Planning Commission, announced that the State Commission will be officially established on June 10. He noted that the Commission will be working with private groups to commemorate significant events which occurred in Maine—such as Arnold's March and the burning of the Town of Falmouth.

Also, during the States' Presentation Mr. Walter H. Peters, New Jersey Treasury Department, discussed the State proposal for Liberty Park, on the Hudson, surrounding the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island. It is the hope of the New Jersey Bicentennial planners to transform a degraded environment into "an oasis of open space in the midst of the most densely built area of the nation." Mr. Peters, using a slide presentation, pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior has asked the ARBC to consider as a Bicentennial need, improvements to the grounds and support facilities of the Statue of Liberty. "We in New Jersey would like to take this opportunity to take that wise recommendation further and call for the appropriate development of the Liberty Park environs," Mr. Peters added.

Senator Joseph J. C. DiCarlo, Chairman of the Massachusettts Revolutionary War Bicentennial Commission, welcomed the ARBC to Boston and discussed the multi-faceted plans of the Bay State for commemorating the Revolution. The format of the States Presentation also included reports and discussions by the following: New York plans, Dr. Louis L. Tucker, Executive Director, New York State ARBC; New Hampshire plans, Senator Nelle Holmes; Vermont plans, Mr. Peter Martin; Executive Assistant to the Governor; and the Honorable George F. McDonald, Jr. of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission urged all involved in planning and development of the Bicentennial observance "to get going now."

THE RIGHT TO INEXPENSIVE AIR TRAVEL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, millions of Europeans will enjoy low-cost summer vacations this year using readily available air travel charters. Eliminating unnecessary redtape for charters can go a long way toward guaranteeing American citizens of average means the same right to inexpensive air travel.

This hopeful prospect is detailed below by Shelby Southard, representing the Cooperative League of the USA, in remarks to the First World Congress on Air Travel and Tourism:

REMARKS OF SHELBY E. SOUTHARD TO THE FIRST WORLD CONGRESS ON AIR TRANSPORTATION AND TOURISM, MADRID, SPAIN, APRIL 17, 1972

I am very pleased to be able to speak to this significant assemblage because I believe the consumer can make an important contribution towards solving what has come to be known as the crisis in air transportation.

I'm not suggesting that we have all the answers, but I do feel that some of the industry's problems are due to, let's call it a misreading of the public need on the part of the airlines and the government agencies responsible for regulating air transportation. This World Congress on Air Travel provides an excellent forum for the expression of those needs. I am, of course, speaking of the situation as it affects the American consumer. And as I look at the variety of low-cost vacation opportunities that exist here in Europe, I'm beginning to wonder whether we do not share some of the blame for our own predicament—for failing to make our need known with sufficient force and clarity earlier in the game.

At any rate, American consumers came rather late into the discussion of air transportation and its problems, and although we have had some success, we are still a long way from the kind of air transportation system that truly meets the needs of the average American consumer—particularly with regard to the development of low-cost vacation travel.

As I sense the apparent reluctance of the air transport industry to provide genuine low-cost air travel opportunities, I get the feeling that they have come to believe the myth of the American tourist as an overaffluent, self-indulgent hedonist who demands the best of everything, regardless of cost. There are some like that, but I've never been able to see how a wider seat, more food and drink, and a little extra personal attention for a pretty stewardess is worth the extra $300 or $400 it costs to fly the Atlantic first class. I believe the majority of Americans feel pretty much the same way.

Most Americans, like most Europeans, or anybody else for that matter, are hard-working wage-earners who are very conscious of the value of a dollar. And in these days of rising costs, many of them—including the 20 million families represented by the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.—have turned to cooperatives as a means of increasing their purchasing power. They have learned that bulk purchasing makes sense: whether it is farm equipment, fertilizer, food, furniture, or a flying vacation.

We are all aware of the tremendous increase in bulk air transportation—chartering—that has taken place during the past decade, particularly across the Atlantic. Impressive as that growth has been, however, I believe that the potential for future growth is even greater—if the airline industry is prepared to adapt itself to meet the demand.

I would not presume to tell the airlines how to run their operations. I would simply point out that the demand for bulk air transportation is great, and the fact that 8.5 million northern Europeans will enjoy inexpensive package holidays in the sun this year seems to indicate that such services can be provided profitably. Many Americans are beginning to wonder why similar low-cost vacation opportunities are not available to them—either in their own country or abroad.

They are beginning to wonder, too, why chartering a plane has to be such a complicated business, even for an organization that meets all the qualifications required

under the affinity regulations set by the Civil Aeronautics Board. As the Transportation Chairman of the Consumer Federation of America, I receive many letters from our member organizations concerning their problems with the affinity regulations. I would like to give you some examples of the major complaints I receive, and ask you to bear in mind that in many instances, the charter organizer is an unpaid volunteer—not a professional travel agent.

Eligibility Requirements: CAB regulations differ from IATA rules governing scheduled carrier charter activity. For example, CAB permits travel by a member's parents, provided they live in the same house; IATA does not.

Restriction on One-way Charter Passengers: One member writes: "If we operate three charter flights a year we are allowed a five percent movement of passengers from one charter flight to another. This is beneficial since it allows members who wish to stay over for a longer period to return on a later flight. However, if we operate four charter flights or more this suddenly becomes a great sin. No one is allowed to travel one way. This is unconstitutional discrimination against certain chartering groups who meet all other requirements of eligibility. It accomplishes only one thing: to restrict the development of chartering programs. It works against the interests of the consumer." No one suggests complete freedom in this area, but I believe that there is room for more flexibility than currently exists.

Unnecessary and Excessive Paperwork: Almost everyone who writes to me is angry about this. One member wrote: "Present regulations require a tremendous amount of documentation, charter applications, supporting information, manifests, copies of every advertisement, date of membership, certification of membership. Obviously this information would be helpful in determining that a given organization is violating regulations and would lead to their conviction. The problem is that the CAB seems to assume that every organization is a violator and subjects them to this same time consuming barrage of paperwork. Some people are not entitled to hold a driver's license. But we do not require every citizen applying for one to submit his life history, document his financial worth, and submit notarized affidavits from references, attesting to his date of birth and so forth."

Restriction on Split Charters: This limits the ability of small organizations to offer charter programs to their members, since not all groups can put together full planeloads of 160 to 250 members. More freedom in the area of split charters requiring 40 or more members, would permit many smaller chartering organizations to consolidate their efforts.

Like many consumers, I wonder about the need for such restrictions. Like many consumers. I believe that people should have the right to travel, and to do so at the lowest cost that is available to them. The burden of proof should be upon those who would abrogate that right and impose restrictions.

I was enormously encouraged the other day to read the views of the British government as expressed in the report of the U.K. Committee on Enquiry into Civil Air Transport, 1969. It bears repeating again and again:

"One of the odd things about statements on Civil air transport is that they very rarely talk about the customer in simple language. So let us say that in our view the primary long-term objective of a national policy towards commercial flying should be to see that each customer gets what he wants—not what somebody else thinks he ought to want—at the minimum economic price that can be contrived. Romantic, exciting, and important though the airline business may be, it is, in the last analysis, there to do the same job as butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers, *i.e.* to provide services for money. Many other objectives are talked about in connection with air transport, but we put this humdrum one right at the top. Moreover we believe that if any other objective conflicts with it, the onus of justification should fall on those who want to press that objective against the interests of the consumer."

I would like to see that statement printed in large letters in the offices of every member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the top officials at the U.S. Department of Transportation, and any U.S. Senator or Congressman who has anything to do with civil aviation. Perhaps if they read it often enough, some of its intent might show up in their actions.

The Consumer Federation of America representing over 200 national, regional, and local organizations in the United States, recently expressed its views on charter restriction in the following terms:

"Consumers need access to all forms of transportation and the right to spend travel dollars as they choose. Several CFA members participate in low-cost educational, cultural, and recreational travel by chartered aircraft. These groups resent roadblocks placed on such travel by restrictive and complex rules of the Civil Aeronautics Board, some foreign governments, and the International Air Transport Association.

"CFA asks the CAB to loosen restrictions on travel group charters before taking final action on its proposed new travel group charter concept. We urge adoption of the European plan of inclusive tour charters; we further request the State Department to negotiate agreements with foreign governments that assure charter travelers the same landing and up-lift rights guaranteed to those using scheduled services."

I believe that the average consumer is enthusiastic about lowering the barriers to travel. The files of American Cooperatives, for example, are filled with correspondence from groups in other countries attempting to arrange cooperative interchanges or joint travel programs. Invariably, these efforts are thwarted by the restrictive regulations of their governments, or ours. If these barriers could be removed, I am convinced that it would open up almost limitless opportunities, not only for pleasure travel, but also for more meaningful journeys, educational trips, exchange programs, and similar activities contributing towards badly needed international cooperation and understanding.

I am convinced that bulk air transportation is the wave of the future—particularly for intercontinental pleasure traffic—and the sooner the airlines start preparing for this market, the faster it will develop. I should point out, however, that there are signs that they have already seen the handwriting on the wall—and that, despite their protestations, they are beginning to change. Some, like BOAC, have created charter subsidiaries. And, while scheduled traffic continues to increase in the North Atlantic, others—like Pan American and TWA—have been quietly increasing their transatlantic charter activities.

During the past four years, Pan American's charter traffic increased from 100,472 (in 1968), to 247,780 last year. TWA's charter traffic showed an even more dramatic jump—from 31,837 in 1968, to 151,612 last year.

As I say, perhaps they *are* getting the message.

HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 659, "The Education Amendments of 1972," is being filed today.

As many have characterized it, this report could well stand as the most significant piece of postsecondary education legislation since the Land-Grant Act of over 100 years ago.

To me, it would be a tragedy if the emotion and misunderstanding which surrounds the issue of busing is allowed to overshadow the significant improvements the House and Senate have made in this education legislation. There are those who feel the busing compromise is too tough and those who feel it is not tough enough. They all know that this Congress will have additional opportunities to work its will on this complicated and controversial issue—it should not now be allowed to kill the education bill.

I will be doing whatever I can to see that the Congress does not abdicate its responsibility to the courts for developing reasonable and rational guidelines to help in carrying out our constitutional responsibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us all understand that we will not have another opportunity in the near future to agree on those major education advancements which are now so close to final passage.

Shall we say to 3 million high school graduates "You must wait another few years before we can find the money to open up wider educational opportunities for you"?

Do we say to over 2,500 colleges and universities "You must wait longer before the Federal Government will share your burden of staying financially solvent?"

Do we say to low- and middle-income parents "You must wait longer for the Federal Government to assist you in meeting the rising cost of education?"

I say we should not—for this authorizing legislation is very much needed by both low- and middle-income groups now. Our colleges need this bill now. Existing higher education legislation expires in less than 6 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would stimulate colleges to enroll more of our Vietnam veterans. It would vastly increase programs for career education in our junior and senior high schools, postsecondary vocational and technical schools, and in our colleges.

It would stimulate the development of our community colleges which have burgeoned in enrollment in the past decade.

It would create a National Institute of Education to search out better answers to the process of learning and teaching. And it would do much more.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are hearing from our students, their parents, and our institutions about the great need for this

legislation. After more than 2 years of hard work in both the House and Senate, and with great bipartisan effort, how can we explain to them that such a landmark bill could be held hostage by the unrelated issue of busing?

That issue is important. We must deal with it squarely and firmly. We have gone a good distance in that direction in this conference report and we will go further in the days ahead. But we need the time that this conference report allows in its moratorium on forced busing to tackle that issue without the atmosphere of threat and panic and inflamed rhetoric of this campaign season.

This conference report exceeds 200 pages and is highly technical in some areas. I would like, therefore, to briefly list the significant provisions of the report:

S. 659—CONFERENCE REPORT HIGHLIGHTS OF EDUCATION PROVISIONS

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

All existing programs, including College Work-Study, Direct Student Loans (NDEA), Educational Opportunity Grants, and Guaranteed Student Loans, continued for three years.

New program of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, under which each student would be entitled to $1,400 per year less his expected family contribution. No grant could exceed 60% of what a student needed to attend a particular institution for any year.

Creation of a National Student Loan Marketing Association to buy, sell and warehouse Guaranteed Student Loans, and thereby stimulate new capital for such loans.

INSTITUTIONAL AID

$1 billion annually in direct aid to institutions, both public and private. Note: 45% of the aid would be based on the *number* of Basic Grant recipients at each institution; 45% on the aggregate *amount* of (Supplemental) EOG, Work-Study and Direct Student Loan (NDSL) funds paid to students at each institution; and 10% on the *number* of *graduate* students enrolled at each institution on the basis of $200 per student.

$40 million in emergency grants to institutions in severe financial distress.

Veterans Cost-of-Instruction Grants to stimulate the recruitment of Viet Nam veterans to institutions, in the amount of $300 for each veteran enrolled plus an additional $150 for each veteran who is in a special or remedial program.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Start-up and expansion grants for community colleges. Authorization: $275 million over three years.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

New program to help the States design, establish and operate postsecondary occupational education programs. Authorization: $850 million over three years.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

New agency established within HEW to support, conduct, and disseminate the products of, research at all levels of education. Authorization: $550 million over three years.

HIGHER EDUCATION INNOVATION

New program of grants to institutions to encourage reform and innovation in higher education. Authorization: $135 million over three years.

INDIAN EDUCATION

$95 million over three years in grants to local education agencies for programs to help meet the special educational needs of Indian children.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID

New program of grants for local education agencies to facilitate desegregation and the elimination of minority group isolation. $2 billion authorized over two years.

OTHER NEW AUTHORITIES

State Student Incentive Grant program of matching grants to States which have student grant programs. Authorization: $150 million over three years plus such sums for continuation grants.

Work-study for community service learning program for students, with preference given to veterans. Authorization: $150 million over next three years.

National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education to conduct a thorough study, including the development of standards for effective cost accounting, and report to the Congress by April 1973.

Other amendments relating to the prohibition of sex discrimination, consumer education, ethnic studies, evaluation of education programs, and Federal insurance for academic facilities loans.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Existing categorical aid programs extended for three years, including: continuing education, libraries, developing institutions, undergraduate equipment, language and area studies, International Education Act, graduate programs and fellowships, NDEA III, and vocational education programs.

GAMMA GOAT TRUCK

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am publicly releasing a General Accounting Office report on the gamma goat truck. The release of this report coincides the beginning tomorrow of a special investigation of the gamma goat truck program by a special subcommittee chaired by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. Speaker, the gamma goat program has been a technical disaster. The program has suffered delays, cost overruns, and severe technical problems.

The gamma goat trucks' predecessor, the M715, cost approximately $4,000. The original estimates for the cost of the gamma goat truck were $7,700, but now, because of all the problems encountered, the truck will cost double, approximately $15,000 for each vehicle.

The General Accounting Office outlines numerous defects found on the truck. Among the problems encountered in a two phase testing program were overheating engines, engine failure, center differential failure, steering problems, suspension failures, failures of the front differentials, fanbelt transmission failures, accelerator pedal problems, and leakage. Before these problems were discovered, 4,400 trucks were built. Now the Army is retrofitting the 4,400 trucks to correct all the defects at a cost of $6.8 million. Retrofitting will be completed in February 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the Army is guilty of bungling and mismanaging this program. Apparently our armed services are incapable of building a decent truck at a reasonable cost.

Over and over again the Army has said the bugs are out of the program. But problems are continuing and the taxpayers' money is being wasted.

It is my hope that this investigation will determine whether the contractor or Army officials were guilty of negligence in their conduct of this program. Both the Army and the contractor, Consolidated Diesel Electric Co. of Old Greenwich, Conn. must show that they have corrected all deficiencies and explain how we got into this incredible mess in the first place. If the fault lies with the contractor, then the Government should take all necessary steps to insure that the contractor is penalized for possible default on the contract. If the Army is at fault, then action should be taken to discipline responsible officers.

In the long run, if we do not cut waste and inefficiency in defense programs, then we may bankrupt our Nation in the name of national defense.

MRS. OPAL CHRISTOPHER JONES

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Opal C. Jones is the executive director of the Neighborhood Adult Participation Project, Inc., of Los Angeles and the president of the Los Angeles Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. She is among the most highly lauded leaders of community action in southern California, for she has provided training and direction for most of the others in the field. In 1965 the Neighborhood Adult Participation Project, Inc., was founded in Los Angeles by Mrs. Jones. It became one of the largest antipoverty agencies in the Nation. It served as a model for the rest of America.

New outlooks on life, new professional opportunities, new careers, new paraprofessional concepts, new methods of job training and new job adaptation concepts may be credited to Mrs. Jones. Her accomplishments are legendary and yet very real and very meaningful to the community which she served. She has creatively met the ever expanding needs of her community. Her energies have been used to create and design new meaningful occupational and career opportunities for the sometimes called "hard-core" unemployed. Mrs. Jones has built pride, instilled self-confidence and helped innumerable persons to uplift themselves.

Mrs. Jones is a native of Tyler, Tex., and holds a B.A. degree in sociology from Prairie View College and M.S.W. from the Atlanta University School of Social Work. The associate directorship of the UCLA campus YMCA and the executive directorship of the Avalon-Carver-Community Center are the two respective positions Mrs. Jones held before founding the Neighborhood Adult Participation,

Inc. Mrs. Jones has also served as president of the Los Angeles Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

During the course of her professional life, Mrs. Jones has been cited as almost every organization's woman of the year, including Woman of the Year, 1960, by the city of Los Angeles. Her most recent distinction was her selection as International California Woman of 1971 by the Broadway-Germaine Monteil Concerns.

Other honors Mrs. Jones has received include the Outstanding Service Award from the California Youth Authority in 1964 for "significant contributions toward the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency," and the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority's 1962 Finer Womanhood Award.

She has been cited for "outstanding services to the community" by the following organizations and groups: Los Angeles Urban League Guild, 1964; Golden State Medical Auxiliary, 1965; Association for the Study of Community Organization, 1971; National Association of College Women, 1967; Coordination Council on Economic Development and Employment, 1966; Brotherhood Crusade, 1971; Jefferson Adult School, 1965; and the Zion Hill Baptist Church, 1967.

A WORD OF CAUTION

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when I keynoted Ecology Week at Arrowhead High School in Hartland, Wis., in April, I stated some words of caution relating to the general environmental concern—that Congress has just about run the gamut of legislation and that we needed to look at the practical consequences of some of the things we are doing in the name of ecology and our environment.

John Shinners, a knowledgeable and civic-minded publisher of several weekly newspapers in southeastern Wisconsin, has echoed those words of caution in an editorial entitled "Building a Backlash," which appeared in a recent issue of the Hartford Times-Press. I believe it is thought-provoking and deserves the consideration of my colleagues.

The article follows:

BUILDING A BACKLASH

The price of rising antipollution laws that demand more than technology is capable of producing can be very high. A story by a Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal tells how billions of dollars of industrial outlays are involved in the installation of pollution abatement devices—some of which have yet to be adequately demonstrated as to their effectiveness.

For example, the Environmental Protection Agency requires power companies burning certain types of fuel to install "scrubbing systems" for removing sulphur dioxide from stack emissions. Says The Journal piece, "Standards for new steam-power units . . . include a sulphur-emission ceiling based on the alleged capabilities of such systems. Any plant constructed from now on, and perhaps many existing plants as well, would have to operate with the prescribed limit. The trouble is that the first full-scale operating tests of power-plant sulphur removal are only beginning." Difficulties are showing up that will take time to iron out. Meanwhile, the cost to utilities and their customers soars.

Gradually, the consuming and taxpaying public is learning that the environment means something besides an inspired crusade. It can mean laws that close doors and end jobs. It can mean confusion and waste. It can mean delay in such things as the siting of power plants and endless acrimonious debate that profits no one.

Unless care is taken, the word "environment" is going to become one of the most hated in the English language. It is too often used as a platform for harassment and punishment rather than as a symbol for guidance and improvement.

GREECE: THE TRUE FACTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Dr. Nicholas Destounis, M.D., national chairman of the Justice for Greece Committee, recently testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in an effort to present the true facts about Greece and correct a "lot of misinterpretations, half-truths, and malicious lies" that have "been spread in these last 2 years about Greece and her Government."

So that our colleagues might have the benefit of Dr. Destounis's personal experience and insight into this matter, I include his testimony in the RECORD at this point:

TESTIMONY BY PROF. DR. NICHOLAS DESTOUNIS, M.D.

Gentlemen, I wish to express my deep gratitude for being given today this opportunity, to appear in front of your committee and, as an American citizen, present the true facts about Greece. Indeed a lot of misinterpretations, half-truths and malicious lies have been spread in these last years about Greece and her Government and I believe it is time that another voice be heard, a voice representing no personal interest in the administration or rather exploitation of the country, but adherence to the truth and the principles of fairness, justice and the well-being of the Greek Nation as an ally of our country and an invaluable member of NATO.

I believe it my duty to draw your attention to the fact that, were Greece to commit an error or seek orientations running counter to American interests, it would be causing harm to us. Just as you would be harming both us and Greece, should you commit an error of judgment in assessing the Greek situation, in spite of your good intention to serve both our country and our real friends. Greece is a real friend of ours. Greece has fought in two World wars on our side, was devastated after World War II by a communist aggression which lasted for almost five years and caused innumerable damage, both material and human, sent her sons, who fought gallantly at our side in Korea and, today, offers us the safety of her harbours and the cordiality of her people to our sixth fleet in the most strategic spot in the Mediterranean.

It has been often said, and also published that in Greece, the cradle of Democracy, democracy was abolished through the intervention of the Armed Forces on April 21, 1967. This false statement makes impressive reading but it is totally deceiving. Athens saw the birth of Democracy which, according to the greatest historian of the past, Thucydides, was operating only as a one man rule. Hellas was the sponsor of every sort of regime and forms of rule, from monarchy and aristocracy to tyranny and to the rigid communal-military dictatorship of Sparta, which incidentally lasted for 940 years. Democracy in Athens was a continuous rotation of people's rule through enlightened leadership, reverting to the rule of the mob, due to the intervention of the demagogues, followed by anarchy and resulting to the acquisition of power by the tyrants.

This vicious circle was taking shape in Greece in the years between 1960–1967 and the intervention of the Armed Forces prevented Greece from falling pray to a tyranny known as Communism and from which there is no return. The Greek Parliament of 1964 had been dissolved by the King and the leader of the opposition on the 3rd of April 1967. A popular front had been formed, which declared as its formost intention to withdraw Greece from NATO and close the Greek ports to the U.S. Sixth Fleet. Anarchy had taken over, street riots were the every day spectacle in down-town Athens, where the pedestrian was risking his safety if he had the courage to venture a walk in the center of the city.

Anyone who was in Athens during that time can assure you, that there is no exaggeration in what I said. A succession of strikes was devastating the economy of the country and finally politics in Greece had reached the extreme in graft and corruption. The Greek press of the time was stigmatising the utmost deterioration of the situation, but instead of offering a service to the people, was urging them to civil war. No lesser than Mrs. Eleni Vlachou, who has already appeared and testified last August before your committee, had written in her personal column in her daily paper on April 9, 1967: "Isn't there one patriotic sergeant, to put an end to the chaotic condition into which the Nation is led by its irresponsible leaders?"

The April 21, 1967 Revolution put an end to the chaos and stopped the catastrophy. The economy is booming under conditions of free enterprise and an unprecedented state of price stability. The vast expenditure for the infrastructure of the country is shaping Greece into a modern developing European nation, where the per capita income has surpassed the $1000 mark (as compared to $780 prior to the revolution). Unemployment is almost nil and Greece is forced, as many instances, to import foreign labor.

The next major target of the present Government has been the granting of free Education (from grade I to university graduation) to Greece's youth, which was neglected and almost fell prize to the communist "Lambrakis" movement. Over 1000 schools have been or are under construction at this moment in Greece. Over 9,600 teachers have been newly employed in the last five years, never was such a vast proportion of the Greek budget dedicated to Education as at present: 16% compared to 8% in the years before 1967.

A tremendous boost was also achieved in the sector of social welfare and social security. More than 20 hospitals have been built and outfitted, and today, if a person is in need of hospitalization, he is accepted without the intervention of a political figure, as was the procedure in the "democratic" past in Greece. . . . Today Greece enjoys free medical and pharmaceutical care.

The Ministry of Social Services has been remodelled and streamlined and the Greek working classes today enjoy an unprecedented benevolence, understanding and service on the part of the state in this important sector.

Since the Greeks have this evident endeavour on the part of the Government to really serve the people, it is no wonder that peace, tranquillity, law and order prevail in the country and today Greece is an Oasis amidst the turbulence raging in the whole world and particularly in the nearest vicinity of Greece: Turkey, after a bloody military take-over in 1962, is still ruled under martial law, enforced—how ironic—by her parliament and is a continuous prey of anarchy and instability. The presence of an American ship in any Turkish port is enough to cause street riots and the security of the crew is under question.

Almost the same conditions prevail in "democratic" Italy, from where willy-nilly the Sixth U.S. Fleet will be eventually forced to withdraw their bases. The U.S. Navy's move toward housing Mediterranean sixth fleet personnel and dependents in Greece is, in effect, a forced pushout of reliance on turbulent Italy. Our vital good fortune is that Greece is there for us to go. Greece, our NATO ally, is actually the only country in the entire eastern Mediterranean, where our Sixth Fleet can even congenially call. Greece is a strategic imperative for the United States. No emphasis is enough to stress the importance of Greece in the framework of NATO and the dangerous implications, resulting from that importance. Greece shares common borders extending for over 600 miles with 3 communist countries, while the seas surrounding the country are criss-crossed by a Soviet fleet, which, for the first time in history, supersedes both in quality and quantity the strength of the U.S. Sixth Fleet, according to astute military leaders of our country. The Greek Government fully supports NATO and our foreign policies as a whole. We have an ally, not an enemy, in Greece. And this is the essence of the American interest—or should be.

Thank you.

THE WAR AGAINST CHILDREN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Haim G. Ginott is determined to reach parents and teachers to help them develop skills in the "language of caring." Ginott's methods are outlined in a New York Times May 20, 1972 feature story.

Ginott's work may help avoid the dilemma outlined in a May 19 Life magazine article, "The War Against Children," by James Mills. We cannot be proud that a judge feels compelled to sentence a child to jail rather than return him to his home situation because there is no other alternative.

Child abuse in our country has been rated by some as the No. 1 killer of children today. The number of runaway children increases daily. We need more people who care. Public apathy perpetuates the status quo. Life's effort to raise the public consciousness of this problem is commendable.

The Times article on Ginott and the Life piece follow:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1972]

TALKING TO A CHILD—GINOTT'S METHOD

(By Robert McG. Thomas Jr.)

"There are 55 million parents and 3 million teachers in this country, and . . ." well, one way or another, Dr. Haim G. Ginott, the child psychotherapist who cited the statistics, says he is determined to reach them all.

And if there was only room for 18 mothers and teachers at yesterday's session of the guidance conferences that Dr. Ginott has held frequently for some seven years, you have to begin somewhere.

Where Dr. Ginott begins is with the basic communication between parent and child—"the shaming, blaming, accusing, threatening, promising, guilt-giving, labeling," and all the other destructive patterns that he says parents who are caring but unskilled use to defeat their own child-raising goals.

Dr. Ginott has outlined his approach in the best sellers, "Between Parent and Child," and "Between Parent and Teenager," and in his new book, "Teacher and Child." He emphasizes, among other things, the need for a parent to address a situation ("This room is a mess, it needs to be cleaned up") rather than to focus on the child-as-culprit ("You're lazy and messy and inconsiderate . . .").

The tenure of the mothers, several of whom have been attending the conferences from the beginning, reflects the difficulty parents face in trying to break what Dr. Ginott sees as the destructive patterns of communication that were ingrained in them as children.

"Its a constant struggle," said one mother, who finds mutual support and specific advice in the sessions, which are usually held every other week.

Like most of the women (who preferred that their names not be used with their anecdotes) she had written out a description of a parent-child encounter that had occurred since the previous session. ("It's our homework," one explained.)

Most of the reports reflected a triumph of the Ginott method: the mother who handled her 17-month-old's rejection of his high chair by giving him a choice between the high chair and a booster seat ("he switches back and forth from meal to meal"), the mother whose 10-year-old daughter had made progress toward giving up her pacifier by facing up to her own choice between "being comfortable or growing up."

But then there was the mother (a relative newcomer) whose handling of her teen-age son showed, according to Dr. Ginott, her emotional attachment to the punishment syndrome and an unwillingness to grant the validity of his feelings ("I don't want you to" she said, coming down hard on the word "I" as she had prohibited him from playing basketball. And then, of course, he played ball anyway). There was also the mother who had not mastered the Ginott fine points in dealing with an emotional family discussion that arose over her teen-age daughter's desire to have her ears pierced. ("It would have been better," Dr. Ginott explained, "if you had asked her to put her request in writing.")

Dr. Ginott, who says he dispenses with the $5-per-session fee for those who can't afford it, regards the two-hour meetings in an East Side apartment as his "laboratory."

They also serve as training sessions. Several of the mothers have started their own groups to spread the Ginott word, and it is not uncommon for the women to be approached by friends for help in solving their own family problems.

(One, who had been asked how to deal with a friend's son whose grades had dropped to the point of failure, suggested a special tutor. But Dr. Ginott had a better idea: "He should find a younger child to tutor, himself; the research shows that that's the best way to give him the sense of importance and self-esteem he needs to bring his own grades back up.")

After the meeting, Dr. Ginott explained how he had come to develop his theories. "As a psychologist working as a child psychotherapist, I began to ask myself what it was that I was doing that parents and teachers were not doing."

His answer focused on the use (more often misuse) of the language used by parents he began to see as "unskilled."

As an alternative he developed what he calls "the language of caring," which he teaches to parents through anecdotes and such aphorisms as: "congruent communication" (in which language accurately reflects the underlying emotion) and "information without derogation," which emphasizes the accurate description of a situation without resort to a vicious, counter-productive verbal assault on the child).

The result of his musings has been his venture into what he calls "preventive psychology," which recognizes the fact that there are more children than their are psychotherapists and centers on the need to educate parents and teachers.

What next?

"Well, when I spoke to a meeting of delegates of the United Federation of Teachers, they gave me two standing ovations and I'm now negotiating with the union to teach my methods to 500 teachers at a time in a series of training sessions with 100 from each group being trained to teach others and . . ."

As he says there are 55 million parents and 3 million teachers in the United States and Dr. Ginott is indeed determined to reach them all.

[From Life magazine, May 19, 1972]

THE WAR AGAINST CHILDREN

(By James Mills)

(NOTE: The names and some other identifying characteristics of children and families mentioned in this article have been changed.)

The courtroom has a sink on the wall, a bathroom mirror, peeling paint, and in fact resembles less a courtroom than a public toilet. Trials here are secret—lawyers may attend, but not the public, and newsmen enter only by permission. The defendants are children. As young as 7, they come accused of everything from rape and murder to simple truancy and staying out too late. The secrecy, it is said, protects these children. But it also protects a system which—fully exposed, scrutinized and properly dealt with—could not, one hopes, survive an instant.

In a waiting hall outside the courtroom, long brown benches and the brown tile floor are littered with the shrapnel of exploded families—crying children, distressed and tired parents, small clusters of sorrow who sit for hours awaiting their minute with the judge. A boy of 10 races between the benches, laughing, yelling, trying to play tag with a young Legal Aid attorney. The boy is dirty as only a street kid can be dirty. He is wearing torn sneakers, black pants, ragged green sweater and, on top of long tangled hair, a beret tipped slightly over one eye. He has survived the streets and subways and clearly finds nothing here worthy of alarm.

A uniformed officer emerges from the courtroom and calls a name. "Torres!" The boy stops playing and runs quickly up to the officer. Two Puerto Rican adults rise wearily from a bench and pass with the boy into the courtroom.

Half of all major crimes in the United States are committed by people under 18. The war against crime has become necessarily a war against children. This year 44,000 children will flood through New York City's Family Court, where 39 judges struggle to find homes and treatment that frequently do not exist. In this single squalid courtroom on Manhattan's East Side, 30 cases will be heard today. Some of the accused will be sent home, some to mental hospitals, some to state training schools, some back to the streets. Few if any will receive the care and treatment they require. The judge is a woman, 69-year-old Justine Wise Polier, who in 36

years on the bench has heard more children's cases than any other jurist in the nation. She knows better than anyone what this system does for and to children.

Tall, slender, gray-haired, Judge Polier sits at a desk across from a large paper calendar Scotch-taped to the wall. She is flanked by a court stenographer and a probation officer. She has open before her a thick folder of reports, studies and other documents concerning the Torres boy. His name is Manuel, and she remembers him from earlier appearances. Though he looks 10, he is in fact 14. His parents brought him to court for running away. But parents often minimize their reasons for seeking the court's assistance. Manuel says he runs away from home because his father gets drunk, beats him up and attacks his mother. He says his father once chased his mother out of the apartment with a gun. Last time in court the parents said Manuel had bitten their dog on the ear and pushed its nose into a light socket. The father said, in front of Manuel, that he wanted to get rid of the boy. Judge Polier asked if it would not be better to get rid of the dog. The father said that that was impossible because the dog protected them from drug addicts.

Manuel has three brothers and sisters in a children's home, another in a state training school, another in a mental hospital. Judge Polier reads again through the file. A psychologist writes that Manuel is "good-looking, bright, pleasant, alert, perceptive, cooperative, has many internal strengths and controls, is reaching out for support, starved for affection and recognition." A school report says "he makes a great effort, is thought well of by his teachers, attendance is regular." A social worker found the family's neighborhood "saturated with drug addicts . . . many robberies . . . living conditions far below standard. . . . Difficult to see how the boy can survive in this environment."

After an earlier trip to court, Manuel was taken from his home and placed temporarily in a children's jail called Juvenile Center. A social worker who saw him there reported that "he was scared and afraid that the other children would do bad things to him." Moved to a children's home, he ran away, claiming later that a guidance counselor "always wanted to watch us get undressed." When the psychologist asked Manuel what he wanted to do in life, the boy answered, "Be a policeman so I can get rid of the drug pushers." Manual said he had had a dream in which a man killed his mother and raped his sister. Manuel was a policeman and caught the man and took him to the gas chamber. Manuel says he wants to leave his parents and live in a foster home. The parents say they want that too. But at the moment no foster homes are available. Neither is there a place at a children's home. Judge Polier studies the files, studies the boy, studies the parents—and tries to think of what to do. There is no solution. She may return the boy to his home, where he is not wanted and does not want to go, and from which he will certainly run away, or she can send him to Juvenile Center, to jail. Between the hazards of ghetto streets and jail, she picks jail.

Manuel is sitting between his mother and a Legal Aid lawyer, elbows on the table, back straight, biting his thumbnail, beret on the table in front of him. The judge explains that the court will try to find a place for him where he can live and go to school, but meanwhile he will have to go to Juvenile Center. When he hears "Juvenile Center," his face contorts in anger and he grabs his beret. A court officer leads him to the door, and Manuel shouts back, "I'm going to run away!"

The judge shakes her head and puts the case down for next week, with instructions to the probation department to seek placement.

Judge Polier came to the bench strong, but not tough, and has managed to remain so. When she was 21 she took an $18-a-week job in a New Jersey cotton mill to investigate labor conditions. She was discovered, fired and threatened with arrest. She went to Yale Law School and in 1935 became the first woman in New York to hold a judicial post higher than magistrate. Female judges were so unheard of that when the first man to emerge from her courtroom was asked how it had gone, he replied, "Well, the judge wasn't there—but his wife treated me just fine."

On the bench, Judge Polier does not wear robes ("There is nothing about a black robe that encourages a child to talk to me like a human being"). But 36 years of judicial authority have given her a glance that does more than robes or a gavel to command respect. Confronted by a teen-age mugger in a deserted courthouse stairwell, she gave him her stern, reproving look, and he backed off. "I was just going to give you some money," he said. "Do you need some money? I thought maybe you needed some money for lunch." Then he ran.

A woman of enormous energy, she works 12-hour days, often skips lunch, sprints for taxis, goes coatless in near-freezing weather, and emerges from court after a 40-case day fresher and more lively than youthful court officers. Asked how she could possibly have endured 36 years of witnessing day by day the tragedies of children, she answers, "I tell myself each time that I am trying to do the best that can be done, or this one child in front of me now. And then, starting after court, I try to do what I can for the others like him." She works what she calls a "second day," beginning after court and extending often far into the night. She has created, chaired or served on scores of boards, committees and foundations working to broaden services to troubled children and their families. She is married to an attorney and has two sons (both attorneys) and a daughter.

"I have been very lucky," she says. "I have had love from my parents, love from my husband, love from my children. When you've always had love, it's easy to love. There's a tremendous amount of sanctimoniousness in us when we expect terribly troubled people to survive problems in their lives that we probably couldn't survive in our own. We expect a young woman who has never had an instant of security in her life, who never knew her parents, who was brought up in neglect and violence, totally without love—we expect this woman to be a sustaining, loving mother in a drug-ridden, crime-ridden ghetto, and wisely and successfully to raise her child to be a whole human being. The people in power are so alienated from the powerless."

The judge's day goes on and on, child after child, folder after folder. "The child comes in as a piece of paper," Judge Polier says, "and you look through the probation reports, psychiatric reports, psychological reports, the petition, searching for this child, to find some glimmer of who this child is."

Often it makes very little difference who the child is. After all the studies have been made—and few could wish them more voluminous or thorough—it develops that the treatment recommended is unavailable. In folder after folder, Judge Polier encounters severely disturbed children and the desperate demands of doctors that intensive treatment begin immediately. Rarely if ever is such treatment provided. Not infrequently the frantic prediction of a psychiatrist that the alternative to immediate, intensive treatment is murder or suicide ends up bloodily fulfilled.

Like most American cities, New York pays hugely, up to $24,000 a year, for the care of a child in a private institution. But these homes and hospitals insist on admitting only those children whom they can best serve. Judge Polier claims that these restrictive admission policies are maintained to protect the institutions' track record. "They want the children it's easy to help, the ones they know they can help. And what happens to the others?"

The others include children who are disruptive and difficult to treat—those with histories of assault, suicide attempts, drug use, absconding, those with low IQs, and those who simply happen not to fall within the institution's racial or religious preferences. In New York City, it happens that a black Protestant with an IQ below 70 or a history of assault, suicide attempts, drug use or absconding is not merely denied treatment. He is denied admission even to a state training school (which demands IQs over 69) and ends up in a children's detention center, endlessly awaiting placement in a state "school" for the retarded.

Even state mental hospitals—their budgets cut, staff reduced—often turn away psychotic children, certified schizophrenics with histories of attempted homicide or suicide. Sandra Rogers is a 15-year-old black girl with a schizophrenic mother. Investigators sent to her home reported "no beds . . . mattresses on floor . . . broken refrigerator . . . no hot water . . . garbage strewn about." The mother, who had five illegitimate children by three different men, was chronically alcoholic. She attacked Sandra with a knife, saying she hated the girl because she reminded her of Sandra's father. Sandra ran away from home, and was later hospitalized for an overdose of drugs. She told a psychiatrist she had hallucinations, seeing spiritual figures surrounded by clouds, and often heard voices calling her name. "Sometimes they are mean to me," she said. "Sometimes they tell me to do things I don't want to do." She said that sometimes she walks along the street in a daze and heads into the oncoming traffic. "She knows she is doing this but can't stop herself," the doctor reported.

A psychiatrist who examined her after the drug overdose diagnosed her as schizophrenic. "My recommendation," he wrote, "is urgently for prolonged hospitalization because Sandra is truly in danger of killing herself if she is not contained. It is patently absurd to leave this child in an open setting where she is free to destroy herself."

She was sent to Bellevue Hospital for a one-month study. The diagnosis was "schizophrenia, childhood type, chronic." A psychiatrist reported that "since she has a tendency to follow what the voices tell her to do—such as taking an overdose of pills, or walking in front of a car—she could be a danger to herself or others." Another Bellevue doctor wrote, "It was strongly felt that this young girl was in need of long-term psychiatric hospitalization in a state institution."

So she was dispatched to a state children's psychiatric hospital. But after an examination of only one hour, she was rejected as a possible patient and returned to Bellevue. Bellevue in turn packed her back to the court, with this apology: "Because Sandra's evaluation at [the state hospital] revealed no severe pathology, the patient was returned to Bellevue. We have exhausted every other possible avenue of approach in seeking placement for Sandra, to no avail, and have no other recourse than to return her to court for final disposition. Our facilities do not permit our keeping her here any longer."

The night before Sandra will appear in court, Judge Polier is at an Italian restaurant having dinner with her husband. "The way these children are knocked around like pawns, like inanimate objects, is absolutely indecent," she says. "That child is coming into court tomorrow and she's going to stand there and I have a choice of returning her to the community where she'll kill herself, or remanding her to Juvenile Center. The

state hospital looked at her for *one hour*, ignored a one-month Bellevue study, and just turned her away."

Her husband tries to calm her. "You didn't turn her away, they did," he says.

"But she comes back to court. The child is on *my* doorstep. What do I do with this psychotic, suicidal child?"

"You can't take all the problems on your shoulders."

"But I'm the one who has to remand her."

"That's not your problem. You aren't doing it, they are. Don't take all these problems on yourself. What are you trying to do, save the universe?"

"Yes."

The next day Judge Polier faces Sandra Rogers in court—and orders her returned temporarily to Bellevue while attempts are made to force her admission to a state hospital. Then she takes a recess in a small office with desk, chair and telephone. Joan Strumer, a probation officer, comes in. "Your Honor, can you sign a warrant? Helen says she's going to be killed, and—" Helen is another probation officer. This morning Richard Holland, a 15-year-old escapee from a Bellevue psychiatric ward, called her and said he had a gun and was going to kill her.

When Richard was 11, he was caught mugging another boy in a Harlem subway station. A psychiatrist found no evidence of neurosis or psychosis, but nevertheless suggested therapy. None was given. Now, after many more robberies, many violent escapes—and no treatment—the diagnosis is paranoid schizophrenia. Richard is regarded as homicidal and extremely dangerous.

"Helen's scared to death," Joan Strumer says. "I called the youth squad and they said they'd stake out his house if they can get warrants."

"Talk to the intake judge," Polier says.

Judge Polier goes back to court and hears more cases. A 10-year-old boy heroin addict is ordered into a treatment program. He is furious. "Why do I have to go in a program? I can stop by myself when I want to."

A father demands that his divorced wife comply with the court's order to allow him to visit their son. The wife refuses angrily. Judge Polier explains that she must comply with the order. The woman screams hysterically and runs out of the courtroom. A court officer and Mrs. Strumer bring her back. "You cannot do this," the judge tells the mother. "You and your former husband must not use this child as a tool to hurt each other. He will have enough problems as he grows up. You must not burden him with your problems."

A 16-year-old girl heroin addict, who has given birth to an addicted child, refuses to attend a drug program. Her mother, who has given up on her and says so, is beside her. "I know you're going to send me to Juvenile Center anyway," the girl shouts at the judge, "so it don't make no difference what I say. My mother don't want me and I don't want her." The judge mentions a drug program. "I don't want no program. I ain't got no habit." The judge sends her to Juvenile Center while reports are prepared. "I'll kill myself," she screams. "And I ain't gonna talk to no psychiatrist neither. Next time I'm here I'll be in a coffin."

Two teen-age boys have broken into a blind woman's house, beaten her, robbed her and even taken her Braille wristwatch. The judge sets a trial date.

It is lunchtime.

Every day Judge Polier sees neglected infants, homicidal teen-agers, and all the stages of maturing violence between. Often she must attend helplessly at the early opening of wounds in which, she knows, hatred, madness and murder may take seed and fester. Not in the chaos of the squalid courtroom, but in the silent, subdued solemnity of her private chambers she talks to the parents, and takes the children in her arms. She meets the social workers, probation officers, police, doctors, lawyers, other judges—and grieves at the brutality of a system that studies, considers, suggests, reports, but rarely heals. She has in her chambers a 6-year-old girl, raised in love, who has never done anything more disturbing or criminal than temporarily refusing to eat her spinach. But now destruction threatens, and the law is on its side.

When Martha Jackson was 13, she was raped by her brother. She gave birth to a daughter, surrendered her to a placement agency, and was herself sent to a state training school. Now, five years later, Martha Jackson wants the girl back. Martha Jackson is mentally ill, unemployed, an alcoholic, and lives on welfare in a small, shabbily furnished ghetto apartment with a 6-month-old illegitimate son. Three days after birth, her daughter was placed with carefully selected, middle-class foster parents, and now at the age of 6 still lives with them and two older children. They want to adopt her. She wants to be adopted by them. But the law may prevent this. The case is before Judge Polier, who must decide not only if it is in the girl's best interests to stay with her foster parents, and to be adopted by them, but if the natural mother is herself unfit to care for the child. The law is very strong in this respect. The mother's alcoholism, instability and unemployment, the condition of her home and neighborhood—none of these is necessarily proof of unfitness. Nor are the findings and recommendations of doctors, social workers and probation officers. A psychiatrist said the mother "appeared incapable of providing adequate child care because of her own confusion, poor judgment, and lack of energy, motivation and resources." A probation officer said the foster parents "appear to be well-adjusted, stable, religious persons with noble ideals. Their sincere efforts appear to reflect in the well-adjusted appearance of the children. They hopes are to raise the children to be useful citizens. These plans include a college education." The report concluded, "Returning the child to her natural mother may indeed disturb, shock and profoundly disrupt her positive orientation to life."

Judge Polier is concerned that a ruling to permit adoption of the girl over the protests of her natural mother will be reversed in an appellate court. It has happened before. She has met the natural mother, and now wants to make a personal assessment of the girl and her foster parents. She asks the adoption agency to have them visit her at 9:30 in the morning.

They arrive early. She leaves the girl in a waiting room and takes the parents inside. She sits behind a large desk, and they settle nervously into chairs across from her. They are dressed as if for church. "I think you've done a wonderful job giving this girl a start," the judge says warmly. "I can realize from your faces how deeply you feel about the child. But in a guardianship proceeding like this the law is very strict. The question is whether or not the mother is unfit to raise her. I hope someday we have a better law, but this is the one we have now. I know it means so much to you, because you are her parents in truth."

Both parents nod.

"How long have you had Susan?" the judge asks, knowing the answer but trying to draw the parents out.

"Since she was five days old," the mother says, sitting up so straight her back does not touch the chair.

"What have you told her about her mother?"

"We've told her that when she was born her mother had some problems and she couldn't keep her, but that we are her foster parents and we want to adopt her if we can."

"What does she call you?"

"Mommy."

"And Daddy," the father says.

The judge talks with them a few more minutes and then asks them to wait outside while she sees the girl. She comes in shyly, wearing a dark skirt and white blouse. She stands in front of the judge's desk, quiet but not frightened. The judge smiles at her. "I've just been talking to your parents. They're lovely people."

She smiles.

"I know you think so, too."

"Yes, Ma'am."

She asks her about her school, how she likes her teachers, what she does after school, then she lowers her voice a tone, becomes just slightly more serious and says, "Susan, I'd like to ask you something that's hard, but I'd like you to be very honest with me. I know you haven't seen much of your mother. When you do see her, do you have a good time?"

"Yes." She is hesitant.

"What do you do?"

"Go to the movies. And to the park."

"Would you like to go live with her."

"I don't think I'd like to stay with her."

"Come here, dear," the judge says, and the girl walks around the desk to the judge's chair, moving up closely against her shoulder.

"When you talk to your mother, what do you talk about?"

"I say I want to stay with my other mother."

"What does she say?"

"Nothing."

"When you're with her, do you get any fun or happiness from her?"

"Not much."

"You like your parents?"

"Yes."

"If you stayed with your parents, would you like to keep seeing your mother?"

"No."

"You'd like to make it so they're your home?" She nods in the direction of the waiting room.

"Yes." She raises her hand and rests it on the arm of the judge's chair. The judge touches the lapel of the girl's blouse and says, "I don't want you to worry about this, because we're going to work it out." The girl smiles and the judge takes her face in her hands. "I'm delighted that you're doing so well and that you have parents who love you so much."

The girl nods. The judge walks out with her and sees them all to the elevator. Back in her chambers, her large eyes fire a look of anger and distress. "It's scary, isn't it?" she says. "That child may have to go back to her natural mother. Our courts still deal with these problems as though the rights of the mother are more important than what's best for the child. They seem too often to assume that *every* woman who bears a child is capable of giving that child love. Unfortunately, that's just not true. I must remove this little girl from this pre-adoptive home, the only home she has ever known, unless I find that the mother is unfit. Here are these people bringing out everything in this child, and I'm asked to put her back with a mother who is disturbed, alcoholic, who has been in and out of institutions, who—" She stops and draws on a cigarette. "And none of these things, by itself, necessarily makes her unfit. The courts have so held."

"What does?" she is asked.

"That's a good question, Every case is different."

Judge Polier eventually ruled in favor of the foster parents. The natural mother is appealing.

"Do you want him placed in an institution and put out of your home?" Judge Polier is in court questioning a middle-aged man, dressed in leather jacket, cap, and a pencil behind his ear.

"I'll just have to let him go back where I got him," says the man, stern and unshakable. He is talking about his 6-year-old grandson. The boy's mother is an alcoholic. Several months ago her neighbors heard

screams, went in the apartment and found her hitting the boy's head on the floor and trying to choke him. He was naked except for a cotton shirt, and was spitting up blood. The mother then took him out to the street and told him to leave and not come back.

The boy was taken from the mother, who has since disappeared, and placed with an agency who located his grandfather and stepgranddaughter, described in a probation report as "warm, open people, with a genuine interest in the boy." They agreed to care for the boy "until grown, if need be."

It was not long, however, before the grandparents called the court to complain that he was hard to control and had broken one of their children's bicycles. They wanted him to behave, and they wanted to be paid for keeping him.

Now, while the boy sits alone outside on a bench in the waiting hall, Judge Polier asks the grandfather what he thinks about keeping the boy.

He is annoyed. He says he works nights, seven nights a week, and should be home sleeping. "My wife is the one who takes care of the children. When I get home I go to bed and the door is closed. When I get up it's 11 o'clock and I'm gone. This boy, if he comes in and bothers me, out he go. All my responsibility—I just make sure my wife gets money for the family."

The judge says she wants to talk to the child alone. She goes out to the small office by the waiting hall and someone brings the boy in. She smiles at him and says hello and asks him to come around behind the desk and stand next to her. She puts an arm gently around his shoulder. A probation report described him as "reserved and serious as if too mature for his age, but it is not difficult to make him smile; a pleasant personality." He moves in against the judge's arm and smiles shyly. "I want to ask you something," she says. "And I want you just to tell me what you think." She asks if he is happy with his grandparents. He smiles and nods. "Are they nice to you?" He nods. "Is there anyone else you would like to see?" He shakes his head. "Just them?" He nods.

She returns to court. She explains to the grandfather that because he is related to the boy he cannot receive regular foster care payments. He can, however, receive a lesser amount from welfare. Will that be enough?

"No, $15 or $20 is not enough."

"Well," says the judge, "since he loves you and wants to be with you and has no one else, are you willing to keep him?"

"No." The man is solid-faced and adamant. "He'll just have to go, go back where we got him."

"It's going to be very hard on him. You know that?"

He shrugs. "It'll just have to be that way."

Judge Polier has lunch with a friend who has spent the morning in her court. "At least he was honest," she says of the grandfather. "He certainly had no pretensions of fatherhood." She thinks a moment. "When I put my arm around the boy, I could feel him react. He wants to be loved." The boy is black, Protestant and already 6 years old. "He'll be difficult for adoption," she says.

The friend asks her if she has seen an improvement over the years in the way troubled children are treated.

"It's getting worse," she says. "The delinquents and predelinquents today appear more disturbed than they used to be. I think it's because of the breakdown in the old basic controls, the conventional respect for one's parents, teacher, minister. There's so little help from any caring adult for these children. They don't get it in the schools, in the church or at home. Problems aren't spotted until something happens, until there's an assault or a theft or an overdose. And that's awfully late."

She stops talking and looks down into her plate. Her friend asks if it all makes her angry. She looks up. "I don't think angry is the word for me. It's not my way of functioning. I get *very* determined, and 'How do I break through this . . .' But I'll tell you when I really do get angry. When I sense in someone, 'Well, it's just part of the system. What are you breaking your neck for?' I get angry when I see a greater concern for the system than for what it's supposed to be doing. The system fails to reach out and serve the people it was created to serve. And it makes you terribly distressed and angry when you see this in terms of a child—a child like that boy today whose grandfather doesn't want him and who will be so difficult for adoption. A child—a human being—reaches out for love. And gets hit. And he reaches out again, and gets hit again. And he keeps reaching out, and every time he's denied. And then finally, defensively, he stops reaching. And in no longer looking for love, he loses the ability to love, and the ability to feel. The capacity to feel for another person is cut off, and he can destroy other people without reaction. And then you get rapes and robberies and murder. Take this little boy—he's tried to reach out and be loved. He's made a desperate effort. And he's been turned off. How long can you expect a child to keep reaching?"

TAX ON SULFUR POLLUTION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, every year 35 million tons of sulfur pollution threaten the health and living conditions of every American.

The most serious single consequence of air pollution is its impact upon the health of human beings. The sulfur oxides irritate the respiratory system, causing both temporary and permanent injury. When small particles are breathed in with sulfur oxides, the irritation and injury may increase significantly.

These health hazards have been demonstrated in a number of air pollution disasters—in the Meuse Valley in Belgium in 1930—in Donora, Pa., in 1948—in London in 1952, 1955, 1956, 1957 and 1962—in Rotterdam in 1959 and 1962. The greatest single tragedy took place in the "London Smog" of 1952, which took 4,000 lives. In all these episodes of acute air pollution, concentrations of sulfur oxides and particulates in the air increased sharply above normal levels—and so did the death rate.

In addition to increased deaths in these incidents, sickness increased. Hospital admissions rose. Absenteeism from work increased. But these acute short-term episodes of air pollution are only the tip of the iceberg. There is evidence that long-term exposures to air pollution with relatively low concentrations of sulfur oxides and particulates is related to increased illness.

Coughing, difficulty in breathing, bronchitis, asthma, heart disease, pneumonia, chest colds, may afflict a person who lives for a long time in a polluted area. Emphysema, the fastest growing cause of death in the United States, also has been linked to air pollution.

The total national health cost resulting from sulfur dioxide emissions are conservatively estimated at $3.3 billion annually.

Sulfur pollution not only threatens the health of our people, it has had an ugly and expensive corrosive effect on buildings and contents. Much of this damage results when sulfur oxides are converted into highly destructive sulfur acid. Particulates and sulfur oxides together are even a greater danger. Sulfur oxides physically deteriorate and discolor buildings. Limestone, marble, and other building stones, as well as mortar and roofing slate, are attacked by the acids formed by the interaction of industrial smoke and moisture. Many buildings and homes in Cleveland have been damaged by sulfur emissions, to the point where cleaning buildings is senseless, unless we control the pollution output.

Sulfur dioxide has had an incalculable effect in damaging vegetation. Sulfur dioxide can injure plant tissue, discolor leaves, stunt plant growth, and reduce crop yields.

In the Cleveland area in 1970, the most recent figures on SO_2 pollution indicate that the 10 largest sources of sulfur pollution account for 84 percent of the total emissions. The following industrial operations have been the major sulfur polluters:

The 1970 SO_2 Emissions in Cleveland[1]

Source:	Tons
Cleveland Electric Illuminating	78,480
Republic Steel	20,047
Muny	17,100
Dupont	4,750
Master Metals	1,540
Medical Center	1,650
Subtotal (84%)	123,567
Other coal, oil, incineration processes	20,745
Other processes	403
Transportation	2,385
Total SO_2 emissions in Cleveland in 1970 (100%)	147,100
Total SO_2 emissions in Cuyahoga County in 1970	227,000

[1] Data supplied by the Cleveland Division of Air Pollution Control.

In Greater Cleveland, more than one-third of the "home gardens" have been damaged by sulfur pollutants. Near certain factories almost nine out of 10 gardens were damaged by sulfur oxides. Severe vegetation damage has been noted as far as 52 miles downwind from Cleveland.

The large greenhouse industry in the Cleveland area has suffered severe damage as the air pollutants actually corrode the glass and deflect the needed rays of sun.

The damaging effects of sulfur dioxide on materials, property, and vegetation cost the Nation an estimated $5 billion annually. Health costs are approximately $3.3 billion. Therefore, the total damages of $8.3 billion amount to 25 cents for each pound of sulfur now emitted into our atmosphere.

But the total costs of air pollution are incalculable. Some specific cost can be measured—such as the cost of painting or cleaning a building, of depressed

property values, of crop and livestock losses and of air travel disruptions. Other costs are immeasurable—the shortened human life with its reduced productivity.

The total costs of air pollution cannot be established precisely, because atmospheric contamination stems from a complex interaction of a multitude of factors. But all indications are that air pollution cost the people of the United States many billions of dollars every year. Economic studies are beginning to pinpoint a few estimates: The cost of painting steel structures damaged by air pollution or particulate matter is approximately $100 million a year. The cost of damage to agricultural crops and livestock from air pollution could be $500 million a year or more.

By far the largest sulfur polluter is the electric power industry, which emits 50 percent of the total sulfur pollution. Sulfur is an element in coal and oil, usually comprising 1 to 3 percent of the fuel, though sometimes as much as 7 percent. As of 1969, 59 percent of the fuel burned in fossil-fueled plants was coal, 12 percent was oil and 29 percent was natural gas. Since the power industry is growing at a much faster rate than other sources of sulfur pollution, its total portion of total emissions is growing.

In the United States in 1969, 33.4 million tons of sulfur dioxide were emitted—16.7 million tons of sulfur—primarily from the smokestacks of powerplants, smelters, and other industrial facilities. These dangerous air pollution emissions are increasing every year. It has been estimated that with the increasing generation of electric power and rising sulfur content of fuels burned, sulfur oxide pollution could increase fourfold by the year 2000.

These are increasingly important reasons why this country must research and develop new, efficient, and clean sources of energy. The next 10 years are predicted as critical years in which we are threatened with power shortages. As these fossil-fuel plants start galloping their operations to keep up with demand, the increase in sulfur pollution will be devastating, unless we can force these operations to control their own pollution.

I feel that the only efficient and effective means to control sulfur pollution is to tax the polluter. I am, therefore, introducing legislation to tax sulfur pollution. If this legislation were adopted it would be in the polluters self-interest to research for and to install the very best available pollution abatement equipment. This legislation embodies a five-point plan to curtail sulfur pollution.

First. That the charge on sulfur emitted into the environment be set at 20 cents per pound, and that this rate be achieved by 1975.

Second. That the charge be applied uniformly throughout the Nation, to keep the tax administratively simple, and to prevent pollutors from taking refuge in nontaxed areas.

Third. That Congress, rather than an agency, set the level of tax, so that the debate is out in the open.

Fourth. That the revenue not be earmarked, so that no program's funding is dependent on a lack of pollution control.

The administration has endorsed a legislative proposal for a solution to this problem of sulfur pollution. One provision states that the tax will not be applicable in areas of the country where the "ambient air" is already cleaner than existing Federal standards require. All but two of the 15 copper smelters in the country are in the West. These copper smelters are responsible for 4 million tons a year of sulfur dioxide pollution. Therefore, it seems to me that the administration can "stick another economic interest in its hat." It seems as though the copper companies will escape the tax because a copper smelter in Arizona, where the ambient air is cleaner that the Federal liimts, could theoretically put any amount of sulfur dioxide in the air and not be touched by the tax.

The fact of the matter is that the ambient air over a certain piece of the country does not give a true picture of the air pollution problem, because air pollution does not necessarily obey the boundaries of regions defined under the Clean Air Act. Any legislation that taxes according to regions defined under the Clean Air Act just does not make sense. At a time when tax reform and tax equality is so desperately needed, it seems unconscionable that this tax be selectively enforced. This selective enforcement would undermine the fundamental purpose of the tax—as well as lead to a gradual deterioration of the last remaining clean air regions of the Nation.

This tax on sulfur pollution is an economically sound way of dealing with the problem. This tax of 20 cents a pound on sulfur emittants is high enough so that competitive factors will force polluters to control their pollution, thereby preventing them from simply passing the tax onto the consumer. Since polluting will be more expensive than abatement, any firm which chooses to reduce its pollution will have a competitive advantage over any firm which has not chosen this least-cost alternative.

This legislation is not a revenue-raising measure for any specific programs. Although the concept of pollution taxes grew out of the conviction that the air and water should not be free dumping grounds, the goal of the tax is to make pollution control in the economic self-interest of the polluters, not to collect revenue. The revenue will decrease as the environmental quality improves.

It is my hope that my colleagues will support this measure so that the present and future dangers of sulfur pollution may be effectively controlled to protect the American citizens and their environment.

FREDERICK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HONORED

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Chamber of Commerce president, Mr. William S. Lowe, honored the Chamber of Commerce of Frederick County, Inc., for being charter member No. 1 of the chamber of commerce. Mr. Lowe congratulated Edward J. Daugherty, president, and Richard D. Hammond, executive vice president of the Frederick Chamber, at the 60th anniversary dinner of the chamber.

In 1912, there were 171 charter members of the newly formed National Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce of Frederick County, Inc., was the first charter member and has retained that distinction until today. This active organization has done much to promote community spirit and economic development in Frederick County and worked diligently to benefit the local community. I congratulate them on these achievements.

THE CARPETING WAS RED

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in early March of this year it was my pleasure to escort 13-year-old Julie Wickert, an eighth grade student from Potomac, Md., on a guided tour and interview in the Soviet Embassy.

Julie's interest in the Soviet Union is commendable, and reflects, I think, a widespread attitude of respect, friendship, and interest in the Soviet Union among young Americans. This is a promising sign for the future of East-West relations and deserves a moment of reflection by all Americans.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article from the Montgomery County Sentinel which relates some of Julie's impressions of the Soviet Union after her tour and interview with embassy officials:

THE CARPETING WAS RED—LOCAL GIRL TOURS SOVIET EMBASSY

(By Jacquie Hunt)

A Potomac student's initiative paid off in a recent visit to the embassy of the USSR.

Last Wednesday, 13-year-old Julie Wickert, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Wickert Jr., 12301 Espalier Place, accompanied by Rep. Fred B. Rooney (D-Pa.), was given a special tour of two reception areas of the Soviet Embassy by third secretary Yuri S. Bakenko and Anatoly P. Kotov, an attaché with the embassy's public relations division.

After the tour, Babenko and Kotov answered Julie's questions about the education system and social conditions in the Soviet Union.

"I really didn't expect it would work out," said Julie, "because I had called the embassy myself earlier and they said they didn't give tours. So as Congressman Rooney and I drove up I was feeling pretty excited and happy.

"SCAREY" AT FIRST

"When we first stepped on the doormat, bells went off inside and that was rather scarey. But we pushed the door buzzer, went in, and spoke to the man at the reception desk. Then Mr. Babenko and Mr. Kotov came down. They were so friendly and gracious and spoke such good English that I felt right at home."

Julie was not prepared for the embassy's elegance. "It was gorgeous, just like a palace," she said. "The hallway was lined with

mirrors, divided into panes with gold. The hall, all the way up the stairs, and both reception rooms had red carpeting."

Familiar with Russian art since her visit to the Russian exhibit at the Corcoran Gallery, Julie appreciated the paintings. "I recognized the portrait of Lenin right away," she said, "as our textbooks showed that his picture hangs in all the school rooms in Russia.

"The painting I like best was all done in very soft colors. The Kremlin in the background was soft grey, the sky was all pink and blue, and there was a sled with horses in the foreground."

Although the large reception area was imposing, Julie preferred the smaller parlor where she sat and talked to Babenko and Kotov for half an hour. "It was sort of cozy," she said, "with a sofa, comfortable chairs and a coffee table."

Julie had prepared a list of questions which, she said, seemed to be answered fully and openly. "We talked mostly about the life style in Russia," she reported, "and I learned how everything is owned by the government. In some ways it sounds great, as you can go to the sports arena free instead of paying $6, and all education and medical expenses are paid for.

"I was really surprised about the education," she went on, "because I had expected it might be rather primitive. But it is much the same as here. Students must go to school for 10 years and then the ones who do well on their exams go on to college, without having to pay anything.

SOME CHANGED IDEAS

Julie felt that some of her ideas about the Soviet Union had changed since her visit. "Although the country is very strictly ruled and I wouldn't want to live there," she said, "it doesn't seem as bad as I thought. Mr. Babenko pointed out how people are much the same and how Moscow is a lot like New York."

The envy of her classmates, Julie will report on her experience to eighth grade geography students at Robert Frost Junior High School. They have been working on a four-week unit on the Soviet Union using a contract system whereby students undertake stipulated assignments to obtain predetermined grades.

Julie had already completed the required and optional assignments, including preparation of a Russian meal, when the idea of a visit to the embassy occurred to her.

She wrote to Rooney, a family friend, to ask for his help. A single call to the Soviet Embassy resulted in the visit and what Rooney described as a very warm and cordial reception.

BLUE CROSS AND AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF BLOOD BANKS URGE TOTALLY VOLUNTEER BLOOD SYSTEM

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, two prominent health care organizations have recently called for a voluntary national blood program. The American Association of Blood Banks represents most of the Nation's nonprofit community blood banks and has long been dedicated to volunteerism in blood banking. On March 16, the AABB's Board of Directors approved a statement reaffirming the organization's committment to voluntary blood. The statement includes a recommended time schedule for all AABB members to achieve the goal of 100-percent volunteered blood.

The Blue Cross Association has also recognized the hazards of commercial blood. The governing body for the 74 Blue Cross plans recently urged the chapters to organize voluntary blood replacement programs to guarantee pure and safe blood for all 74 million Blue Cross subscribers. The Blue Cross Association also called for all blood to be labeled as to its original source—paid or volunteer.

My bill, H.R. 11828, would provide the basis for a totally volunteer blood system by appointing a director who would conduct a vigorous nationwide donor recruitment program, and set yearly percentage levels for volunteer blood. By this method we would gradually phase out paid donors as we no longer rely on them. My bill would also require the labeling of blood as to its source to give doctors and patients an understanding of the risks involved in each transfusion.

The texts of the AABB statement and the Blue Cross Association resolution follow:

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF BLOOD BANKS' AFFIRMATIVE APPROACH TO IMPROVING BLOOD BANKS AND BLOOD TRANSFUSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

The American Association of Blood Banks (AABB) is the only national organization devoted exclusively to blood banking and blood transfusion service. It represents not only the majority of the nation's nonprofit community blood banks, but also over 1464 hospital blood banks and transfusion services which have the final responsibility of transfusing blood to patients. Its institutional members (blood banks) collect, process, and distribute over 3,300,000 units of blood and provide over 5,698,000 units of blood and components for transfusions annually.

Since its inception in 1947, the AABB has actively promoted the voluntary blood donor concept and the maintenance of high medical standards in the collection, processing, distribution, and transfusion of blood for the protection of not only the donor who gives blood, but also the ultimate "consumer"—the patient in the hospital needing blood transfusions.

The AABB's position, outlined on the following pages, recognizes that every patient's need for blood must be met. Any practical plan for a voluntary blood donor program to meet total patient needs must take into account local resources and requirements, by allowing variations in approach. Further, mechanisms which currently are serving the public's needs well, must not be impaired without adequate consideration of the impact on patients.

The American Association of Blood Banks is vitally interested in improving the nation's blood bank services and is concerned with maintaining adequate blood supplies in the unpredictable interim between the present and the future. The expertise and experience of blood collecting and transfusing facilities—large and small, hospital and community—are needed if the increasing demands for blood and blood components are to continue to be met efficiently and in the best public interest. No one organization or system alone has all the resources to accomplished this task.

AABB STATEMENT

To assure a safe, adequate and economical blood supply for blood transfusions, the American Association of Blood Banks:

1. Reaffirms the principle that the voluntary blood donor provides blood and blood components which are safest for patients, and urges member blood banks to move as rapidly as possible toward a goal of total voluntary blood supply.

2. Recommends to its member banks who are not already providing 100% voluntarily-donated blood, the following time schedule for achieving this goal: For the year ending December 31, 1973—75% voluntary; for the year ending December 31, 1974—90% voluntary; and for the year ending December 31, 1975—100% voluntary.

This time schedule was adopted in the knowledge that paid donors cannot be eliminated overnight without seriously jeopardizing the blood supply in some parts of the country. The complete elimination of paid donors depends on (1) improve blood management and the movement of blood of the right type to the right place at the right time, and (2) the public's awareness that it holds the key to assuring safe and adequate blood supplies by giving blood voluntarily.

The AABB's National Clearinghouse Program provides a mechanism for achieving these goals by enabling donors to replace blood voluntarily anywhere in the country, and by coordinating blood exchanges between banks to assure the better utilization of all available blood supplies, thus minimizing the use of paid donors and blood outdating.

To assist blood banks to reach the 100% voluntary goal, the AABB is engaging in a nationwide public information and donor recruitment program.

3. Reaffirms that the blood nonreplacement fee (deposit) concept in effect today is currently a necessary incentive for donor recruitment for many blood banks in this country.

The AABB believes that at the present time it is unrealistic to assume that a 100% voluntary donor goal can be achieved in the immediate future without allowance for the continuation of the nonreplacement fee and the individual or group credit concept.

In a recent study conducted by the Association,* 677 of 781 banks surveyed, representing a blood usage of over 3,325,000 units, place a moral and financial responsibility on patients to replace blood by charging a blood nonreplacement fee (weighted mean of $23.-30). When blood replacements are made, or previously established credits are released in the patient's name, the fee is refunded or credited to the patient's account. This fee, therefore, is an important and inherent part of the donor recruitment programs of many blood banks and hospitals, and the motivating basis for participation in most blood assurance and predeposit plans.

The nonreplacement fee also has been instrumental in keeping the processing fee charged by blood banks for the collection and processing of blood at a minimum. Most blood banks are not subsidized by public funds through taxation or community fund drives and must be self-sustaining. Many banks, therefore, use the nonreplacement fee to subsidize part of their operating costs rather than increase their processing fee (weighted mean of $12.62). Thus, the patient who supports the local blood program through blood donations is able to receive blood at less cost than the patient who prefers to pay the nonreplacement fee rather than to seek blood replacement donors from among family and friends.

4. Urges the formation of a voluntary Commission on Blood Banks and Blood Transfusion Services, to be composed of representatives of the two major blood banking organizations in the United States—the American Association of Blood Banks whose members are concerned with total blood transfusion

* "Fees and Replacement Policies of Institutional Members of the American Association of Blood Banks," March-April 1972 issue of Transfusion.

service, and the American National Red Cross whose 59 centers collect, process and distribute blood—as well as appropriate representatives of medical, hospital and consumer organizations. The purpose of this Commission would be to improve national coordination of blood bank systems and programs, particularly relating to donor recruitment, public educational, inventory management, standards, scientific activities and research.

Adopted by the AABB Executive Committee, February 8, 1972, and approved by the AABB Board of Directors, March 16, 1972.

HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE AABB IN NATIONAL BLOOD RECRUITMENT AND TRANSFUSION SERVICES

In keeping with its goals over the past 25 years, the AABB, through the voluntary efforts of its over 4200 individual members—physicians, scientists, blood bank administrators, medical laboratory technologists, nurses, and others closely allied to the field—has originated and implemented many programs and services in the public interest, and has played an active role in national blood recruitment and transfusion services.

In 1962, to re-emphasize its position to the public and to its members, the AABB Board of Directors adopted the following *Statement of Principles of Blood Procurement:*

1. Blood for transfusion is human living tissue and is not a commodity. Blood does not carry an expressed or implied warranty. Blood used for transfusion is a service. Blood is an integral part of the rendition of medical services to the individual.

2. Most blood banks operate on the voluntary donor replacement or predeposit donor systems. These policies are designed to obtain maximum voluntary donor participation in replacement of blood used by patients. These principles which have proven a successful method of blood procurement for over 25 years are endorsed by the American Association of Blood Banks as the primary method of obtaining human blood.

3. The insurance or assurance principle, when applied to blood banking as it relates to the provision of blood itself, should be based on the concept that payment of the premium is primarily by blood donation rather than by money.

Most recently, the AABB's Statement of Principles was embodied in the following *Summary of Statement* which was submitted as part of the testimony of the American Association of Blood Banks before the House Ways and Means Committee during its hearings on National Health Insurance, October 28, 1971:

1. *The motivation and recruitment of sufficient voluntary blood donors to keep pace with the increasing demand for blood is the main problem facing blood banks today.* In a nation of over 200 million people, with more than 100 million individuals qualified to give blood, only 3% of the eligible population are blood donors.

2. Recent studies indicate that blood from commercial sources is 10 times more likely to transmit hepatitis through blood transfusion than blood which is obtained from voluntary donors.

3. The Hepatitis Associated Antigen Test for the identification of blood that may be a carrier of serum hepatitis is estimated to be only 20–30% effective.

4. The public expects blood to be available and safe when needed for transfusion. To meet the increasing demand for quality blood, banks must get more voluntary donors. Blood is available only because of another individual's willingness to give.

5. Throughout the United States nonprofit blood banks offer to individuals, families and groups, blood assurance programs which will cover their blood and blood component requirements for a period of a year or more through voluntary blood donations.

6. To nourish voluntary replacement of blood, most blood banks place a monetary value on the blood itself—*a blood replacement or blood deposit fee.* This fee is kept relatively high, not to provide greater income for blood banks, but to provide a strong incentive for patients to seek blood donors. *When blood replacements are made, or previously established credits are released in the patient's name, the fee is refunded or credited to the patient's account.*

7. It is imperative that positive efforts be made to encourage voluntary blood donations in advance of need (predeposit and blood assurance programs), and to retain the moral and financial obligation for patients to replace blood they receive with blood, not dollars.

8. Blood banks cannot transfuse dollars. Monetary payment of the blood replacement fee by private health insurance or by the Government indirectly forces blood banks to turn to the use of paid donors or commercial blood sources in many communities.

AABB PROGRAMS AND SERVICES IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Among the many far-reaching accomplishments of the AABB and its member banks in improving the Nation's Blood Lifeline are the following programs and services:

1. A *National Clearinghouse Program,* initiated in 1953 to promote the voluntary replacement of blood anywhere in the country and to facilitate the "borrowing and lending" of blood between banks to minimize outdating and to provide better blood inventory control. Currently, over 900 blood banks and drawing stations utilize the services of the clearinghouse program for the benefit of patients in over 3400 hospitals and transfusion facilities throughout the United States. Through an interorganizational agreement between the AABB and the American National Red Cross, the services of the clearinghouse are extended also to patients receiving blood in hospitals supplied under the ARC Blood Program. Since its inception, over 2,000,000 blood replacement credits have been transferred for the benefit of patients, and over 1,000,000 units of blood have been shipped between banks under the coordination of the clearinghouse system.

2. A voluntary *Inspection and Accreditation Program,* implemented in 1958 to assure that blood shipped under the clearinghouse program is of the highest quality, and for the benefit of more than a thousand blood banks not under any city, state or federal licensing program. Over 1300 blood banks and transfusion services have been accredited by the AABB under this program, which is available to any blood bank regardless of whether or not it holds membership in the Association.

3. *"Standards for Blood Banks and Transfusion Services,"* which provides a basis for the AABB Inspection and Accreditation Program. Now undergoing its sixth revision, these standards, which cover all aspects of blood transfusion service from the collection of blood to its transfusion to patients, have been widely accepted throughout the world and have provided the basis for many State licensing programs.

4. *"Technical Methods and Procedures,"* an AABB manual which has helped to raise the standards of innumerable blood banks by providing an important reference document for the performance of laboratory tests to assure the safety of blood transfusions.

5. A network of 28 AABB *Regional Reference Laboratories* which offers valuable assistance to any blood bank or hospital encountering problems of crossmatching, transfusion reactions, and antibody identification.

6. A *Rare Donor File,* listing over 8171 rare blood donors, which is available on a no-fee, 24-hour basis to assist in locating compatible blood for patients worldwide.

7. A system of ten *Frozen Blood Depots* throughout the country which provide an immediate source of rare blood placed in storage for future use. "Super rare" blood has been placed in AABB storage at the Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea, Massachusetts.

8. A *Certification in Blood Banking Program,* approved by the American Medical Association and sponsored in cooperation with the Registry of Medical Technologists of the American Society of Clinical Pathologists. Under this program, hundreds of qualified medical technologists have been trained in the specialty of blood banking technology.

9. A *Standby Contract with the Department of Defense* for the procurement of blood by AABB banks in times of national emergency.

STATEMENT FROM BLUE CROSS ASSOCIATION

The Board of Governors of the Blue Cross Association, citing the high risk of infectious hepatitis among the recipients of blood from paid donor sources, has called for all blood programs to be built on the voluntary donor principle.

Human blood and blood product programs should be built on the principle of voluntary donation because of the proven higher safety record of such programs in comparison with those operating through paid-donor relationships, the Board said.

The resolution of the board calls on the nation's 74 Blue Cross Plans "to develop the means to make blood replacement programs available to their employees and to their 74 million subscribers." The Blue Cross Association, national coordinating body for the 74 Blue Cross Plans in the United States, has organized its own voluntary replacement program for employees of the Chicago headquarters.

According to the Board, patients who receive paid donor blood run greater risks of contracting infectious hepatitis than patients receiving volunteer blood. At present, the incidence of "transfusion hepatitis" causes a drain of about 450,000 hospital days on the nation's acute care institutions, according to one estimate. The most reliable screening tests for hepatitis are successful in detecting only about one-in-four cases.

About half of the nation's blood supply is derived from voluntary donor sources, according to the Board, and the other half is from paid donors.

Because paid-donor blood programs do not provide adequate supplies of low-risk blood, the Blue Cross Association "declares its strong support in the effort to provide an adequate supply of low-risk volunteer blood for the people of this nation," the Board said.

Blue Cross Plans should also encourage member hospitals to use only blood that has been labeled by donor sources, the governing body said.

STATEMENT ON VOLUNTARY DONATION AND REPLACEMENT OF BLOOD

In view of the Blue Cross system's interest in improving the health of Americans, it would be timely to strengthen the Blue Cross position on both voluntary blood donation and blood assurance programs. It is an accepted and statistically proven fact that a patient who receives paid donor blood runs a higher risk of contracting infectious hepatitis than a patient receiving volunteer blood. One blood expert estimates that approximately 450,000 hospital days a year are consumed by patients with transfusion hepatitis—a considerable drain on precious acute-care institutional resources. The recently developed Hepatitis Associated Antigen (HAA) screening test for hepatitis (now being used by most U.S. blood banks) detects approximately one out of four hepatitis carriers.

Currently, volunteer donors provide only half the needed U.S. blood supply; the rest is paid-donor. The key to doubling the number of volunteer donors and cutting the hepatitis rate lies with: 1) aggressive public

education programs for more voluntary blood donations; 2) more blood assurance programs, where the volunteer is assured he will receive an adequate supply of low-risk blood, if needed for himself or family; and 3) immediate programs to end direct payment for human blood, because such payment discourages adequate supplies of low-risk blood and increases the hepatitis risk for all recipients.

Therefore be it resolved that:

The Board of Governors of the Blue Cross Association reaffirms its April 8, 1968, position that hospital and community blood programs should be built upon the principle of voluntary donation and replacement, and should encourage blood assurance programs which follow that principle, and that in designing benefits, urges Member Plans to take into account the need for an adequate supply of blood and blood components, encouraging donations and replacement programs of blood assurance in lieu of direct payment for blood.

In reaffirming this position, the Board of Governors recognizes that until such time as an adequate supply of low-risk blood is available, a few intermediate steps should be taken. Plans should refrain from offering new certificates which provide for payment for human blood. Plans should encourage their member hospitals to utilize only that blood which has been labeled by donor source.

Further, the Blue Cross Association, representing 74 Member Plans, operating within the United States, declares its strong support in the effort to provide an adequate supply of low-risk volunteer blood for the people of this nation. Blue Cross Plans are urged to develop the means to make blood replacement programs available to their employees and to their 74 million subscribers.

A STEP TOWARD PEACE IN EUROPE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the vote last week in the West German Parliament which ratified the eastern treaties marked a momentous step in reducing tensions in Europe and in continuing that continent's progress toward normalized relations among its countries.

The voice of reason has been heard. The vigorous debates in the Bundestag preserved the democratic basis for this decisive step which Chancellor Willy Brandt has pursued so long and so well.

The American people can, I believe, be confident that future developments, as promising as this treaty ratification, will bring equally dramatic progress in the post-cold war era in eastern-western relations. The next step in these developments is the signing of the Berlin accord already agreed to by the four powers. The planning of the European Security Conference should follow promptly.

Chancellor Brandt spoke briefly on German radio and television last Wednesday following the Bundestag vote. I include his remarks below:

STATEMENT BY CHANCELLOR WILLY BRANDT

With the German Bundestag's approval of the treaties of Moscow and Warsaw, a new phase of the history of the Federal Republic has been inaugurated. After difficult and very vehement disputes, the way of reason has been taken—a way leading to the future.

The decision—which will most surely not be delayed by the Bundestrat (upper house)—holds good for the Federal Republic of Germany. It creates facts on the basis of which all responsible forces will have to proceed in future. All Democratic forces will respect this decision in their actions. This was also the case following the decision in the fifties on our integration in the western alliance system. The decision then and the decision today complement each other.

Today, it will be still more evident to our friends and partners in west and east than it has been in the past that the Federal Republic of Germany is determined to contribute its share to detente in Europe. The Federal Republic will adhere to the letter and the spirit of the treaties. It expects the same of the treaty-partners.

The Bundestag has approved by a large majority a resolution that makes plain the basic lines of our foreign policy. In a number of points it describes the position consistently taken by the government during the negotiations and after the signing.

Before us lies the task of putting life into the treaties. The call to do this also includes those who deemed it appropriate to abstain from voting on the matter.

Before us lies the task on which our policy centers: Living improvements for the people in divided Germany, peace along the borders, normalization of the relations between the two States, and thus a beginning permitting east and west in Germany and Europe to live with each other.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN BANK LOANS AND CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the privilege of appearing before the National Commission on Consumer Finance, which is looking into sex discrimination in the granting of bank loans and consumer credit.

As Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, who chaired this morning's meeting of the Commission, stated, there is ample documentation of the breadth and pervasiveness of this discrimination. The primary question, then, is how to deal with it.

Today, I introduced three bills on this subject which would make it illegal for any federally related bank, credit union, or other financial institution to discriminate on the basis of sex or marital status, for any lender to discriminate on the basis of sex or marital status with respect to federally related mortage loans, and for any institution covered by the Truth In Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. 1601–1665, to discriminate on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of consumer credit.

I include at this point the text of my statement before the Commission and the text of the three bills introduced today:

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CONSUMER FINANCE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss sex discrimination in bank loans and consumer credit transactions.

Today, women in this country are treated as if they were totally dependent and unreliable when they apply for loans, consumer credit or mortgages. Under the present state of the law in many states, women have no credit rights *at all.*

In most states, women who are married, or have ever been married, find that credit, like domicile, follows the husband. A married woman thus receives credit *only* through her husband as his ward and not as an individual. She is a non-person for credit purposes. Credit cards and accounts are virtually always issued in the name of the husband and not the wife regardless of whether the woman is the applicant and regardless of whether she is a better credit risk. This is also true in many cases when women apply for mortgages or other kinds of loans.

All credit institutions—whether they be banks, department stores, credit unions, or mortgage companies—are able to do this because at present, neither the United States nor the individual states have passed legislation to prohibit credit discrimination based upon sex. Viable and vigorous legislation of this nature is needed in every state to correct this incredulous and dehumanizing practice against women.

I would like to cite a few cases where women in responsible business and professional positions have been denied credit in their names and told that they could only obtain credit through their husbands.

From a woman in Chicago, there is a typical story about Bank Americard:

"In April of 1970 I received a form letter notifying me as a First Card Holder that all First Cards would be revoked as of May 1, 1970, and that all holders in good standing would receive a Bank Americard to replace it. I had no reason to expect not to receive this new credit card, but it appears that to the First National Bank of Chicago members in good standing must be standing in a Men's room somewhere. My male friends received their cards automatically, I received only credit card applications. This surprised me because I had used my First Card not infrequently (once I reported an infraction on your First Card rules on the part of a member store, in letter and then by phone at request), paid my bills promptly also, and in April 1970 the sum of $2,232.24 in a Savings Account in your bank. My husband used his card much less than I, he paid his bills promptly also, and in April 1970 had $669.89 in his Savings Account in your bank. He received his card without question. I wrote two letters to the Bank. To the first letter I received another credit card application. The second letter was answered by a phone call from a Mr. Fletcher proceeded to try to ask me the questions on the credit application over the phone. This irked me, and as soon as I mentioned my husband's experience with his replacement card Mr. Fletcher changed his tone and I assume brightened my prospects of approval. He said he would have to process my application through a computer and when I talked to him later that afternoon and said that yes, I could have a Bank Americard, but he didn't want to send it out so near to Christmas because it might be in jeopardy in the Christmas mail with so much part time help. I would have my new card in January. I waited until March and then all but closed my account with your bank as you can see by the accompanying xerox copy of both my husband and my bank books showing the pertinent time period. I will never willingly put another penny in your bank, nor will I allow any money which I control to be entrusted to your case. If all the females who have been treated in this same high-handed fashion would take similar action I'm sure that you would have cause for much more regret than the removal of my $2,000 from a savings account. I hope someday they shall."

From Indiana, a woman describes her experiences with the Gulf Oil Company:

"My husband uses his card for business and keeps careful records of gas repairs etc. for his car. I use my car and use my own credit cards for gas, etc. so that when the bills pile in, he knows right away which belong to which car.

"Last January, I sent in the standard credit card application form to Gulf Oil with all information provided as it pertained to me—a wage earner in the 5 figure range, employed for the past 4 years . . . and received a letter in reply requesting that the form again be completed, by my husband! My husband has had an active account with Gulf Oil for several years. . . . Needless to say, we no longer have any business with Gulf Oil. I was really quite insulted and we promptly terminated our account."

These two examples—and there are many more like them—indicate that regardless of her credit-worthiness, a married or formerly married woman achieves the use of credit only as an appendage of the husband.

The Diner's Club blantantly sets forth this policy on its application by providing for "family head applicant" and "supplemental card" for the wife (with written permission from the husband).

Single women find that when they get married creditors will usually either notify them that their account is cancelled and ask for the return of the credit card, or find out the name of the husband and re-issue the account to him.

Women who become divorced find that they have no credit rating and cannot get credit since all accounts during marriage were in the husband's name. The husband takes the credit rating with him, unaffected by the change in marital status. Women who had businesses and good credit ratings prior to marriage are amazed to find that they suddenly have no credit rating, even though in the same business and just as credit-worthy as before.

Credit discrimination on the basis of sex is not only irrevelant and unfair but a peculiarly paralyzing form of denial of opportunity: without credit, a woman cannot get loans and therefore cannot go into business.

The bills I am introducing today go directly to the problems articulated above:

The first bill covers all federally-insured banks savings and loans associations and credit unions. It would prohibit any of these institutions from discriminating against anyone because of their sex or marital status.

A study on banking practices done by the St. Paul, Minnesota Department of Human Rights revealed widespread abuses by banks in that city toward women. The conclusions of the report were that:

"Approximately 39% of the banks interviewed revealed discrepancies in the loan policies stated to males and females: Two banks allowed the male interviewed to obtain a loan when under the same set of circumstances they would not make any statement or commitment to the female interviewed. Three banks that had a policy of requiring both signatures on a loan would make an exception for the male interviewer but not the female interviewer. Two banks would allow the male interviewer to receive a loan without his wife's signature, but would not allow the female to receive the same loan without her husband's signature. Two banks would grant a loan to a married man but the same loan is an exception to policy for married women."

This bill would eliminate these abuses by making it illegal for institutions covered by the bill to engage in any of the practices just described.

The second bill relates to mortgage transactions. Loans which are federally-related mortgage loans will be subject to the same prohibition against discrimination because of sex or marital status. The coverage is broad. The term, federally-related loans include any loan which is secured by residential real property and is made in whole or in part by *any* bank or other financial institution, the deposits or accounts of which are insured by any agency of the Federal government. Other lenders are covered also, but the point I want to make is that this is a critical and necessary area that has long been ignored. The men that control the mortgage market have effectively prohibited women heads of households from exercising their right to use money for shelter, one of our basic rights.

The unique feature of these two bills is their disclosure requirements: the lender must disclose to the appropriate Federal Agency why credit applications were turned down, and keep records that will be available to the public so that banking practices can be documented and possibly used in suits against offending institutions.

The third bill amends the Truth-in-Lending Act to cover discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of consumer credit.

It is time that women exercise their right to take part in *all* aspects of American economic life. There is no rational reason to have any sort of obstacle to women who want to exercise their economic rights. I hope that you and the Congress will support this legislation and end the discriminatory practices which have for too long prevailed in the area of finance and credit.

H.R. 15115

A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act, to prohibit discrimination by creditors against individuals on the basis of sex or marital status with respect to the extension of credit

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Chapter 1 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 115. Prohibition of discrimination based on sex or marital status.

"It shall be unlawful for any creditor to discriminate on the basis of sex or marital status against any consumer in connection with the approval or denial of any extension of credit."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 1 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"115. Prohibition of discrimination based on sex."

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

H.R. 15114

A bill to prohibit discrimination by financial institutions or any other persons on the basis of sex or marital status in connection with federally-related mortgage transactions, and to require all parties to any such transaction to submit appropriate reports thereon (containing specified information) for public inspection

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any party to a federally-related mortgage transaction—

(1) to discriminate on the basis of sex or marital status against any individual in connection with such transaction (whether such discrimination involves the approval or denial of a mortgage or loan, the imposition of different fees or charges or of different terms and conditions with respect to the loan or any item or service related thereto, the approval or denial of title insurance, mortgage insurance, or loan guaranty, or any other aspect of the transaction); or

(2) to refuse to submit any report with respect to one or more federally-related mortgage transactions as required by section 3, or to omit from any such report any information which is required by section 3 to be contained therein, or to include in any such report any information (required by section 3 to be contained therein) which is known to be false or is deliberately misleading.

(b) Whoever violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 months, or both, for each such violation.

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "federally-related mortgage transaction" means any federally-related mortgage loan (as defined in paragraph (3)) or any other loan secured by residential real property which is made by a Federal lending institution (as defined in paragraph (2)), and includes the application for such loan and any other activity or document directly related to such loan or required as a condition thereof;

(2) the term "Federal lending institution" means any bank or other financial institution—

(A) the deposits or accounts of which are insured by any agency of the Federal Government, or which is itself regulated by any agency of the Federal Government; or

(B) which makes any loan that is secured by residential real property and is—

(i) insured, guaranteed, supplemented, or assisted in any way by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or by any other officer or agency of the Federal Government, or

(ii) made in whole or in part under or in connection with a housing or urban development program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or a housing or related program administered by any other such officer or agency;

(3) the term "federally-related mortgage loan" includes any loan which—

(A) is secured by residential real property; and

(B) (i) is made in whole or in part by any bank or other financial institution the deposits or accounts of which are insured by any agency of the Federal Government, or is made in whole or in part by any bank or other financial institution which is itself regulated by any agency of the Federal Government; or

(ii) is made in whole or in part, or insured, guaranteed, supplemented, or assisted in any way, by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or by any other officer or agency of the Federal Government or under or in connection with a housing or urban development program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or a housing or related program administered by any other such officer or agency; or

(iii) is eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Government National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, or from any financial institution from which it could be purchased by the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; and

(4) the term "party" with respect to a federally-related mortgage transaction includes (in addition to the buyer and seller) any lender, attorney, title insurance company, real estate agent or broker, or other institution, agency, entity, or other person performing any function or providing any item or service which is a part of, or is required in connection with, such transaction.

SEC. 3. (a) Every party to a federally-related mortgage transaction shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, prepare and submit to the Secretary a full and complete report of any acts and functions performed (or participated in) by such party as a part of or in connection with such transaction. Each such report shall contain full information with respect to any loan

or other assistance which was denied or refused after proper application therefor, the terms and conditions imposed and charges made in connection with the transaction, previous transactions involving the same property (including the purchase price paid and the terms and conditions imposed and charges made, and any improvements to or changes in such property occurring after the last such previous transaction), and such other information as may be required by such regulations for the purpose of assuring that buyers, sellers, and other parties in federally-related mortgage transactions will fully understanding such transactions and the consequences of such transactions to them.

(b) The reports required of any person under subsection (a) shall be submitted by such person in such manner and form, and at such time or times (not less often than once a year), as the Secretary may require.

(c) Reports submitted by parties to federally related mortgage transactions under this section shall be organized and maintained by the Secretary in a convenient and accessible manner and shall be made available to the public for inspection at reasonable times and places for use in determining compliance or noncompliance with subsection (a)(1) of the first section of this Act and for such other uses as may be appropriate in determining the rights and remedies of affected individuals under laws relating to housing and urban development.

SEC. 4. CIVIL LIABILITY

(a) Any party to a federally related mortgage transaction which discriminates on the basis of sex or marital status against any person in a credit transaction or in connection with an application for credit is liable to that person in an amount equal to the sum of

(1) the principal amount of credit extended or applied for, whichever is larger, except that the liability under this paragraph shall

(A) not be less than $100 nor greater than $10,000 in an individual action, or

(B) in the case of a class action, not more than the greater of $50,000 or 2 per centum of the net worth of the party as of the end of the party's fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the discrimination occurred; and

(2) in the case of any successful action to enforce the foregoing liability, the costs of the action together with a reasonable attorney's fee as determined by the court.

(b) Any action under this section may be brought in any United States District Court, or in any court of competent jurisdiction, within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation.

SEC. 5. CRIMINAL LIABILITY

(a) Any party who willfully and knowingly violates the provisions of section 105 of this Act shall be fined not more than $15,000 for each violation,

(b) Any director, officer, or employee of any party who willfully and knowingly violates the provisions of section 105 of this Act shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both, for each violation.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of this Act shall take effect thirty days after the date of its enactment.

H.R. 15116

A bill to prohibit discrimination by any federally insured bank, savings and loan association, or credit union against any individual on the basis of sex or marital status in credit transactions and in connection with the applications for credit, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Equal Credit Opportunity Act."

SEC. 102. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

The Congress finds that there is a need to insure that the various financial institutions engaged in the extension of credit exercise their responsibility to make credit available with fairness, impartiality, and without discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status. Economic stabilization would be enhanced and competition among the various financial institutions engaged in the extension of credit would be strengthened by an absence of discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status. It is the purpose of this Act to require that financial institutions engaged in the extension of credit make that credit equally available to all credit-worthy customers without regard to sex or marital status.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS AND RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

(a) The term "Board" refers to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(b) The term "credit" means the right granted by a creditor to a person to defer payment of debt, to incur debt and defer its payment, or purchase property and services and defer payment therefor.

(c) The term "application for credit" refers to any communication, either oral, written, or otherwise, by a person to a creditor requesting an extension of credit to that person or any other person.

(d) The term "creditor" means any bank whose deposits are insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, any savings and loan association whose deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts are insured under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and any credit union whose member accounts are insured or are required to be insured under Title II of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended.

(e) The term "person" means a natural person.

(f) The term "State" refers to any State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(g) Any denial of credit, or increase in the charge for credit, or restriction on the amount or use of credit imposed by a creditor solely on the basis of sex or marital status shall constitute discrimination.

(h) Any reference to any requirement imposed under this Act or any provision thereof includes reference to the regulations of the Board under this Act or the provisions thereof in question.

SEC. 104. REGULATIONS

The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act. These regulations shall contain such provisions as are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, and to facilitate compliance therewith.

SEC. 105. PROHIBITED DISCRIMINATION

It shall be unlawful for any creditor to discriminate against any person in any extension of credit or in connection with any application for credit on the basis of sex or marital status.

SEC. 106. ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT

(a) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this Act shall be enforced under—

(1) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, by the Comptroller of the Currency;

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), by the Board;

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(2) section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, section 407 of the National Housing Act, and sections 6(i)) and 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (acting directly or through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation) in the case of any institution subject to any of those provisions; and

(3) Title II of the Federal Credit Union Act, by the Administrator of the Federal Credit Union Administration.

(b) For the purpose of the exercise by any agency referred to in subsection (a) of its powers under any act referred to in that subsection, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. In addition to its powers under any provision of law specifically referred to in subsection (a), each of the agencies referred to in that subsection may exercise, for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act, any other authority conferred on it by law.

(c) The authority of the Board to issue regulations under this Act does not impair the authority of any other agency designated in this section to make rules respecting its own procedures in enforcing compliance with requirements imposed under this Act.

SEC. 107. VIEWS OF OTHER AGENCIES

In the exercise of its functions under this Act, the Board may obtain upon request the views of any other Federal agency which, in the judgment of the Board, exercises regulatory or supervisory functions with respect to any class of creditor subject to this Act.

SEC. 108. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

This Act does not otherwise annul, alter, or affect in any manner the meaning, scope, or applicability of the laws of any state relating to prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act of regulations thereunder, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

SEC. 109. REQUIRED REPORTS

(a) Not later than January 31 of each year after 1972, each creditor subject to the provisions of this Act shall prepare and file with that respective Federal agency referred to in Section 106(a) of this Act having an exercising examination authority over it a report in a form prescribed by the Board which shall show the extent of compliance with the provision of this Act. Such report shall contain—

(1) the total number of credit applications received by the reporting creditor during the preding calendar year;

(2) the total number of such credit applications which were denied;

(3) the name and address of each applicant for credit during the preceding calendar year, including an identification of each individual whose application was denied, together with the reason or reasons for each denial;

(4) such other information as the Board, by regulation, may require.

(b) Not later than May 1 of each year after 1972, each of the agencies referred to in Section 106(a) of this Act shall, respectively, make reports to Congress concerning the administration of their functions under this Act, including such recommendations as each, respectively, deems necessary or appropriate. In addition, each report shall include its assessment of the extent to which compliance with the requirements imposed under this Act is being achieved.

SEC. 10. CIVIL LIABILITY

(a) Any creditor who discriminates on the basis of sex or marital status against any person in a credit transaction or in connection with an application for credit is liable to that person in an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) the principal amount of credit extended or applied for, whichever is larger, except that the liability under this paragraph shall—

(A) not be less than $100 nor greater than $1,000 in an individual action, or

(B) in the case of a class action, not more than the greater of $50,000 or 2 per centum of the net worth of the creditor, as of the end of the creditor's fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the discrimination occurred; and

(2) in the case of any successful action to enforce the foregoing liability, the costs of the action toegther with a reasonable attorney's fee as determined by the court.

(b) Any action under this section may be brought in any United States District Court, or in any court of competent jurisdiction, within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation.

SEC. 111. CRIMINAL LIABILITY

(a) Any creditor who willfully and knowingly violates the provisions of Section 105 of this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000 for each violation.

(b) Any director, officer, or employee of any creditor who willfully and knowingly violates the provision of Section 105 of this Act shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both, for each violation.

SEC. 112. EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of this Act shall take effect 30 days atfer the date of its enactment.

SIDNEY HOOK, EXPONENT OF DEMOCRACY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal could not have picked a better title for their editorial page feature on Dr. Hook on Monday, May 22, 1972. It is a pleasure to insert the article into the RECORD.

For some years I have been among those who, if they have not always agreed with Dr. Hook, at least made it a definite point to read what he wrote and pay attention to what he said. I always found it stimulating and rewarding to read the observations of a man who is a truly great liberal in the classical sense of the word, a voice of reason and balance in an atmosphere often polluted by incredible irrationalities.

I believe the country owes him much for his contributions toward stemming the tide of student violence that threatened to swamp one great university after another not too long ago. In a speech I made in Indianapolis in May 1970, and later had reprinted, I quoted him twice:

Some faculty apologists for the student rebels have sought to play down the enormity of the offenses against intellectual and academic freedom by dismissing them as inconsequential. "Just a few buildings burned," they say. This is as if one were to extenuate the corruption of justice by the numbers of magistrates not bribed, or lynchings by their infrequency. Sober fact is that violence has reached such proportions on the campuses today that the whole atmosphere of American—and many European and Japanese—universities has been transformed. The appeal to reason is no longer sufficient to resolve problems or even to keep the peace. In order to make itself heard in some of our most prestigious institutions, the appeal to reason must appeal to the police . . .

That was from his "The Perverse Ideology of Violence." Speaking before 2,500 educators in New York, he blasted the weakness of university administrators by saying:

Moral courage is in a very short supply.

The article points out that although he will retire from teaching, he will continue to write. May his tribe increase.

The article follows:

SIDNEY HOOK, EXPONENT OF DEMOCRACY

(By Edwin McDowell)

"I've had a wonderful week," Sidney Hook once told a colleague. "I've had a fight every day."

In truth, Professor Hook, one of this century's pre-eminent philosophers, has never stopped fighting. But his battleground has been that of ideas and enduring values, his weapons have been the debate platform, public forums and the printed word.

Several years ago, Columbia University philosophy professor Robert Paul Wolff said of Mr. Hook: "For 40 years he has been pouring out books, articles and reviews at a pace that would do credit to an entire department of philosophy."

At that time Professor Hook's output, on such diverse subjects as moral philosophy, law, sociology, nistory, politics, metaphysics, and religion, included writing 21 books, editing 14 others, contributing to 63 others, publishing 517 articles in professional journals and writing countless reviews in the popular press. And that, remember, was several years ago. "If it is true that the academic world is ruled by the maxim 'Publish or perish'," added Professor Wolff, "then Mr. Hook must be virtually immortal."

" 'Immortal' is one of the nicer things I've been called," Mr. Hook joked during a recent conversation at New York University, where he has taught for 45 of his 69 years. "You couldn't print many of the epithets directed at me." And indeed, few people are neutral about the slight, bespectacled scholar.

BLASTED BY RIGHT AND LEFT

For years he has been anathema to many right-wingers because of his insistence that socialism and freedom are compatible, because of his vigorous support of social welfare measures, and for his lifelong commitment to racial integration. Today he has alienated and enraged a good many left-wing former admirers who consider his independence virtual treason to their cause—a heresy for which he is regularly denounced in those esoteric journals that monitor ideological purity.

In fact, the only cause that Sidney Hook is deeply committed to is that of protecting the democratic social order and promoting those fundamental values that make democracy possible. "At one time those values were under attack from the right," he says, "but today the greatest threat comes from the left. Even freedom of speech and assembly, freedoms that liberals traditionally exhalted, are under heavy attack, and in the universities, of all places."

Mr. Hook's vigorous defense of those values and freedoms has not gone unnoticed in high places. President Nixon was so impressed with his testimony before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest that he publicly endorsed Mr. Hook's statement decrying student activism. Then, earlier this year, the President invited Professor Hook to the White House ceremony honoring Reader's Digest publisher DeWitt Wallace, and later named Mr. Hook to the 26-member council of the prestigious National Endowment for the Humanities. What made this attention from a Republican President all the more anomolous is that Sidney Hook has been a Socialist since 1916 and he remains a sympathetic, if critical, interpreter of Karl Marx.

Indeed, in the late 1920s, Mr. Hook had the distinction of being perhaps the only admitted Marxist professor in an American university, and he offered the first undergraduate course devoted to a critical evaluation of Marx.

It hasn't been easy being a lifelong ideological maverick. "When I was at Brooklyn Boys High School I helped organize the Young Socialists in opposition to World War I," Mr. Hook remembers vividly. "When Teddy Roosevelt described opponents of intervention as 'the Hun within the gates,' I called him a chauvinist. That word wasn't so well known then and the superpatriots thought I had profaned him, so a couple of times they beat me up, and in those days I often had to run for my life."

Later, when Mr. Hook was a student at City College of New York, a professor drove him from the classroom for preaching secession—and later barred him for preaching sedition.

In the mid-1930s, Mr. Hook, faculty colleague James Burnham, and the pacifist clergyman A. J. Muste organized the American Workers Party, a militant democratic Socialist party. Whereupon the Hearst papers launched a sustained nationwide editorial attack against them, charging they were more dangerous than the Communists and demanding that NYU dismiss Messrs. Hook and Burnham. "But Chancellor (Harry Woodburn) Chase and the board refused," he recalls with satisfaction, "and that turned out to be a turning point in the history of American higher education. After that, many other faculty members took increasingly bolder stances."

That incident was a major turning point in the struggle for academic freedom. And absolutely nothing starts the adrenalin flowing in Sidney Hook faster than threats to academic freedom. From every available pulpit he has defended the freedom of professionally qualified persons to inquire, discover, publish and teach the truth as they see it in the area of their competence.

AN OUTSPOKEN FOE

He was a council member of the American Association of University Professors in the stormy '30s. Several years ago he helped establish and served as president of the University Centers for Rational Alternatives, an organization of diverse scholars and teachers united only in their insistence that universities resist becoming instruments of political action to pressure the community to act on controversial matters. He remains an outspoken foe of student and faculty revolutionaries—those he has labeled "Gravediggers of academic freedom"—who punctuate their demands with force and violence.

To Sidney Hook, the lifelong educator, there is something contemptible about trying to effect political change by destroying educational institutions, those vulnerable citadels of reason and rationality. Even if the university were only a bulwark of the social and political status quo, Mr. Hook says, this would at most justify criticism and protest—not violent and lawless acts that would be equally illegitimate whether used to convert the university to an agency of conservatism and reaction or one of revolution.

But, he says, it's simply false to say that American universities are bulwarks of the social and political status quo. "There is no institution in the country in which dissent and criticism of official views, of inherited traditions, of the conventional wisdom in all fields, is freer and more vigorous than in the American university," he insists. He adds that trying to justify campus disruptions because they have resulted in some reforms "is like justifying arson because it has led to more efficient methods of putting out fires."

Mr. Hook has for years argued for curricular reform and improved teaching quality. But he insists that, although the university should invite participation and consultation by students on all educational matters, the

ultimate decision on what to teach must be left to those who are professionally qualified.

Many of Professor Hook's views on education were shaped by John Dewey, under whom he studied while earning his doctorate at Columbia University and whom he considers his intellectual mentor. "Dewey had the greatest influence on me," he says, "not only because I accepted his point of views, particularly that democracy was not only a system of government but a way of life, but also because he was fair, open and humble—he lived his philosophy."

Mr. Hook was also strongly influenced by Morris R. Cohen, the noted philosophy teacher at CCNY, and by Bertrand Russell. Those who knows only that Messrs. Hook and Russell carried on a running debate over unilateral disarmament in the pages of the New Leader and elsewhere may be surprised to learn of Mr. Hook's longtime deep affection and admiration for Lord Russell, whom he regards as "one of the most brilliant minds of all time."

Mr. Hook prefers to argue principles, not personalities. Nevertheless, inevitably he has been involved in several bitter personal exchanges. If most of them were thrust upon him it's safe to conclude that he never avoided a challenge. And, as any number of adversaries can attest, he is a formidable polemicist.

Nevertheless, Mr. Hook apparently believes that some of the bitterest opposition to him is based on rumor rather than first-hand knowledge of his writings. If controversy continues long enough, he explains, "you're often judged by what others say about you, rather than by what you've actually said. And even by the time the *zeitgeist* has caught up with me, the only thing some of my opponents remember is that they differed with me, not that I may have been right."

However that may be, it is fair to say that Sidney Hook has never been dissuaded from taking a stand just because the *zeitgeist* was against him. When the tides of intellectual passion were at their flood, he wrote brilliant dissents and exegeses on such emotional topics as the Fifth Amendment (during the sit-in, lie-in, wade-in years) and the more recent assertion that ours is a "sick society."

Furthermore, Mr. Hook, like a skilled jouster, impales double standards with an accuracy and speed that any knight-errant would admire. At various times he has criticized those who:

Favor armed troops to achieve integration in Southern schools, but oppose using force to prevent rioters and revolutionaries from occupying and destroying universities;

Condemn Southern segregation, yet support black militant demands for segregated dorms or separate curricula;

Justify the actions of the revolutionaries because of "pressures of the Vietnam war" and other "objective conditions" yet would rightly dismiss as evasive apologetics any suggestion that the riotous behavior of white racists against Negro women and children was caused by the "objective conditions" in which they were nurtured;

Were quick to grasp the evil of nazism and fascism but are indulgent toward communism. This last is a particular *bete noire* of Mr. Hook, an early and unyielding critic of Sen. Joseph McCarthy. He has consistently maintained that "no one can expect to have his professions of liberalism taken seriously who is not outspokenly *both* anti-Communist and anti-Fascist."

And Mr. Hook has been both. Although when Hitler threatened he helped organize a group of leading intellectuals to endorse the 1932 Communist candidate for the presidency of the U.S. Lewis S. Feuer, philosopher and professor of sociology at the University of Toronto, said that in the latter 1930s "it often seemed that he was the only professor who had the courage to speak out against the evil of Stalinism." At a dinner four years ago honoring Mr. Hook's many contributions, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., praised him for having "enlightened a whole generation to the dangers of communism."

Professor Hook is not a dogmatist, not a myopic True Believer. Even his socialism is less an economic or political dogma than what he regards as a pragmatic way to extend the democratic process. But he opposes the completely planned economy ("we've seen the harm in that") and admits that he and other Socialists underestimated the way Western democracies could effectively use tax policy and the political process to modify economic institutions and establish social welfare.

REMEMBRANCE AND REGRETS

How would Sidney Hook like to be remembered? With only the slightest hesitation he replies, "As an exponent of the democratic way of life, for teaching that democracy and freedom can live in fruitful union."

Has he any regrets after so many battles over so many years? This time his hesitation is more pronounced. Then he replies slowly:

"Like John Dewey, I've always regarded intelligence as the central value in the moral economy. Intelligence indicates how to reconcile such conflicting values as love, kindness, virtue, duty and honor. But now, toward the close of my life, as a result of the upheavals on campus, I face a problem that Dewey and I never came to grips with—namely, that intelligence is necessary but it isn't sufficient for the good life. We need, in addition, moral courage to act on intelligence."

Professor Feuer has predicted that, "as time goes on, it becomes clearer that the one significant political philosopher that our country has produced this century has been Sidney Hook. . . . Of all America's philosophers, Sidney Hook was the one who kept its conscience alive." Conservative sociologist and psychoanalyst Ernest van den Haag dedicated his excellent book, "Passion and Social Constraint," to Mr. Hook, "who disagrees with much of my thought—and without whom I would not have thought as much."

Next year Sidney Hook will teach his last class at the Washington Square campus where he first taught NYU students in 1927. But he does not intend to vegetate. Already he has contracts for five books, including a political autobiography.

Has he a title for the autobiography? His eyes light up. Then, with that impish grin familiar to all who ever saw him setting forth to battle against what Orwell described as "all the smelly little orthodoxies which are now contending for our souls," he replied: "It's going to be titled 'Out of Step.' What else?"

What else, indeed.

EXPLOSION OF WORLD POPULATION

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I read with a great deal of interest a New York Times supplement entitled "Population, the U.S. Problem, the World Crisis" authored by a number of very perceptive thinkers, writers, public officials, educators, and students, including a message to Congress by President Nixon, a message entitled "A Call for Stabilization" by John D. Rockefeller III, messages from Representative PATSY MINK, and Rev. Theodore Hesburgh of the University of Notre Dame.

Mr. Speaker, all of these people have written eloquently, impressively, and knowledgeably on this subject. This subject is so important to us and to the world that I think it should be made a part of the permanent record of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I am inserting it in the hope that all who have an interest in this subject will find it as worthwhile, stimulating, and challenging as I did.

The supplement follows:

"POPULATION, THE U.S. PROBLEM, THE WORLD CRISIS"

PART I: THE UNITED STATES PROBLEM

President Richard M. Nixon, Message to Congress on Population.
John D. Rockefeller III, A Call for Stabilization.
The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Population and The American Future.
Representative Patsy T. Mink, Women's Stake.
Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, A Concerned Catholic.
Black Perspectives: The late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Rev. Jesse Jackson; Representative Shirley Chisholm; Roy Wilkins.

PART II: THE WORLD CRISIS

Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, The Role of the United Nations.
Rafael Salas, The U.N. Fund for Population Activities.
Robert S. McNamara, A Burden on Development.
Robert K. A. Gardiner, Africa.
Alberto Lleras Camargo, Latin America.
President Ferdinand Marcos, The Philippines.
Jaime Zipper, China.
Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit, India.
Julia Henderson, Worldwide Private Efforts.
Norman E. Borlaug, Man and Nature.
William H. Draper, Jr., Summing Up.
Sources for Further Reading.

CONTRIBUTORS

This supplement was made possible through generous contributions from the following individuals and numerous others.
Dr. Paul Strong Achilles
Ambassador Theodore C. Achilles
James L. Allen
Robert O. Anderson
Mrs. Anna H. Bing
Dr. Louis Block
Harold W. Bostrom
Marvin Bower
John L. Burns
Cabot Foundation, Inc.
Mrs. Otis Chandler
Mrs. and Mrs. Alexander S. Cochran
Peter F. Cunningham
Mrs. James M. Faulkner
David L. Francis
Mr. and Mrs. John B. Greene
Henry J. Heinz, II
Mrs. Albert Lasker
Thomas B. McCabe
Ambassador George G. McGhee
Dr. John McGibony
Richard Saltonstall
S. Abbot Smith
Philip Sporn
Robert D. Stern
The Sunnen Foundation
Robert G. Wehle

Editor---------- Lawrence R. Kegan
Photo Editor---------LeRoy Woodson, Jr.
Design-------Schumacher Associates, Inc.

MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON POPULATION

In a historic message, President Richard M. Nixon on July 18, 1969 called on the Congress and the American people to recognize the U.S. population problem and the world popu-

lation crisis. The following are excerpts from that address.

In 1830 there were one billion people on the planet earth. By 1930 there were two billion, and by 1960 there were three billion. Today the world population is three and one-half billion persons. If this rate of population growth continues, it is likely that the earth will contain over seven billion human beings by the end of this century.

While there are a variety of opinions as to precisely how fast population will grow in the coming decades, most informed observers have a similar response to all such projections. They agree that population growth is among the most important issues we face. They agree that it can be met only if there is a great deal of advance planning. And they agree that the time for such planning is growing very short. It is for all these reasons that I address myself to the population problem in this message, first to its international dimensions and then to its domestic implications.

IN THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

It is in the developing nations of the world that population is growing most rapidly today. In these areas we often find rates of natural increase higher than any which have been experienced in all of human history. At present rates, many will double and some may even triple their present populations before the year 2000.

As a result, many already impoverished nations are struggling under a handicap of intense population increase which the industrialized nations never had to bear. Their standards of living are not rising quickly, and the gap between life in the rich nations and life in the poor nations is not closing.

It is our belief that the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international bodies should take the leadership in responding to world population growth. The United States will cooperate fully with their programs.

In addition to working with international organizations, the United Statees can help by supporting efforts which are initiated by other governments. In fact, I have asked the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to give population and family planning high priority for attention, personnel, research, and funding among our several aid programs.

IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States our rate of population growth is not as great as that of developing nations. The present growth rate of about one percent per year is still significant.

In 1917 the total number of Americans passed 100 million, after three full centuries of steady growth. In 1967—just half a century later—the 200 million mark was passed. If the present rate of growth continues, the third hundred million persons will be added in roughly a thirty-year period. This means that by the year 2000, or shortly thereafter, there will be more than 300 million Americans.

This growth will produce serious challenges for our society. I believe that many of our present social problems may be related to the fact that we have had only fifty years in which to accommodate the second hundred million Americans. In fact, since 1945 alone some 90 million babies have been born in this country. We have thus had to accomplish in a very few decades an adjustment to population growth which was once spread over centuries. And it now appears that we will have to provide for a third hundred million Americans in a period of just 30 years.

The great majority of the next hundred million Americans will be born to families which looked forward to their birth and are prepared to love them and care for them as they grow up. The critical issue is whether social institutions will also plan for their arrival and be able to accommodate them in a humane and intelligent way. We can be sure that society will *not* be ready for this growth unless it begins its planning immediately.

It is for all these reasons that I today propose the creation by Congress of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

I would take this opportunity to mention a number of additional government activities dealing with population growth which need not await the report of the Commission.

First, increased research is essential.

Second, we need more trained people to work in population and family planning programs, both in this country and abroad.

Third, the effects of population growth on our environment and on the world's food supply call for careful attention and immediate action.

FOR THE FUTURE

One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today. If we now begin our work in an appropriate manner, and if we continue to devote a considerable amount of attention and energy to this problem, then mankind will be able to surmount this challenge as it has surmounted so many during the long march of civilization.

When future generations evaluate the record of our time, one of the most important factors in their judgment will be the way in which we responded to population growth. Let us act in such a way that those who come after us—even as they lift their eyes beyond earth's bounds—can do so with pride in the planet on which they live, with gratitude to those who lived on it in the past, and with continuing confidence in its future.

A CALL FOR STABILIZATION

The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future

Chairman, John D. Rockefeller 3rd.

Vice Chairwoman, Grace Olivarez, *Executive Director, Food for All, Inc.*

Vice Chairman, Christian N. Ramsey, Jr., M.D., *President, The Institute for the Study of Health and Society.*

Joseph D. Beasley, M.D., *The Edward Wisner Professor of Public Health, Tulane University Medical Center.*

David E. Bell, *Executive Vice President, The Ford Foundation.*

Bernard Berelson, *President, The Population Council.*

Arnita Young Boswell, *Associate Field Work Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.*

Margaret Bright, *Professor, Dept. of Behavioral Sciences, and Professor, Dept. of Epidemiology, School of Hygiene and Public Health, The Johns Hopkins University.*

Marilyn Brant Chandler, *Former Chairman of the Board, Otis Art Institute, Student, Volunteer.*

Paul B. Cornely, M.D., *Professor, Dept. of Community Health Practice, College of Medicine Howard University, and Assistant to the Executive Medical Officer, Welfare and Retirement Fund, United Mine Workers of America.*

Alan Cranston, *United States Senator, California.*

Lawrence A. Davis, *President, Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical & Normal College.*

Otis Dudley Duncan, *Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan.*

John N. Erlenborn, *United States Representative, 14th District of Illinois.*

Joan F. Flint, *Past President, Community Service Council of the Greater Tulsa Area Volunteer.*

R. V. Hansberger, *Chairman and President, Boise Cascade Corporation.*

D. Gale Johnson, *Chairman, Department of Economics, University of Chicago.*

John R. Meyer, *President, National Bureau of Economic Research, Professor of Economics, Yale University.*

Bob Packwood, *United States Senator, Oregon.*

James S. Rummonds, *Student, Stanford School of Law.*

Stephen L. Salyer, *Student, Davidson College.*

Howard D. Samuel, *Vice President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.*

James H. Scheuer, *United States Representative, 22nd District of New York.*

George D. Woods, *Director and Consultant, The First Boston Corporation.*

Charles F. Westoff, *Executive Director.*

Robert Parke, Jr., *Deputy Director.*

John D. Rockefeller 3rd, Chairman, Commission on Population Growth and The American Future.

The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future was created by an act of Congress in March 1970 and its members appointed by President Nixon. The mandate from the Congress states its purpose to be: to conduct and sponsor such studies and research and make such recommendations as may be necessary to provide information and education to all levels of government in the United States and to our people, regarding a broad range of problems associated with population growth and their implications for America's future.

Many of us on the Commission shared an interest in the relationship between population growth and America's future. But it was as students rather than experts that we came together, seeking to approach the issues objectively and suggest answers to the problems identified.

Over a two-year period we have met regularly each month in Washington, held hearings around the nation, and contracted for research on a broad spectrum of population-related questions.

Diversity of viewpoints and backgrounds is a vital aspect of America's strength. We believe we have benefited greatly from the nature of the Commission's composition. The great range in our vocations, ages, religions, races and experiences, when focused on such diverse issues, lends special strength to our final report. We had a great deal to learn from each other. It was remarkable that given such variety in our viewpoints we found ourselves in general agreement in formulating solutions for the problems addressed in fulfilling our mandate. Most important, we agreed on the need for an explicit population policy for the United States; the main themes of that policy are suggested in the following statement.

The submission of our final report discharges us from our formal responsibilities to the Congress, the President and the American people. But we fully realize that the success and significance of a Commission is not measured by its production of written materials; rather success or failure is found in the questions: Did this Commission generate wide public concern and understanding of the problems it addressed? More important, was it able to move the country beyond that concern to a program of meaningful action?

The final answers to these questions will be found only in what ultimately is achieved—by the Congress, the President, and most important by those private citizens who are stirred by our endeavor.

POPULATION AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

A SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS, U.S. COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

Because of the pervasive impact of population growth on every facet of American life and its implications for the quality of life, the Commission has concluded that the time has come for the United States to adopt a deliberate population policy.

The United States today has a declining

birth rate, low population density, enormous amounts of open space, and population leaving the central cities—but that does not eliminate the concern about population. This country, or any country, always has a "population problem" in the sense of achieving a proper balance between size, growth, and distribution on the one hand, and the quality of life to which its citizens aspire on the other.

POPULATION ISSUES COMPLEX

Population issues involve virtually every aspect of our national life and hence any policies to deal with them must be correspondingly broad. But population policy is no substitute for social and economic planning and development. Successfully addressing the population problem requires that we also address our problems of poverty, sex discrimination and minority discrimination, careless exploitation of resources, environmental deterioration, and decaying cities.

The concern about population is as complex as it is consequential. There are no simple or immediate solutions. An attitude of indifference or complacency is unwarranted; so is the cry of early catastrophe and crisis.

In proposing this Commission to Congress in July, 1969, President Nixon said: "One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today."

We have been asked to assess the impact that our growing population and changing patterns of settlement will have upon our government, economy, natural resources, and environment, and the various means by which our nation can achieve a population level properly suited for its resources and needs; and to make recommendations regarding a broad range of problems associated with population growth and its implications for America's future.

Our mandate is broad, reaching, in one way or another, into practically every aspect of American life. But, our perspective is population. Out of our deliberations have come major findings and recommendations that deserve careful consideration by this society and its government. Regardless of diverse approaches to the matter—whether one puts personal freedom or minority concerns or ecological balance at the center—the following points emerge.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The United States has a number of "population problems" that need close and continuous attention; two out of three Americans believe that the matter is "serious."

SHIFT FROM QUANTITY TO QUALITY

No substantial benefits will result from the continued growth of our population beyond that made almost unavoidable by the rapid growth of the past. On the contrary, it is our view that population growth of the current magnitude has aggravated many of the nation's problems and made their solution more difficult. The Commission believes that the gradual stabilization of population—bringing births into balance with deaths—would contribute significantly to the nation's ability to solve its problems, although such problems will not be solved by population stabilization alone. It would, however, enable our society to shift its focus increasingly from quantity to quality.

The nation has nothing to fear from a gradual approach to population stabilization. We have looked for, and have not found, any convincing economic argument for continued national population growth. The health of our economy does not depend on it, nor does the prosperity of business or the welfare of the average person. In fact, a reduction in the rate of population growth would bring important economic benefits, especially if the nation develops policies to take advantage of the opportunities for social and economic improvement that slower population growth would provide.

The Commission believes that slowing the rate of population growth would ease the problems facing the American government in the years ahead. Demands for governmental services will be less than they would be otherwise, and resources available for public support of education, health and other governmental activities would be greater. However, it would be a serious error to read these conclusions as comforting and reassuring. Under the most optimistic assumptions, at least 50 million more people will be added to the United States population before the end of the century, increasing the demands on governmental services and making more difficult the achievement of a participatory political process responsive to contemporary conditions. More important, these added demands and complexities will fall on governmental structures and processes already severely burdened—many would say overburdened—by the problems facing the nation.

In this framework we must face the fact that Americans have suddenly become a metropolitan people. In 1970, nearly 70 percent of the United States population was metropolitan—the figure will approach 85 percent by the year 2000. For better or for worse, we are in the process of becoming an almost totally urban society. Most metropolitan growth now results from natural increase, not migration. Thus, the trend toward bigness of metropolitan areas, if undesirable, cannot be substantially checked except as national growth is slowed or stopped.

Migration is from low-income rural areas and abroad to metropolitan areas, from one metropolitan area to another, and from central cities to suburbs. Nearly 40 million or one in five American change homes each year. About one in fifteen, a total of 13 million, migrate across county lines. What is needed is guidance and assistance.

BENEFIT TO RESOURCES & ENVIRONMENT

Along with the burgeoning urban problem is another of equal complexity and size: resources and the environment. Population growth is one of the major factors affecting the demand for resources and the impact on the environment in this country. From the standpoint of both resources and environment, considerable benefits would result over the next 30 or 50 years from a prompt reduction in our population growth. This conclusion emerges with particular clarity with regard to water, agricultural land, and outdoor recreation. Over this same period, we can, if we have to, solve the environmental and resource problems created by population growth, but we may not like some of the solutions. Continued growth incurs increasing risks, for we will be forced to adopt solutions to the consequences of growth before we understand their side effects.

Even a one-child difference in average family size makes an enormous difference over the decades. A century from now, with continued immigration, the two-child average would result in a population of 350 million, while growth at the three-child level would result in nearly a billion.

Demographic events have the quality of persisting over time—for example, the baby-boom generation born after World War II is still working its way through the age structure, with many repercussions. In view of its effect on the age distribution and the accommodations thus required, sharp shifts in most demographic trends are undesirable. Whether or not fluctuations occur, a slower average rate of population growth will result in an older age composition, with the problems of the aged in somewhat sharper relief.

It takes a long time to affect population growth rates in a democratically and ethically acceptable manner. Even with a two-child average from now on, it would take 60 years or so to achieve a nongrowing population. But precisely because the lead time is decades in length, it is necessary to face the issue now and come to deliberate and informed decisions about population problems—their burdens, their costs, their remedies.

POPULATION: EVERYONE'S AFFAIR

Slowing population growth in this country is everyone's affair: All segments of the society should participate; all segments will benefit. The major contribution to growth now comes from the advantaged majority in our society. Because of their smaller number, our "have-not" groups—our racial and ethnic minorities—do not bear the primary responsibility for population growth, and inducing them to limit the number of children they have would not in itself stabilize our population. However, there are strong connections between high fertility and the economic and social problems that affect the 13 percent of our people who are poor. Therefore, we recognize that unless we address our racism and poverty, we will not be able to resolve the question of population growth for our racial and ethnic minorities. As deprived groups are brought into the educational, occupational, and residential mainstream, their fertility will probably decline to the level of the people already there.

In every society, there are norms of behavior that affect fertility, and every legal structure contains (usually inadvertent) regulations that encourage or discourage childbearing. As nearly as we can tell, the social and legal pressures in the United States, while present, are not particularly powerful one way or the other; but on balance, the pressure is probably toward child-bearing.

UNWANTED FERTILITY SERIOUS

There is a serious problem of unwanted fertility in this country. Making it easier to avoid unwanted childbearing will make a substantial contribution to the lives of the people involved as well as to slowing growth—and in any case, it is consistent with American values and desirable on that ground.

Illegal immigration is more troublesome than legal immigration, and is numerically substantial. As for legal immigration, that is indeed a contributor to population growth; but, for many people, traditional political, cultural, and humanitarian values outweigh demographic considerations.

Our population will stabilize as the American people challenge the traditional assumptions of growth and appreciate what is at stake, both for the individual family and the society at large. Zero population growth is best understood as an average accommodating small fluctuations and not as a fixed rate. The average of two children per family, which would yield zero growth over the long term, can be reached through many different combinations of proportions married and of different size families. Indeed, such diversity is itself highly desirable. And if our annual rates fall below the two-child average for some periods of time, we should not react with alarm, but rather should recognize that this will hasten the advent of stabilization.

We view population policy not as an end in itself, but as a means to facilitate the achievement of social goals desirable in their own right. Above all, the Commission wishes to emphasize that the objective of the policies we advocate is the enrichment of human life, not its restriction; that the control of reproduction, by assuring greater opportunity to each person, frees man to attain his individual dignity and reach his full potential. Recognizing that the great majority of parents desire to have the knowledge and the means to plan their families, the Commission believes that the resolution of the population problems can and should be based on voluntary action determined by the individual's own best interest.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of its two years of deliberation and based on the substantial research it contracted, the Commission reached a number of conclusions and recommendations. These recommendations speak simultaneously to population issues and other social values important in their own right. In the broadest sense, the policies recommended aim at promoting desirable social conditions by increasing opportunities to exercise freedom of choice. At the same time, the result of such policies would be to slow population growth and hasten the advent of population stabilization. Their implementation depends to a considerable extent on the attainment of the necessary funds, organizational change, and research, the details of which are elaborated in the full text.

The Commission recommends:

In order to better prepare present and future generations to meet the challenges arising from population changes, the federal government should enact a Population Education Act to assist school systems in establishing well-planned population education programs.

In order to maximize information and knowledge about human sexuality and its implications for the family, we should make sex education available through responsible community organizations, the media, and especially the schools; and similarly we should seek to improve the quality of education for parenthood throughout the society.

In order to improve the opportunities available for children, we should develop maternal and child health programs, provide adequate child-care arrangements for parents who wish to make use of them, eliminate discrimination against children born out of wedlock, and reform adoption laws.

In order to neutralize the legal, social, and institutional pressures that historically have encouraged childbearing, as well as to equalize opportunities generally, we should eliminate discrimination based on sex by adopting the proposed Equal Rights amendment to the Constitution.

In order to enable all Americans, regardless of age, marital status, or income, to avoid unwanted births and enhance their capacity to realize their own preferences in childbearing and family size, we should:

Increase investment in the search for improved means by which individuals may control their own fertility.

Extend subsidized family planning programs.

Liberalize access to abortion services with the admonition that abortion not be considered a primary means of fertility control.

Extend and improve the delivery of health services related to fertility—including prenatal and pediatric care, contraceptive services, voluntary sterilization, abortion, and the treatment of infertility—through public and private financing mechanisms.

In order to regulate the impact on population of migration from outside this country, we should not increase the present levels of legal immigration and we should stop illegal immigration.

In order to provide a framework for regional, state, and local planning and development, the federal government should develop a set of national population distribution guidelines.

In order to ease the problems created by population movement, we should develop programs for human resource development, counseling and assistance on worker relocation, and a growth center strategy to promote job opportunities in depressed areas.

In order to facilitate the accommodation of population movements, we need comprehensive planning on a metropolitan and regional scale which could be facilitated through greater public control over land use and the establishment of state and regional planning agencies and development corporations.

In order to increase freedom in choice of residential location, we should extend governmental provision of suburban housing for low- and moderate-income families and should take effective steps to promote genuinely free choice of housing within metropolitan areas on the part of racial and ethnic minorities.

In order to strengthen the basic statistics and research upon which all sound demographic, social, and economic policy must ultimately depend, the federal government should move promptly and boldly to implement specific improvements in these programs.

In order to improve the federal government's population-related programs and its capacity to evaluate the interaction between public policies, programs, and population, specific organization changes should be made. These include the creation of a National Institute of Population Sciences within the National Institutes of Health, and an Office of Population Growth and Distribution within the Executive Office of the President.

And finally, this nation should welcome and plan for a stabilized population.

What matters ultimately is the impact of population growth upon the quality of American life; changes in population are merely the means to such a goal. Does this country want to continue to invest its resources simply in meeting more demands for more services, more classrooms, more hospitals, more housing, more roads, more everything . . . as the population continues to grow? Or should we concentrate our energies and resources on improving the quality of such services and extending them to those for whom such quality is at best a hope rather than a fact? The population problem is the problem of achieving, consistent with political and ethical standards, a lasting and constructive balance between numbers of people and an evolving definition of "the good life" in this country and the world.

We end as we began: Our country can no longer afford the uncritical acceptance of the population growth ethic. Given the whole trend of human history to the contrary, that is not an easy lesson to learn. The growth ethic seems to be so imprinted in human consciousness that it takes a deliberate effort of rationality and will to overcome it, but that effort now seems necessary. The recommendations we propose are worthwhile for many reasons as well as appropriate to steering a prudent demographic course into a future filled with uncertainties.

WOMEN'S STAKE

(By Patsy T. Mink, U.S. Representative From Hawaii)

"Keeping women in the home may be the major contributor to excess population growth."

Women have a great stake in population stabilization in America. For if American families decide to have only two children, instead of three, it will mean a difference of at least fifty million people by the year 2000. At two years of home care per child, this free-choice system of control would produce 100 million woman-years of "liberation".

But in urging population control, we should be guided by one vital principle: there must be no discrimination. The policy must apply equally to all people, men and women, regardless of race, sex, or income level.

All too often, demands for population control are made in terms of a particular group, instead of the general society. Women, for example, are blamed for having too many babies when obviously men are just as responsible. Why should there be so much emphasis on birth control mechanisms for women? Why not spend Federal research funds equally on finding a way to prevent the man from fertilizing the ova? Why not push vasectomy? If women are truly equal, society would not establish birth control clinics only for women. Send the men!

MOST GROWTH FROM MIDDLE CLASS

As a member of the oppressed minority called women, I feel deeply concerned that so much of the drive for population control is directed at the ethnic minorities, as though it is all their fault for having too many babies. We hear the cry, "Solve the welfare problem, the problem of housing, slums, ghettos, crime—just about all the social ills, you name it—it's the fault of all the children those blacks and Puerto Ricans have". But, a Senate report projecting our population growth to 300 million by the end of this century stated: "The poor contribute only a small proportion of this overall increase, with most growth resulting from the fertility of middle-class families."

There have been encouraging signs over the past few years that people *are* having fewer children—accompanied by shifting social patterns of great interest to women. We are beginning to realize that the age-old tradition of keeping women "in the home" is not only destructive of equality, but may be the major contributor to excess population growth. Obviously, if a woman's only choice is to stay at home all day, for all of her life, she may as well have numerous children to occupy her time. If, on the other hand, we encourage policies which will permit women to choose other roles, many will leave the home and thus decide to have fewer children.

EQUAL WORK STATUS FOR WOMEN

We should encourage this movement of women into the work force for whatever reason—to add to family income or to seek the fulfillment that work offers—by removing the discriminatory barriers which presently make many of them decide against such a course. Most of the best jobs are reserved for men while women are assigned clerical, secretarial, and other secondary duties, without any hope for advancement.

It is logical to assume that as women achieve equal status in the professions, and have real opportunities for promotions to executive positions, they will have fewer children. This places the population control challenge squarely on all of our society. We must begin to change our entire attitude toward the roles of the sexes so it will not only be accepted, but expected, that women will become corporation board chairmen, university presidents—even President of the United States!

It is not coincidental that many of the goals of "Women's Liberation" center on getting out of the traditional home role. Women want to greatly expand the child-care system so that those who need or want to work will have a place where their children can receive beneficial care. I visualize these child-care centers as places where the health, recreational, educational and psychological needs of the child will receive full attention. This is women's rights, human rights, and population control, too.

ABORTION, A WOMAN'S RIGHT

Women are also concerned over the subject of abortion. While it is true that the "right" to have abortions would result in fewer childbirths, I view this issue as more of a woman's rights cause than of population control. Women seeking legalized abortion want the right of control "over their own bodies". From a population control standpoint, it makes more sense to prevent pregnancy than to seek its termination, but the right of termination must exist as a human choice.

It should be most clear that the course I am advocating—the changing of social patterns and the role of women—is radical and difficult to achieve. The prevention of unwanted birth by itself entails new programs in fertility control, advances in family planning services and education, contraceptive technology, adoption and abortion. None of these things, however, challenge the base of a male-oriented society which I see as the real cause of the population "problem". To get to the real cause, we will need elimination of the child-bearing bias of a society which seeks to impose home life on women by social indoctrination.

Women who have achieved positions of authority must take the lead in educating the country to the need for change. We need a revolution in the attitudes of the U.S. power structure—white, middle class and mostly male. This is an immense task, but I am heartened by the fact that women themselves have so much to gain by new and more enlightened policies. When we achieve population control, all society will benefit—but the women will win the most, with a new promise of equality.

A CONCERNED CATHOLIC

(By Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, President, University of Notre Dame Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights)

"If we really made human dignity meaningful for everyone, then in large measure we would ultimately solve the population problem."

Among many people who discuss the population problem there is often the assumption that somehow Catholics do not admit the problem or that they minimize it, or, worse, that they complicate any possible solution to the problem. I cannot speak for Catholics, of course, but I can speak as a Catholic, one among some 500 million around the world. As one Catholic, then, I would make these points:

There is, and will increasingly be, a population problem in the world at large. Population growth is much a greater problem in the poor countries than in the industrialized countries, and this has little relation to whether they are mainly Catholic countries or not. Sweden, a non-Catholic, industrialized country, has the same low population growth (doubling every eighty-eight years) as Italy, a Catholic, industrialized country. The less affluent, non-Catholic countries of Morocco, Syria, and Pakistan have exactly the same high population growth (doubling every twenty-one years) as the less affluent, Catholic countries of Ecuador, Panama, and Paraguay. Rapid population growth is a greater problem in developing countries because it eats up all their gains in attempting to provide more education, food, health services, and housing.

Parents are responsible for the children they bring into the world. If they aren't, who is? Catholic theology points to three great elements of Christian marriage: love between husband and wife; the bearing of children; and their education and nourishment to adulthood. Love is forever—until death do us part; child-bearing is of relative short duration compared to absolute fertility; and education and nurturing of children will keep most parents busy past fifty years of age. In the past infant deaths and rural living kept families within manageable limits. Today parents may achieve a generous family early in marriage.

Rational and even generous Christian control of basic biological possibilities is in a very primitive state as one views the available means.

For this reason, I wish Catholics would help support basic research in all areas bearing on the biochemistry of human procreation. I am convinced that, with more imaginative and creative research, there will be many new means made available that will pass any moral, theological, or cultural test and provide adequate means of fulfilling one's obligation to all the essentials of a generous and loving marriage. Meanwhile, conscience must do what it can to meet obligations that often seem to work at cross purposes.

The space age has given us the image of the earth, seen from the moon, as a space craft with finite resources to sustain all of its passengers. Let us admit at once that some passengers are presently faring better than others. Twenty per cent of the present passengers are enjoying eighty per cent of the spacecraft's resources and, if present tendencies prevail, ten per cent will soon enjoy ninety per cent. For example, one nation, the United States, which represents six per cent of the world's population, annually uses forty per cent of the world's energy. We are blessed with a marvelous continent, the new world, but we complicate our living by having seventy-five per cent of our population on three per cent of our land. It is unthinking to disassociate population problems from land usage.

I wish Catholics who enjoy the largesse of this country would begin to concern themselves more with foreign aid. The U.S. Gross National Product this year exceeds a trillion dollars, the budget of the United States Government is almost one-fourth as large, and we give a mere one billion dollars to the U.S. Agency for International Development to help our spacecraft's lesser citizens, two-thirds of whom live on less than $200 a year. This, too, is part of the realities of the population problem that I hope U.S. Catholics will espouse as fifty million of God's favored nation.

One of the greatest evolutions of our times, human dignity, is becoming lost in the discussion of population growth. Never before has human dignity seized the imagination of man as it does today. Over many millenia, man has been enslaved by poverty, ignorance, war, malnutrition, dirt, squalor, and all the rest. Today we know better. Man need not live like this. Human development is the new name for peace among men.

AGAINST ABORTION, A RIGHT TO LIVE

If population growth is viewed alone as *the* one great crisis, then we will descend to all kinds of pragmatic and immoral initiatives. One of the most blatant of these is abortion as a means of population control. This degrades women as nothing else can, despite the protestations of the Women's Liberation Movement. As a priest, I have known of nothing that so shatters a woman psychologically and morally as the destruction of human life within her. One of her greatest assets is life-giving—not life-destroying. Cast her in this latter role and you ultimately destroy her. All too little has been said about the rights of a live, but yet an unborn human being who is often, for the most frivolous reasons, denied his or her most fundamental human right, the right to life which precedes liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We are, especially in developed and affluent countries, facing a crisis of values and priorities that will destroy us much more quickly and far more efficiently than a crisis of population. It is difficult to differentiate the population problem from the problem of sex. All human beings are endowed with sex. Sex is one of the great realities of humanity—at the core of our literature and art. We should cherish sex, as it is, indeed, God-given. The modern world needs, not our sex-soaked culture, but a reasonable philosophy that transcends mere sexual thrills.

To be meaningful in our day, sex must signify love and the kind of communication that only love makes possible between man and woman. To redeem the times, the population problem as well, we must redeem sex—to make it once again the language of love, of generosity, of children responsibly and lovingly begotten; not sex—the haven of selfishness, childlessness, and empty pleasure.

What I am really saying is that if we fully gave ourselves to human development in a more equitable fashion aboard our spaceship earth, if we really made human dignity meaningful for everyone, then in large measure we would ultimately solve the population problem, too. Making population, as such, our single focus may be exactly the wrong way to proceed towards a world that can achieve what the other planets in our solar system seem to lack: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

BLACK PERSPECTIVES

(By the late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.)

"Negro and white have a common bond."

Negroes were once bred by slave owners to be sold as merchandise. They do not welcome any solution which involves population breeding as a weapon. They are instinctively sympathetic to all who offer methods that will improve their lives and offer them fair opportunity to develop and advance as all other people in our society.

For these reasons, we are natural allies of those who seek to inject any form of planning in our society that enriches life and guarantees the right to exist in freedom and dignity. For these constructive movements, we are prepared to give our energies and consistent support; because in the need for family planning, Negro and white have a common bond; and together, we can and should unite our strength for the wise preservation, not of races in general, but of the one race we all constitute—the human race.

"POPULATION CONTROL IS SUBORDINATE TO WEALTH CONTROL"

(By Rev. Jesse Jackson, President, Operation PUSH)

The nation's preoccupation with multiple crises is evidenced by the description of the population challenge as a population bomb. Yet, if life for us in the 1970's is more problem than possibility, we may well be in danger of losing that race which H. G. Wells described as "education's race with disaster . . ."—the race to create a sound and meaningful civilization.

The alarmist concern for "Zero" population growth is by and large predicated upon Malthusian premises about population growth as over against the ability to meet the needs of that growth. But modern technology increasingly makes Malthus' views obsolete. If there is any issue of human survival, it is one which must be defined on a new terrain, determined in large measure by the entitlement of the have-nots, worldwide and in this nation, to a larger share of the available resources.

In this country, the real issue is not an unmanageable surplus of people but a basic maldistribution of the resources. Over 20% of the nation's population, in Dr. Martin Luther King's words "languish on an island of poverty in a vast sea of affluence. . . ."

Another reason for suspecting the stridency of some population control advocates is that, despite reports predicting the inevitability of a big baby boom, reinforced by the spectre of 8.5 million women in prime reproductive years by 1970 and one million more by 1975, the baby boom has just not materialized. In fact, some population experts are admitting that, with a population of 200 million today and with the continuation of present trends, the projection of 300 million by the year 2000 may prove too high.

Without becoming simplistic in exploring a very complex problem, I would submit the following reservations which I have about the population control issue:

First, when the more militant of my colleagues refer to the total policy as the initial step to legitimizing genocide, they are con-

sidered down-right alarmists. Yet the timing of the population issue is a source of some concern. That this issue should surface simultaneously with the emergence of blacks and other non-whites as a meaningful force in the nation and the world appears more than coincidental.

BLACK STRENGTH IN NUMBERS

Second, blacks, devoid of economic strength, must seek to deploy skillfully the strength they have in numbers. But a population policy, such as is proposed, may well dilute that strength. There are now fifty locations in this nation where black people are 50% or more of the population, and over 200 locations where blacks are now 30% or more. This is a power of numbers which blacks cannot afford to think of lightly. Recent court decisions could mean hundreds of more black public officials at all levels, throughout the South. Thus, just the simple arithmetic of "one man, one vote" could so transform the face of politics in this nation as to make Dr. King's fondest dreams of Selma a fundamental fact of this democracy.

BLACK POVERTY CRITICAL

Third, black people need a vastly larger equity in the resources of this nation. For the poverty, which we must now freight to the political bargaining table, is itself evidence of our vulnerability. Black Americans possess only 2% of the total U.S. wealth. Black businesses had receipts in 1969–1970 representing 7/10th of 1% of the total business receipts of the nation. Black banks presently control 1/50th of 1% of the banking assets of the nation.

Black economic penury is a critical issue. It spotlights the relevance of our demands for a greater share of the resources while, at the same time, corroborating our central argument that the creation of a more equitable distribution system is of greater priority than population control. Population control is subordinate to wealth control. For a nation which engineered the Berlin airlift and the lift to the moon, the challenge is to wed its resources with its compassion to build a human community.

GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY MANY WOMEN WILL CHOOSE TO HAVE FEWER CHILDREN

(By Shirley A. Chisholm, U.S. Representative from New York)

I have long been and still am an ardent advocate of family planning. I believe that every woman has the right to control her own reproductive process. The decision to have children, when and how many, is one of the most important decisions she will make in her entire lifetime. But too often, for a variety of reasons, she doesn't decide at all; the pregnancy just occurs.

One of the biggest problems is the lack of information about reproductive process and contraception. Studies have shown that most poor families as well as the American population in general desire a family of two or three children. The poor however have much less access to either good prenatal or postnatal care or information about contraceptive techniques.

The result, limited financial resources are insufficient and the family may sink even deeper in poverty. More than one-quarter of all families with four or more children are living in poverty. Their risk of poverty is two-and-a-half times that for families with three children or less.

Another serious and growing problem is illegitimacy. As of 1967 approximately 4.5 million children under the age of 18 in the United States were illegitimate. A recent study by the government of the District of Columbia showed that in 1970 the percentage of illegitimate births had exceeded 40% and projected that by 1973 over half the babies in the District will be born out of wedlock.

We can't ignore this. These children and this problem are not going to just fade away. We need to be concerned about the quality of these lives—both of the children and of their mothers.

Even though approximately 40% of the mothers of the 245,000 babies born illegitimately in the United States every year are women 19 years or younger, we still are not making information on birth control available to these young girls. Although many young people seem to be very sophisticated about sex, they, in fact, are frequently lacking in knowledge about the facts of life. By forcing a young girl to have an unwanted child, we are assigning her to society's trash heap. Young, confused, usually without skills or training, she will be cut off from avenues of opportunity.

My own experiences at the community level and other studies done after the introduction of the New York State abortion repeal law confirm the fact that given the opportunity many women will choose to have fewer children.

There are those who either for religious or personal convictions believe that abortion and certain forms of contraception are morally wrong and amount to killing a child; others believe that human life does not start until sometime after conception or at birth. I believe that this is a matter of personal conscience which should not be decided by the State. Under the present circumstances we are imposing the Catholic view of abortion on the entire population of the United States.

The lack of access to birth control information and materials and the archaic laws that prevail with regard to abortion amount to compulsory pregnancy.

At the other end of the spectrum are those who advocate sterilization and a limitation on the number of children a family may have, as a solution to the "population problem". While it is true that our population and that of the world is growing at an astounding rate and that we do need to be concerned about the conservation of human resources, forced sterilization or any compulsory directive is an anathema to the human spirit.

It is the suggestion of compulsory birth control regulations that has prompted concern among American Blacks about "race genocide". There have been instances when judges have ordered individuals, such as convicted felons to be sterilized, and there have been suggestions that women be "required" to use contraceptives or have an abortion as a prerequisite to receipt of public assistance. Indeed there are reports that some social workers already imply that those who don't attend family planning seminars will have difficulty with the welfare office.

There is a difference between making information and services available and coercion. It is a very important difference that we must jealously guard and respect. Women should neither be forced into having children they don't want nor restricted from having children they do want.

MINORITY GROUPS SHALL NOT BE DENIED ACCESS TO FAMILY PLANNING

(By Roy Wilkins, executive director, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People)

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People supports "the dissemination of information and materials concerning family health and family planning to all those who desire it."

In taking this position the NAACP does not ignore the traditional concern of the Association, indeed, the reason for its being, the racial discrimination against minority groups that is so prevalent in all aspects of American life. It recognizes that "the family constitutes the foundation of our society. . . . The general well-being of the family and all the services that affect it—are of paramount concern to this Association. It is further recognized that, although numerous health and welfare benefits are available, both overt and subtle forms of discrimination are practiced in the rendition of these services to minority groups."

Special emphasis is placed upon the welfare system and the myths which have been given wide currency in order, in part, to "justify" racial discrimination. There is, however, no ambiguity in the NAACP approach to the significant, but highly emotional, topic of family planning. The Association supports the dissemination of "information and materials" for those who wish it.

The NAACP does not purport to be a crusader for family planning. That is the task of those organizations specifically designed and equipped to render the services where requested. However, the NAACP does not believe that obstacles should be placed in the way of the dissemination of information on the subject.

There can be no question that family size beyond the capacities of available income or of health and educational resources, constitutes a genuine problem, outlined in graphic detail for any unbiased observer.

The basic determination of the NAACP is that minority group families, who must wrestle with myriad manifestations of racial discrimination, shall not be denied access to family planning help by reason of their racial and economic deprivations.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General, the United Nations)

"To slow population growth is an important prerequisite for future world stability."

The greatest challenge for the United Nations during the Second Development Decade is to promote peace with justice and, to achieve this end, to improve the conditions of life for the billions of men, women and children who will inhabit the earth in the coming decades. Our goal is not mere survival, but a life of dignity and peace with hope for each new generation. Therefore, the Second Development Decade will require a serious confrontation with our most basic problems of poverty and population growth.

The problem of poverty and the gap which separates the rich from the poor is a source of fundamental concern for the future security of man. It should also now be obvious to every man that rapid population growth strikes a heavy blow to the development efforts of many nations around the globe. An immediate commitment to slow population growth is an important prerequisite for future world stability.

Increasing productivity alone will neither eliminate the basis of poverty nor spark a transition to low birth rates. What is needed is also a more equitable distribution of this world's goods. We need to focus less on total economic growth and move on to specific social problems such as unemployment, malnutrition and illiteracy. We must assure the world's poor that the means for a better life will be made available to all.

This call for a new attitude towards development has implications for rich and poor nations alike. Within poor nations each decision on development strategy must be considered in terms of whether its effect will reach the vast majority of the population.

The year 1972 is a threshold that may well lead toward even more vital United Nations commitment. The Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment will bring together a critical mass of information, impetus, and leadership that must surely link the increasing pollution of the planet with the increasing population of the planet.

This spring the United Nations will be formally inaugurating preparations for the World Population Year 1974 and the World Population Conference. A worldwide review and appraisal will try to determine more precisely the effects of population growth and the measures needed to reduce excess growth.

To this review the United Nations itself must bring a broad perspective on population issues, keeping to the forefront three major levels of concern and action.

First, the United Nations must speak for the entire world community bearing always in mind that four billion people cannot live independently, without concern for one another's needs. The world of the twentieth century offers knowledge and opportunity that would have staggered our ancestors. A world of four billion people also faces constraints that past ages never knew and that we violate at our peril.

Second, the United Nations must speak to and with governments, for population policies remain within the sovereign domain of each nation. The General Assembly has recognized that governments should study population factors and adopt population policies. Some thirty member states have such policies; a hundred others do not and may need advice and resources to evaluate their needs.

Third, the United Nations must speak in behalf of individuals. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights proclaims the right of all parents freely and responsibly to determine the number of their offspring. Yet the information and services to exercise this right still do not exist in much of the world and may not exist in the future unless the United Nations can provide the assistance needed.

THE U.N. FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES

(By Rafael Salas, Executive Director, United Nations Fund for Population Activities)

"The U.N. is mounting a global population strategy."

A most important step towards mobilizing the energies and skills of all nations and all peoples to deal with world population problems was taken by the Secretary-General in 1967 when he established the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). He placed the new organization under the supervision of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), thus making population a part of the overall development assistance being given to developing countries. By this step, the Secretary-General not only cleared the way for coordination and expansion of the population work within the United Nations system, but also opened up the possibility of mounting a global program with a global population strategy to which all countries could contribute according to their capabilities and from which all countries could benefit according to their need.

THE DEVELOPING PROGRAM

Given its mandate, the Fund has given more impetus and a wider scope to the population work of the specialized United Nations organizations, and the countries requesting assistance have thrown considerably more light on their own needs and priorities in the population field. As a result, the Fund can now identify many areas of special urgency. Some of these areas are already engaging the attention of the specialized United Nations agencies with Fund financing. Other areas call for new initiatives by the Fund itself.

Some 400 projects make up the bulk of the present program. However, the Fund recognizes that breakthroughs in research, in technology, in teaching and demonstration methods, particularly in regard to fertility control, might dramatically change the picture. Accordingly, the Fund is ready to take the lead, when appropriate, in developing new fields of activity which would sharpen and intensify the attack on population problems.

UNIQUE U.N. CONTRIBUTION

The year 1971 marked the second fully operational year of the Fund. Almost fifty countries have made voluntary contributions close to the $50 million mark for the support of the Fund's activities. The U.S. provided very helpful support. More than sixty countries have requested assistance in carrying out population projects costing almost the total amount of available resources. Many more countries are now taking a sober look at the effect population trends are having on their economic, social and environmental progress as a preliminary to embarking on their own population programs.

The work of the Fund confirms that the United Nations can bring into play three elements to arrest the deteriorating world population situation which no one country or international organization can provide.

First, impartiality. Population is a sensitive area where every individual, every group and every nation looks with suspicion at the proposals of his neighbors. Only a world organization of unassailable neutrality is capable of effective operation under such conditions.

Second, structure. Over twenty-five years, the United Nations has built up a network of interrelated and intercommunicating regional and national offices to serve its member nations in all corners of the earth. Through this network, the Fund can draw on the technology, skills and the experience of all nations to help solve the problems of individual nations.

Third, resources. No one will dispute that a program which coordinates the inputs of a wide range of United Nations agencies with special competencies, of numerous bilateral, nongovernmental and private organizations with active field operations, of countries with advanced research and technical programs and of those already coping with population pressures, can, and should, attract more substantial resources than a series of independent undertakings.

Taking these considerations into account, it is hard to think of an alternative to grasping the opportunity offered by the United Nations to engage in immediate, responsible and concerted action. After all we have only one world organization—and only one world.

"WITHOUT REALISTIC POPULATION POLICY, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS DOOMED TO FAILURE"

(By Robert S. McNamara, President, the World Bank)

The planet we live on is finite, and the population which it can support at a reasonable standard of living is likewise finite. One can debate what a reasonable standard of living ought to be, but what is beyond debate is that some two billion individuals of the human race currently are condemned by circumstances to a standard of living that is plagued by poverty, deprivation and indignity.

We are not talking about poverty that is a mere absence of affluence. We are talking about a poverty that is corrosive of human decency, characterized by hunger and malnutrition, high infant mortality, low life expectancy, widespread illiteracy and chronic unemployment.

COSTS OF RAPID GROWTH

It is in this context that the population issue must be faced. For broadly speaking, those countries which are caught up in this struggle against poverty are the same countries which are faced with dangerously high rates of population growth. In the past twelve months, the world's population has grown by more than seventy million people. Between 85 and 90% of this population growth has occurred in the poorer countries.

Overly rapid population growth in a poor country siphons away resources that are desperately required for reducing economic and social deprivation. At the national level, the government must devote a greater and greater amount of investment simply to provide minimal services to an ever-increasing number of children. At the family level, the same needs press in on the parents of large families. For roughly the first fifteen years of their lives children are consumers rather than producers. For both the government and the family, more children means more expenditure on food, on shelter, on clothing, on health, on education, on every essential social service.

As the children reach adulthood, the problem is compounded by mounting unemployment. There are not enough jobs to go around because the government—grappling with the daily demands of the increasing population—has been unable to invest in job-producing enterprises. Thus the cycle of poverty tightens, and the entire social and economic framework of the nation weakens under the massive weight of population.

Social tensions, political turbulence and the irrational eruption into violence are the final fruits of unmanageable population pressures. No society, no economy, no government can sustain such pressures indefinitely.

GOVERNMENTS MUST ACT NOW

The first step a government must take to avert these dangers is, of course, to recognize them. Some twenty-five countries, with over two-thirds of the population of the developing world, today have formally adopted an official population policy. Other governments are providing some family planning assistance to those parents who desire it.

Many governments in the developing world, however, have neither an official population policy, nor extend assistance to private family planning efforts. And without realistic population policy, overall social and economic development is doomed to failure.

What is important to understand is the explosive potential of population growth. Even, for example, in the unlikely event that the developing countries were by the year 2040 to reduce their net reproduction rate to one—that is, to an average of two children per couple—the present population in the developing world of 2.6 billion would increase more than five-fold to nearly 14 billion.

If the net reproduction rate of one could be reached two decades sooner, the ultimate size of the population of the developing countries alone would be more than 4 billion less, a figure in excess of the planet's total population today.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from these projections.

Each decade of delay in addressing the population problem in developing countries will lead to an ultimate population in those nations approximately 20% longer than would otherwise be the case.

Further, even in favorable conditions, the population in those nations will continue to grow rapidly for several decades, expanding perhaps four-fold from present levels and reaching a total of nearly 10 billion.

The implications for all who are engaged in development are clear: there must be an intensified effort in population planning, with the goal of shortening the time required to reduce the rate of growth.

WORLD BANK CONCERN

There can be no question, then, that effective population planning is an essential ingredient of a nation's social and economic development. That is why the World Bank is concerned with the problem. It is equally clear that primary responsibility for action in this matter lies with each individual country. No outside development agency can presume to solve the problem for a nation. What it can do is to point out the dangers of delay, offer counsel and technical information, and where feasible, make available financial assistance to aid a government in

setting up its own program to deal effectively with the issue.

The population problem in the developing world cannot be solved with one five-year plan, or in a single decade, or even in what remains of this century. It is a problem that will require a long-term continuing effort. But above all, it is a problem that can no longer afford postponement or procrastination. Each day of delay makes the task more difficult.

The World Bank is ready to assist its developing member countries in their efforts to move towards a sound and sensible solution—and to move now. We are confident that ultimate success is possible, given the necessary leadership and resources and resolve.

AFRICA

(By Robert K. A. Gardiner, Executive Secretary, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa)

"The relationship of family planning to all aspects of life must be recognized."

To say that we, in Africa, are at the crossroads is putting it mildly. Only a few African countries achieved the minimum target of five per cent growth rate in national income in the First United Nations Development Decade. And our population continues to expand at a rate faster than anticipated. The ominous implications of this are clear, and this is precisely why the role of population in African development is important.

The current rate of population growth in Africa, at 2.8 per cent per annum, is at par with that of South Asia and Latin America. With a steady decrease in the death rate and with fertility remaining high, Africa would, from about 1980 onwards, have the highest rate of growth among all the major areas of the world.

In 2000 A.D., Africa's total population could be 734 million, or 818 million, or 906 million, depending on the actual paths fertility and mortality take. The 172 million difference between the high and the low estimates—slightly less than half Africa's present total population—shows the difference an effective population policy could make.

But policy formulations and action programs should not await the development of universal and perfect data collection systems. If action is to take effect in the future, the time to initiate it is now. The new entrants to the labor force in the next fifteen years have, for example, already been born; thus the size of the labor force will be affected only after fifteen years by any action program taken now. But a smaller family norm, if established now, would immediately make available additional resources that could improve the productivity of the existing labor force.

A national population policy should, of course, be made an integral part of the development process and not merely treated as an outside factor. Any population policy, to be viable and effective, must be coupled with economic and social policies aimed at improving the lives within all sectors of the population.

While broad economic and social considerations are expected to be the main factor for adopting national population policies and programs, considerations of the wishes of individual family members are an important complement to it. The decision as to the number and spacing of children should belong to every family.

BEYOND FAMILY PLANNING

At various meetings of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa the view has been expressed that population problems in Africa should be seen in the total context of improving the quality of life, and not merely in terms of the reduction of the size of families. Having fostered this approach, we must find ways and means of promoting it.

Members of the Commission have also felt that the term "family planning" is not altogether satisfactory. It is seen as an inhibiting, almost a negative phrase. The general consensus has been that family planning programs, to be effective, must discard the one-sided approach of offering family planning services only. The relationship of family planning to all aspects of life must be recognized so that the programs can find their place and function within the other relevant and desirable services and institutions, such as maternal and child health services, educational services, and rural extension activities. The task, as we see it, is to go beyond family planning and to cover the whole area of family welfare.

Such an approach may be initially expensive, because in many areas this will, for example, mean building health centers. In the long run, I believe it will pay for itself by improved health, education, and skills and, therefore, by increased productivity and the enhancement of the quality of life.

Aware of the problems engendered by the present age-structure of the population and the high rates of growth, six African countries—Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Morocco, and Tunisia—have adopted official population policies, and two others—Botswana and Nigeria—have included programs in their current development plans aimed at reducing the high rate of growth of population through a reduction in fertility. These eight countries account for 40% of the total population of Africa. About twenty other African countries, with 30% of the continent's population, have family planning programs in operation, either through voluntary associations, or as a part of health services. Of course, one cannot add these figures together and say that 70% of Africa's population is receiving family planning services.

The interest of African governments in population programs is of recent date. This is due mainly to the lack of trained nations, and the absence of studies for individual countries relating population growth to economic and social development. To meet the shortage of demographers, two regional institutes for population studies have recently been established in Accra and Yaounde, in addition to the one in Cairo.

LATIN AMERICA

(By Alberto Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia, Chairman, Advisory Board, United Nations Fund for Population Activities)

"Population, the principal resource and ultimate object of development, is a restraint to progress."

During the last decades Latin America has undergone rapid progress. Economic and social reforms have been initiated on a large scale. Urban centers have grown at an unprecedented rate, but the economic and social advances of our nations are far from sufficient. Fulfilling the needs of the masses of Latin America is the major challenge of the century.

The very progress achieved has tended to modify the origins of our social and economic problems. Educational deficiencies, bourgeoning urban slums, unemployment, hunger and social and political unrest are simultaneously expressions both of developmental retardation and maturation. The fundamental key is the rapid incorporation of technological development with the expansion of the base of opportunity for the majority.

It is in this perspective that the rapid population growth rate of Latin America should be considered. Historically, the pressure of population growth was a positive force that actually formed the foundations for progress in Latin America by creating new opportunities, narrowing the agricultural frontiers and intensifying the urgency of economic and social reforms. Now, however, it is a serious handicap.

There were nearly sixty million Latin Americans in 1900 and there now are 290 million. At today's rate of growth, the population will double every twenty-four years. If such a growth rate continues, the population of Latin America will total 580 million by the end of the century.

My own country, Colombia, has twenty-three million inhabitants and a growth rate of 3.4%. Thus, this country will double its population in only twenty-one years and reach an estimated ninety million people by the year 2000. The figures for Mexico are even more disturbing. Given her present population of fifty-four million, and also a growth rate of 3.4%, Mexico will have over 200 million people in forty years. Brazil will, with present trends, have almost 200 million inhabitants by the beginning of the 21st century.

While the national populations as a whole are growing at unprecedented rates, the growth rates of our cities are even greater. Some of these are actually doubling their populations in 10 years. Worst of all, the terrible slums, our "favelas", "callampas", "villas miserias", "ranchose" and "tugurios" are growing faster than the cities themselves. As a result, in spite of financial investment, there has been an increase in unemployment and underemployment and an inadequate provision of schools, hospitals, doctors and housing. This offshoot of development is now surfacing. The circumstances in many Latin American cities are better defined in terms of misery than progress.

NEED TOTAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

These social ills cannot be cured by merely reducing population growth. The salient consideration is that socioeconomic policies of development must be implemented with a decrease in the population growth rate to achieve the desired objectives.

Capital for the development of Latin America is scarce. Three units of investment are required to produce one unit of per capita income. Therefore, an annual capital investment increase of nine percent would be needed to produce a sustained growth rate of three percent in per capita income. The urgent need of investment in schools, hospitals, health centers, housing, agrarian reform and in the expansion of services to the poorer sectors of the population requires annual capital investment growth rates of twelve to fifteen percent. But purely economic measures, however, are unsatisfactory unless they are incorporated into a total strategy designed to conquer the misery, malnutrition, unemployment and low cultural level of the masses and the hopelessness of the sprawling slums.

We are faced with a paradoxical situation. The population, the principal resource and ultimate object of development, is becoming a restraint to progress. If the objectives of economic growth are not coordinated with the goals of improved levels of health and education and the establishment of social conditions which reflect the image of a better quality of life, it is probable that development strategies will be adopted which are characterized by enormous human suffering.

VOLUNTARY RESPONSIBLE CHOICE

High population growth rates offer an unprecedented challenge to the concurrent achievement of progress and humanitarian objectives. They have created the need to redefine the relationship between economic development and social justice.

In a more developed Latin America, human reproduction should be the result of conscious, responsible, voluntary decisions by the people. This dignified freedom of choice is part of the "cultural revolution" and forms an integral component of family welfare and maternal and child health. Family planning is an essential element of social modernization.

Obviously, each Latin American government should recognize the right of the citi-

zen to plan the size of his family and should provide the services indispensable to civilized society. National social development plans must include an analysis of the problems of family welfare, goal proposals and specific programs.

Furthermore, it is the duty of the government to make all citizens aware of the population problem in order to establish a consensus which will serve as a base for a national population policy. It is my firm belief that the Latin American nations should adopt a policy of reduced, and therefore, moderate population growth as a component of their total social development programs.

THE PHILIPPINES

(By Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Philippines)

"Annual population growth rate will decline from 3.4% to 2.3% by 1976."

The population of the Philippines today is 38 million and is growing at the rate of 3.4 per cent a year. If this rate of growth continues, by the year 2000 there will be about 100 million Filipinos, a population which will be altogether too much for our small country to contain comfortably, and even more of a burden to support.

Not only would we have to contend with the enormous problems of food, housing, education and health, but we would have to face up to the pollution of our air and water, which population congestion inevitably brings. That was why on May 15, 1970, I issued an executive order creating the Commission on Population. This Commission was given the responsibility of formulating and implementing a long term population program to cope with the grave social and economic problems arising from rapid population growth.

The Commission also has the responsibility of promoting and publishing studies on all aspects of our population, and to assemble and disseminate technical and scientific information relating to medical, social, economic, and cultural phenomena as these effect or are affected by a growing population.

The campaign to deliver the service of family planning has expanded in the past year, reaching additional thousands of people. Family Planning clinics, presently numbering 1,256, were established all over the country with private medical practitioners actively participating in the program.

FIVE-YEAR TARGETS

The present goal is the establishment of a total of 2,000 clinics by 1976, with some 20,000 personnel needed to man them. The clinics also provide information, motivation, communication services, training, and undertake educational research, all of which are actively pursued as integral parts of the program.

The Commission on Population has set definite targets under its five-year program. The program aims at gaining three million acceptors by 1976. This means that during that period more than 50 per cent of the eligible women would have accepted some method of family planning.

The agencies engaged in clinical services have registered a total number of 547,000 new acceptors from 1970 to the first semester of Fiscal Year 1971–72. By the end of this year it is expected that at least another 600,000 new acceptors will have enlisted. Based on this performance, we feel that the annual population growth rate will decline to 2.3 per cent by 1976.

The increase in the number of acceptors is credited to the intensified motivational program launched by our National Media Production Center and Social Communication Center and the training of family planning personnel, here and abroad.

POPULATION EDUCATION FOR 12 MILLION STUDENTS BY 1976

This training, which is geared to support the family planning program, is provided by seven institutions. From July 1970 to June 1971, 14,445 physicians, nurses, mid-wives and lay motivators have been trained within the country, and 135 persons trained abroad. The lay motivators are trained to provide potential acceptors in their area with the right answers to questions about family planning.

Much effort has been concentrated on research. Research projects have been established to delve into various fields relating to population. Among these are program evaluation, demography, census and statistics, biomedical research and curriculum development.

The Commission has also programmed curriculum development and teacher training courses on Responsible Family Life. These are directly imparted to students in classrooms. By the end of five years, population education will have reached some twelve million students in both the elementary and secondary grades.

The program is being implemented not only by various organizations of diverse character, but it is being managed by a Commission composed of knowledgeable people of different backgrounds and professions. We feel that this diversity of talent has contributed to the success of the program. We hope that we can carry on with even greater dedication, a surer direction, and continuing success.

CHINA

(By Jaime Zipper, M.D., professor of physiology, University of Chile Medical School, inventor of "Zipper" Ring and co-developer of Copper T IUD)

"Family planning was introduced in China to guard against catastrophe."

Chinese party leaders and doctors at the Peking Hospital provided an up-to-date account of family planning in the People's Republic of China to a group of Chilean doctors on a visit we made to China in October 1971. Our purpose was to exchange information about all aspects of family planning.

OFFICIAL PHILOSOPHY

At one of the major briefings, a Chinese party leader read a statement of the official philosophy from a text which I took down nearly verbatim:

"Family planning was introduced in China by Chairman Mao to guard against catastrophe and to facilitate national planning. It will greatly influence future generations of Chinese and the prosperity of the entire nation.

Family planning is fundamental for the economic planning of the country. It involves an ideological revolution to change basic concepts and traditional ways. Furthermore, family planning represents the demands of the masses, especially of the many women who want to be freed of the burden of excessive children in order to be able to contribute to the reconstruction of the country.

An information campaign to popularize methods of population control was first undertaken in the People's Republic in 1957. But in order to control the growth rate and convert this nation into a planned economy, Chairman Mao declared that it was first necessary to produce a simple medicine to be taken orally or by injection. This decision signaled the start of scientific experimentation.

But this instruction for a new line of thinking did not reach the masses. Only in 1968, with the Cultural Revolution, did the technicians initiate a family planning action program with three objectives:

1. To develop vigorous support among the party cadres;

2. To educate the experienced older people as well as the middle-aged and young people;

3. To pursue scientific and clinical research to find the oral medicine which had been proposed by Chairman Mao.

It took only seventeen days of medical work to produce a compound. Researchers experimented with the drugs first on animals. In less than two months our scientists found a satisfactory formulation. To complete the tests women volunteered to take the drugs.

Family planning is a common cause promoted by the work of the masses. The educators have done the teaching. Because of their achievements, the medicine can now be widely used. It is easy to take and has few side effects."

BIRTH CONTROL METHODS

We later learned that a Czechoslovakian technician was instrumental in making possible the manufacture of these pills in China. These pills are distributed to married women in plain bottles of one hundred each and taken regularly for twenty-one days without complicated tabulations or different colors. The Chinese women seem to have no difficulty following this procedure.

Intrauterine devices have been used since 1958. Coils of non-rusting steel and plastic rings, based upon Japanese models, were most prevalent. Sterilization, both male and female, is occurring more frequently.

ABORTION READILY AVAILABLE

Abortion, which has been legal in China since 1957, has become popular in the last three or four years. The pattern is simple. First, women are provided with contraceptive methods; if these fail, abortion by vacuum aspiration is used. It is a simple, unspectacular occurrence. Actually, abortion offers special advantages in that women have the right to fifteen days of paid vacation afterwards. In China, this is exceptional because there are no vacations as we know them in the Western World. There is only one rest day each week.

REACHING THE PEASANTS

The real challenge of health care in China is reaching the peasants who live in rural communes. The "barefoot doctors" are China's answer. They are usually women with academic training in medicine who have worked at least two years in a commune or factory. They are then sent to a hospital for six months, where they are taught to distribute contraceptives, and to perform IUD insertions, abortions, vasectomies, and tubal ligations. After their hospital experience, the barefoot doctors return to their village and work from a crude clinic, usually in the cultural center of the commune.

URBAN BIRTH RATES LOW

Despite the current campaign in rural areas, the urban centers are so far having greater success in reducing birth rates. In the city of Peking, for instance, where the population is now 5 million, we were told that the birth rate was down to 6 and 7 per thousand and that the rate of population increase was registered at 0.1% annually the lowest in the world. For Peking province as a whole, Hopeh, the birth rate was given as 17 per thousand. The province has grown from 49 million people in 1957 to 60 million in 1970, an increase of nearly 2% annually.

Family planning in China is fundamentally justified as an emancipation of women, based on the equal rights of women to study, to participate in political decisions, to exercise their social conscience, and to work side by side with men in building a socialist society. Where once "having many children" was considered a blessing for women, now family planning is depicted everywhere as a benefit to the individual and to society. Family planning is therefore both a means and an

end in the massive modernizing and restructuring of Chinese society.

India is quite capable of looking after its large and growing population from its own resources and its growing national income. But our rapid population growth has made the increment in the individual's share of that income smaller than it need be. Also, the quality of life and of the environment is diminished by too dense a population. That is why our Government felt it necessary to make family planning an official policy. India was the first nation in the world to do so. We view our family planning program as part of a larger welfare package for the individual, the family and the community.

Our birth rate is not going up; on the contrary it is going down. But the death rate—particularly infant mortality—is receding much faster. In some States of our country, it is nine deaths per thousand—the same as in the United States. This reflects the impressive success achieved by the country in public health. However, this means that our population is growing at a faster rate than before.

CLINICS IN ALL RURAL AREAS

Sometimes it is said that our adherence to tradition is an obstacle to innovation and change. Our remarkable success in agriculture is conclusive proof that the rich texture of our culture is capable of speedy adaptation.

We have set up a network of family planning clinics, fully backed by the machinery of mass media and extension work, which covers all parts of rural India. We have organized camps where people by the thousands come to have themselves sterilized or women come to have loops fitted.

It is notable that ten million men and women have taken to voluntary sterilization. This is about the same as the total number of persons sterilized in the rest of the world. This is the safest and best method for terminating conception.

Indian medical and research workers are rising to the challenges posed by this responsiveness of the people to accept family planning. Not only in sterilization techniques but also in the development of new contraceptives, our research workers and doctors are playing a pioneering role.

EXTENSIVE CONTRACEPTIVE PRODUCTION

A promising new oral contraceptive which is nonsteroidal and, therefore, without side effects, has been developed at one of our Research Institutes and is now being tested. It is the long-sought "morning-after pill" and the trials are encouraging. A new device which can be used by men or women has also been developed by this Institute. Experimentation is proceeding also into several herbal substances commonly used in our indigenous systems of medicine.

A public undertaking produces 140 million condoms each year. There is also a factory in the private sector. To meet the growing demand, yet another production unit is contemplated. A Government factory for loop production meets our total demand.

India has thus developed extensive productive as well as research capacity for contraceptives. Indeed, the success of family planning owes much to the innovative spirit of self-reliance of all those engaged in the program and in the research and training which backs it.

The combined efforts of Indian doctors, sociologists, extension workers and voluntary organizations have created a ferment of ideas making the small family the preferred choice of the people. Our approach to the new program is educational. Being a democracy we reject compulsion or coercion.

In 1971 India passed through great trials. Normally, involvement with such vast problems would have meant a slowing down of welfare programs. Yet, the family planning program has not only moved steadily forward, but at the end of our financial year in March, we set a new record.

WORLDWIDE PRIVATE EFFORTS

(By Julia Henderson, Secretary General, International Planned Parenthood Federation)

"If public and private efforts can be sustained, we need not despair for the future."

As we have added 1.7 billion people to world population in the years since 1930, so the concern to find safe, effective ways to control human fertility has grown into a mighty movement not only in North America and Europe but in many areas of the Third World. Nearly forty governments support national family planning programs. However, there is danger that the public may become deaf to the sounds of population projections to the year 2000 or 2040 or 2070.

One of the factors in determining whether our concern will grow and effectively motivate both families and political leaders to take action on the scale necessary will be the health of the voluntary movement for family planning.

FAMILY PLANNING PIONEERS

This movement in the United States will forever be linked to the name of Margaret Sanger. Perhaps not so well known are the pioneers in other countries who were, amongst others, her contemporaries: Shrimati Dhavanti Rama Rau of India, Mrs. Elise Ottesen-Jensen of Sweden, Dr. C. P. Blacker and Dr. Helena Wright of the United Kingdom, and Dr. van Emde Boas when these pioneers decided at a conference in Bombay, India to establish the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF).

The aims of the Federation have steadily broadened as understanding grew that family planning could also contribute to the national welfare. In 1963, the Federation decided "to increase the understanding by people and governments of the demographic problems of their own communities and of the world as a whole." It tries to help its members achieve these goals through population education and sex education; through stimulating scientific research in the biological, psychological and social implications of human fertility and its regulation; research into methods of contraception; and making known the findings of such research to the workers in the front line who are making information and services available to the people who need them.

The fundamental approach is through the support of voluntary and autonomous national associations. Membership is limited to one association in each country which must clearly establish its leadership in the field and must not discriminate on the grounds of race, creed, color, politics or sex, nor be controlled by commercial interests.

FEDERATION GROWTH

As comprehension of the size of the problem facing us has grown, the Federation has had a phenomenal growth. Today there are seventy-nine national associations and the Federation is working in more than one hundred countries. The Federation's outreach to regions such as Latin America and Africa, where a very limited number of governments have any defined policy related to population, is particularly significant. Governments that are not yet brave enough to establish a policy or governmental services in this field often welcome the fact that their own citizens, through the voluntary movement, try to meet the urgent demands of their citizens for such information and services.

As the outreach has grown, the requirements for funds to help, particularly in forming and expanding the work of associations in the developing countries, have grown correspondingly. From a budget of $30,000 in 1961, a quantum leap was taken in 1965 with the first government grant to the Federation from Sweden. Seven years later we are working with a budget of $25 million for work in the developing countries while another $55 million is raised and spent through the voluntary movements in the United States, United Kingdom and European countries which do not receive grants. Thus, we can identify some $80 million flowing this year through the system of the IPPF as the private sector contribution to the solution of the world population problem. The U.S. Agency for International Development is today the single largest contributor to IPPF's budget for work in the developing countries. U.S. private fund-raising alone contributes in excess of $3 million of our private funds.

Thousands of volunteers still work faithfully and patiently in welcoming frightened or shy women in the clinics, making contacts with individual families, talking with groups of men or women, and doing the thankless chores in a clinic or in a hospital maternity ward (which is often the best place to find new clients for the program).

A CHALLENGING FUTURE

Naturally, an organization which has grown so rapidly in a situation which is constantly changing faces many problems. One of these is finding its proper role in countries in which governments and UN agencies are launching major programs. In these cases, IPPF seeks a division of labor in which governments provide clinical services and the IPPF affiliate concentrates its energies in information and education work basic to changing social climate and individual behavior. The IPPF has also pressed forward in its efforts to join forces with all agencies reaching the community level—women's organizations, trade unions, youth organizations, and professional organizations of nurses, midwives, teachers, and social workers.

If this interest can be sustained over a long enough period both through public and private sector efforts, hopefully joined with multilateral institutions such as the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, we need not despair for the future of our species. The growing concern with our human environment in the industrialized countries and the continuing drive for economic development and higher standards of living in the Third World are twin engines for giving new momentum to the world population movement.

MAN AND NATURE

(By Norman E. Borlaug, Nobel Peace Prize, 1970, Director, International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, Rockefeller Foundation, Mexico)

"Exploding human population growth threatens many other species and eventually man himself."

The past several decades have seen a growing polarization of the world into the affluent and the poor nations—the have and have-not peoples. While one third of the world's population today lives in luxury inconceivable a generation ago, half of the globe's total human population often lacks even adequate food, the first necessity for life.

The affluent nations, in most cases, draw heavily on many of the "non-renewable" resources of the underdeveloped nations for their continued economic development. The affluent nations, thereby, inadvertently contribute to widening the gap between rich and poor nations. It is, therefore, obvious that the affluent nations cannot continue to remain aloof and isolated from the problems of the developing nations.

FOR A DECENT LIFE

The basic moral and survival issue for mankind for the next several generations is to find a way to assure that all who are born into this world will have an opportunity to

acquire the basic necessities for a decent life. Unless this is achieved, there will be increasing numbers of national and international social and political disorders—with world civilization in jeopardy—as biologic man competes for the basic necessities of life. There will be no peace.

It should be obvious to all educated people that the first step towards providing a decent standard of living to all who are born into this world is to slow the increase in human numbers to manageable levels, and to stabilize populations as soon as feasible. Certainly, to do nothing and to rely upon the Malthusian principle to stabilize human numbers through starvation is immoral. Moreover, inaction in both irresponsible and unnecessary, considering that man, unlike other species, has a brain and mind which can analyze our present population predicament and project ahead and see the consequences for man and his civilization of the continued reckless increase in human numbers.

In recent years many studies of wild species of animals, birds, and fish have shown that there are natural laws which restrict growth of their populations long before shortage of food and starvation limits increase. Undoubtedly, man's increase in numbers long ago was governed in part by these natural laws. In the process of the development of his religious, ethical and humanistic philosophies which, in turn, contributed to the development of his cultures and civilization, these devices have been made ineffective and resulted in our present dilemma.

Man today must face up to the multifaceted, many-headed population monster if he is to avoid disaster. Exploding human population growth threatens first the survival of many other species, but later, of civilization and eventually the survival of man himself.

NO SIMPLE ANSWER

We must avoid seeking a simple answer to the complex and interrelated problems resulting from astronomical human numbers. It is unwise to continue to develop imbalanced attacks on single aspects of these complex problems, as has been done by some extremist environmentalists in the past. All too often this approach has led to alienating some segments of society—especially the underprivileged low income groups—both in the USA and the developing nations. The campaign by privileged people living in nonmalarial areas of the world to ban the use of insecticides—including DDT—for controlling this disease is questionable both from an ethical and tactical viewpoint, until other methods of control are available.

On the food production front, we can hold the line for the next 30 years—while hopefully population growth can be slowed—if agriculture is given the proper priority and support.

If the world is to be fed, however, more, rather than less, agricultural chemicals—including chemical fertilizers and pesticides—will be needed. To deny the developing nations their use is to abandon them to hunger and disorder. It goes without saying they should be used judiciously, just as with medicines.

Time is late and the obstacles are many to overcoming the problems which confront mankind. But when one looks back over the short span of 10,000 years since man first cultivated plants and domesticated animals, which made possible the development of modern civilization, one must be amazed at the progress. There is, however, no time to be lost in preening over past achievements. Instead, man must face up to the many growing problems caused by the wild increase in human numbers.

I have the feeling that if the people of the world are given the facts concerning the seriousness of the population problem man will show that his specific name Homo *sapiens* was not ill-chosen, and he will build a better world.

SUMMING UP

(By William H. Draper, Jr., Honorary National Chairman Population Crisis Committee)

"One dollar per person per year for world population stabilization."

On behalf of the Population Crisis Committee, I express my appreciation to those who made this publication possible—those who prepared articles, those who made contributions, our Executive Director who organized the project, and, above all, the U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, whose final report is featured.

In this historic and far-reaching report, the Commission, established by Congress and appointed by the President, calls for population stabilization in the United States as soon as possible by voluntary means, through responsible individual action and enlightened governmental policies. The United States thus becomes the first developed nation in the world to formulate an explicit, comprehensive, long-term population policy. After two years of study, the Commission has concluded that bigger is not better. Even in the richest country of the world with vast acres of arable land, the quality of life will suffer if the total population continues to grow. To any who still may think that power and prosperity depend on an unending proliferation of people, the Commission answers unequivocally "No."

National power has, in the past, been associated with population growth. When life was shorter and technology simpler, nations deliberately encouraged their citizens to breed more people to serve as soldiers or workers. Today, that concept is obsolete. A world of 7 billion people, which demographers project for the year 2000, will not bring power to anyone, only increasing poverty with national and international turmoil.

Since the end of World War II, the world has faced four new and global challenges:

Control of nuclear weapons by the developed nations;

Economic advancement for the underdeveloped nations;

Protection of the human environment on this planet; and

Limitation of the population explosion.

None of these problems are solved, but the governments of the world are gradually recognizing that mutual self-restraint and restriction—through international negotiation and agreement—will ultimately protect the world from a nuclear holocaust better than overskill in the hands of many different governments.

In the field of economic development and, more recently, in the environmental field, governments are also setting aside ideology to negotiate and cooperate with one another. At the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment this spring in Stockholm, governments will embark on arduous long-term negotiations for world-wide non-pollution. Governments are not moved by international philanthropy, but by a hard-headed recognition that mutual economic gains and mutually agreed upon environmental protection will achieve and maintain a higher quality of life for their citizens.

THE TIME IS NOW

In the population field, the time has now come to recognize that the proliferation of people, no less than the proliferation of nuclear weapons or international pollution, is against the long-range interests of the entire human race. We must move toward world population stabilization. International agreement on this objective would, of course, not involve coercing individuals in their personal behavior. It would focus the attention of governments through out the world on appropriate voluntary and humanitarian measures, much as the U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future has recommended for this country.

The United States was not the first government to appoint a Population Commission. In fact, several developing countries have also established commissions to study national population problems and make recommendations. The United Nations is emphasizing the need for all governments to develop appropriate population policies and to appoint their own population commissions in connection with the World Population Conference and the World Population Year, scheduled for 1974.

World population stabilization, based on the recommendations of the different national populations commissions and designed to enhance not to restrict, individual opportunity, would not be cheap—any more than arms control, economic development, or environmental protection are in fact cheap. Continuing demographic study, the search for better birth control technologies, the expansion of health services, and the development of new educational programs all require considerable resources.

Programs to help the world reach population stabilization, and especially to help the developing countries where population growth most directly impedes the prospects of individual betterment, will, I estimate, require governmental expenditures during the 1970's of about $3 billion each year in the developing countries and perhaps half that much in the developed countries. The total costs, between $4 and $5 billion annually, will amount to approximately one dollar per person for the entire world. International assistance can be channelled through the U.N. Fund for Population Activities which since 1970 has allocated $40 million for population work in some 60 countries. National programs must be established within each country in the light of its own needs and through its own institutions, but all countries should be guided by studies and deliberations of their own as serious, as thoughtful, and as important as the work of the U.S. Commission summarized here.

A start has been made—in the United States, by the Congress, by three U.S. presidents, by the trail-blazing report of this Commission and by annual domestic expenditures of about $250 million as well as important program assistance overseas; in the international private sector, by the pioneering work of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, discussed by Julia Henderson; and in the United Nations by its increased commitment, proclaimed by Secretary-General Waldheim, and by the growing resources of its Population Fund, as discussed by Rafael Salas, Executive Director.

But much remains to be done. World population stabilization, achieved at the cost of roughly one dollar per person per year can help governments and individuals to improve the quality of life.

The amount needed for the developing world, where the problem is rapidly reaching crisis proportions, is about $3 billion, only one-tenth of one percent of the world's Gross National Product.

Is this too much to pay for survival?

SOURCES FOR FURTHER READING

Books

Who Shall Live? American Friends Service Committee. New York: Hill & Wang. 1970, 150 pp. paperback, $1.75. Examines ethics of man's control over birth and death.

Are Our Descendants Doomed? Harrison Brown & Edward Hutchins, eds. New York: Viking Press, 1972, 377 pp, paperback, $3.45. 12 papers on technological change and population growth.

Abortion: Law, Choice and Morality, Daniel Callahan, New York; Macmillan 1970, 524 p. $14.95. A survey.

The American Population Debate, Daniel Callahan, ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1971, 375 pp, paperback, $2.50. 23 selections on the U.S. population problem.

Readings in Human Population Ecology,

Wayne H. Davis, ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971, 251 pp, paperback, $4.95. 31 essays on the world population problem.

Population, Resources, Environment: Issues in Human Ecology, Anne H. & Paul R. Ehrlich. San Francisco, Calif.: W. H. Freeman, 1972, 499 pp. $9.50. College introductory text.

Psychology & Population, James T. Wawcett for The Population Council. Distributed by Key Book Service, Bridgeport, Conn., 1970, 160 pp. paperback, $3.95. Behavioral research issues.

Birth Control & Love, Alan F. Guttmacher. New York: Bantam, 1970, 289 pp, paperback, $1.25. All methods of family planning explained.

The Population Dilemma, Philip M. Hauser, 1970, 206 pp, paperback, $2.95. World population trends.

Birth Control in America: The Career of Margaret Sanger, David M. Kennedy. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1971, 320 pp, paperback, $2.95.

The Population Problem, Arthur McCormack. New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1970, 264 pp, $7.95. A concerned Catholic's assessment.

The Limits to Growth, Dennis L. Meadows, et al. New York: Potomac Associates/Universe Books, 1972, 208 pp, paperback, $2.75. A computer-aided, systems analysis of population prospects.

Rapid Population Growth: Consequences and Policy Implications, National Academy of Sciences. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971, Two volumes, 768 pp. $20.00, paperback of volume I only, $2.45. Vol. I: An overview. Vol. II: Supporting technical papers.

Population, Valerie K. Oppenheimer. New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1971, 95 pp. $1.00. A concise consideration of world population growth.

Mankind's Great Need: Population Research, Population Crisis Committee (see organizations). 1971, 71 pp, $.25. 31 leading figures in population research assess latest developments.

World Population Situation in 1970, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. New York: United Nations Sales Section, 1971, 80 pp, $2.00.

Population Program Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, 232 pp, $2.00 Country-by-country review.

From Now to Zero: Fertility, Contraception & Abortion in America, Leslie A. & Charles F. Westoff. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971, 358 pp, paperback, $3.95. Presents 1965 National Fertility Study.

Especially for children

Population, Robert J. Lowenherz. Mankato, Minn.: Creative Educational Society, 1970, 120 pp, $5.95. Grades 4–7.

Three illustrated, introductory books prepared by the Population Reference Bureau (see organizations):

This Crowded World, 1970, 60 pp, $1.50, Grades 4–6.

People!, 1968, 63 pp, $1.50, Grades 7–9.

The World Population Dilemma, 1972, 80 pp, $2.00, Grades 10–12 & undergraduate college.

Commission report

The Final Report of the U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will be available from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The report is a single volume of about 250 pages. The price is not yet determined. The report has also been published in paperback by the New American Library, 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.

Several volumes of supporting research papers and testimony presented at the Commission's public hearings will also be available. These detail economic, environmental, social and governmental aspects of present and future population trends in America. A complete listing of titles and prices can be obtained from the U.S. Government Printing Office.

Other material

A sourcebook on population, 1969, 50 pp, $.50. Surveys whole population field; classified by topics and by books, articles, films and organizations. Available from the Population Reference Bureau (see organizations).

Social Education, April, 1972 edition, 144 pp, $1.50. Designed for teachers and devoted entirely to population education, curriculum development and teaching aids. Available from the National Council for the Social Studies, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Available from the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (see organizations) for $.25 each:

"A Small Library in Family Planning For the General Reader" (# 108)

"Paperbacks on Population, Family Planning & Related Subjects" (#107)

"A Selected Bibliography For Professionals" (#102)

"Planned Parenthood Publications" (#100)

"Guide to Information Sources" (#103)

"Population Research & Study Centers in the USA" (#104)

Ecologos, Spring, 1972, $.10. A listing of standard, recent and forthcoming books on ecology and related environmental sciences. Available from Sidney Kramer Books, 1722 H St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Science for Society—A Bibliography, John Moore, 1971, $1.00. Over 4000 recent books & articles on science, population, health & society. Available from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Organizations

These private organizations are active in the population/family planning field and will furnish on request a full description of their activities and list of publications. Those offering memberships are asterisked (*).

International Planned Parenthood Federation, World Headquarters: 18–20 Lower Regent St., London, SW1Y–4PW. Western Hemisphere Region: 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003. A non-profit federation serving as an active catalyst to increased private and public family planning efforts worldwide. Publishes "Situation Reports" on specific countries, a newsletter and various reprints.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Information & Education Office, 810 Seventh Ave., New York, N.Y. 10019. A non-profit organization maintaining offices in almost 200 communities throughout the United States. Extensive publications and source material available including "Family Planning Perspectives," a quarterly magazine and "Planned Parenthood Report," a bimonthly newsletter.

*Population Crisis Committee, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. A non-profit organization concentrating on public education. Publishes "Population Crisis," a periodic Washington newsletter; "Victor-Bostrom Fund Reports," chronicling latest worldwide developments; and "Population and Family Planning in the People's Republic of China." Also distributes reprints of President Nixon's "Message to Congress on Population" and "The Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970."

Population Council, 245 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017. A non-profit organization specializing in specific and scholarly presentations of population developments. Publishes "Studies in Family Planning" and "Country Reports."

*Population Reference Bureau, 1755 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. A non-profit organization which gathers, interprets & publishes educational & scientific information relating to population issues. Publishes "Population Bulletin," "Profiles," "Selections," and "Population Education Interchange." Recent "Bulletins" include "Man's Population Predicament" and "Population Activities of the United States Government," $.50 each.

*Zero Population Growth, 4080 Fabian Way, Palo Alto, Calif. 94303. A non-profit organization, actively lobbying for population stabilization policies at all levels of government. Includes over 300 local chapters and a Washington, D.C. office. Publishes the "ZPG National Reporter" and distributes educational materials.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has been holding extensive hearings on the problem of congressional and public access to Government documents. Despite the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act of 1966, there has been little reform in this area, and Executive Order No. 11652, which is about to take effect, does more harm than good.

It is apparent that it is time for Congress to act legislatively in a manner which will limit or close altogether some of the loopholes in the Freedom of Information Act and the new Executive order.

At this point, I wish to include in the RECORD the text of my statement to the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee and the report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Secrecy referred to therein:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG

MAY 23, 1972.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I am grateful for the opportunity to testify on the Freedom of Information Act this morning. You and your staff are to be congratulated for the effort and expertise which you have mounted on behalf of this exhaustive inquiry. The whole morass of government record-keeping, classification of information, release of information on a selective basis, and so forth, is almost too complex to define or solve. Information is power, and, like power, is not easily surrendered by those who possess it.

The Freedom of Information Act of 1966 was a frontal assault on the bastion of Executive secrecy. For the first time, the burden

was placed on the government to produce the records of its activities or justify its refusal or failure to do so. Under this Act, the citizen for the first time could appeal to the courts when denied information by a bureaucrat.

The Act has its limitations, however. Vital categories or types of information are exempted from its provision. The exemption most relevant to this inquiry is information that is "specifically required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense and foreign policy."

The Executive order which covers this class of information is Executive Order 10501 of November 5, 1953. One week from today, Executive Order 10501 will be superceded by a new order, Executive Order 11652. This order, said to be the product of a year's study by a committee appointed by the President in response to the furor over the release of the Pentagon Papers, was issued by President Nixon on March 8 and is the subject of a National Security Council directive of May 17.

The new Executive order purports to speed up the process of declassification of records by providing, among other things, for a "mandatory review" at the end of ten years of all classified information to determine whether it should remain classified any longer. The new order further estabilshes a 30-year rule for the automatic declassification of records, giving the Archivist of the United States the authority to declassify records or to request their declassification.

These are improvements, but the time periods are far too long.

Leaving aside certain obvious problems with the language of the order, such as that "mandatory" review turns out to be not mandatory at all, I should like to address the question of just what classified information is.

Under the old order, classified information was "defense information", defined as "official information which requires protection in the interests of the national defense". Under the new order, classified information is expanded to include not only defense information *but also information concerning the foreign relations* of the United States. To quote from Executive Order 11652, "Security information" is "official information or material which requires protection against unauthorized disclosure in the interest of the *national defense or foreign relations* of the United States . . ." (Sec. 1) (emphasis added).

It has been said that war is too important to be left to the generals. I submit that the foreign relations of the United States, upon which depend in large part our internal well-being as well as the external relationships which bring war or peace around the globe, are too important to be left exclusively to the occupant of the White House. Our Constitution clearly gives Congress the duty and right to participate in the conduct of foreign relations.

Who is it, under this order, who decides what "Security Information" is? It is the President of the United States, advised *solely* by a review committee appointed by the National Security Council and chaired by a person designated by the President, presently Ambassador John Eisenhower. The members of the committee are to come *solely* from the Executive branch, without the participation of Congress or other outside members. (Sec. 7(A)).

Who has the authority to declassify "Security Information," once it has been so declared? Again, the President and his subordinates. Under the terms of the new Executive Order, they can refuse to declassify it in perpetuity if they so desire.

Far from being an improvement, this new Order is a dangerous and unwarranted expansion of the powers of the Executive. Like its predecessor, it appears to be unconstitutional, since by giving the President exclusive control over information, it usurps powers expressly granted to Congress in the fields of foreign affairs and national defense.

Further, Section 8 of this order exempts atomic energy information from its provisions, as required by statute. It is time for us to end our worship of the sacred cow of atomic energy. The Congress should take another look at the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act as they pertain to the release of information said to be "born classified" but now twenty-five years of age or more. Like the atom itself, unseen and unheard, this category of information permeates nearly every aspect of our daily lives and our relations with other countries, since it concerns the nuclear balance and our vital energy supplies. It is essential that Congress and the public be fully informed on these matters.

To those who would argue that either atomic energy information or defense information is "technical" or "scientific" information for which our legislators and our people have no need in order to make wise political decisions, I should like to refer to a recently "declassified" report of a Department of Defense Task Force on Secrecy which I wish to submit in full for the record. This board concluded in July 1970 that it was reasonable to suppose that scientific information originated by us would be discovered by others within a period of *one year*. This prestigious task force, composed of some of our most eminent scientists, believed that "more might be gained than lost if our nation were to adopt, *unilaterally if necessary, a policy of complete openness* in all areas of information . . ." (emphasis added).

The task force concluded with an even more remarkable statement: ". . . in spite of the great advantages that might accrue from such a policy [of complete openness], it is not a practical proposal at the present time. The task force believes that such would not be acceptable *within the current framework of attitudes*, both national and international, toward classification." (emphasis added)

The Pentagon's own technical advisory board on secrecy recommended a policy of complete openness and then declared that such a policy was not "acceptable." This, of course, was prior to the publication of the Pentagon Papers and other breaches of this ridiculous security classification system which have since occurred.

Let us hope that these hearings and others to come will demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that the "current framework of attitudes" *has* changed.

But more is needed than a change of attitudes. We need to overhaul the entire apparatus of Cold War legislation which has made this miasma of secrecy possible. The Congress needs to take a fresh look at such basic legislation as the National Security Act, the Espionage Act, the Atomic Energy Act and others.

Some constructive legislation has already been proposed by the former chairman of this sub-committee, Mr. Moss, in association with my colleague from New York, Mr. Reid. H.R. 15006 would amend the Freedom of Information Act to provide for automatic cut-off of funds to agencies which fail to provide information on request after certification to a committee of Congress that they have done so. H.R. 9853, introduced by Congressman Hébert last July, would amend the National Security Act to establish a "Commission on the Classification and Protection of Information" composed of four members of Congress, four members appointed by the President, and four appointed by the Chief Justice. Such a broad group, if established on a permanent basis as a classification review committee, would certainly be an improvement over the National Security Council Review Committee established by the new Executive order.

Mr. Chairman, I understand you plan to introduce in the near future a major amendment to the Freedom of Information Act which would revamp the classification system to make it more responsive to the needs of a democratic society. That is something that needs to be done. I believe Congress should substitute its judgment for that of the Executive classifiers who have a built-in interest in perpetuating secrecy in government.

Another line of approach, which so far as I know has not yet been explored by the sub-committee, may be to amend the Federal Records Act of 1950 which governs records management. This act defines the duties of the Archivist of the United States under the General Services Administration, but gives him no real authority to set guidelines for the maintenance, use and disposition of government records.

Let me sum up this brief statement by urging this committee and other committees of Congress with jurisdiction in the field of information control to have the courage of their convictions. The Freedom of Information Act was "one small step for mankind". I believe it has done some good, but much more work lies before us.

[Report of the Defense Science Board, July 1, 1970]

TASK FORCE ON SECRECY

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1970.

Memorandum for the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Through: The Director of Defense Research and Engineering,
Subject: Final Report of Task Force on Secrecy.

The following report of the Defense Science Board was prepared in response to a request of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering. The study was conducted by a special task force of the Board under the chairmanship of Dr. Frederick Seitz. In his memorandum of submittal. Dr. Seitz emphasizes the need for "major surgery" in the DoD security system.

With the approval of the Defense Science Board, I recommend this report to you for your consideration.

GERALD F. TAPE,
Chairman, Defense Science Board.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1970.

Memorandum for the CHAIRMAN, Defense Science Board.
Subject: DSB Task Force on Secrecy Final Report.

The Task Force on Secrecy herewith submits its final report. This report, which has

been coordinated with all members of the Defense Science Board, concludes the work of the ask Force.

The report addresses specific questions posed by the DDR&E in general terms since time and resources did not permit establishment of detailed steps required to correct the deficiencies identified in the present DoD scientific and technical information security classification system. These actions are more appropriately the responsibility of the cognisant DoD elements.

In addition, the Task Force ocnsidered security classification from the national long range and short range viewpoints. These combined considerations, i.e., the specific questions posed by the DDR&E and the national considerations, resulted in a general conclusion that the DoD security classification system requires major surgery if it is to meet the Defense national and international environment of today, specifically, we found that:

1. It is unlikely that classified information will remain secure for periods as long as five years, and it is more reasonable to assume that it will become known to others in periods as short as one year.

2. The negative aspect of classified information in dollar costs, barriers between U.S. and other nations and information flow within the U.S. is not adequately considered in making security classification determinations. We may gain far more by a reasonable policy of openness because we are an open society.

3. Security classification is most profitably applied in areas close to design and production, having to do with detailed drawings and special techniques of manufacture rather than research and most exploratory development.

4. The amount of scientific and technical information which is classified could profitably be decreased perhaps as much as 90 percent by limiting the amount of information classified and the duration of its classification.

General recommendations to correct these deficiencies are contained in the report.

FREDERICK SEITZ,
Chairman, Task Force on Secrecy.

PREFACE

Late in 1969 the Defense Science Board established the Task Force on Secrecy to consider questions pertinent to the classification of information in all stages of research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), as well as procurement and deployment.

The members of the Task Force were as follows:

Dr. Frederick Seitz (Chairman).

Dr. Alexander H. Flax.

Dr. William G. McMillan.

Dr. William B. McLean.

Dr. Marshall N. Rosenbluth.

Dr. Jack P. Ruina.

Dr. Robert L. Sproull.

Dr. Gerald F. Tape.

Dr. Edward Teller.

Mr. Walter C. Christensen (Staff Assistant).

In the course of its discussions, the Task Force consulted a number of individuals and groups, among whom were the following persons:

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Dr. Gardiner L. Tucker, Principal Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Dr. Luis W. Alvarez, Professor of Physics, University of California, Berkeley.

Mr. Joseph J. Liebling, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Security Policy).

Dr. Donald M. MacArthur, Deputy Director (Research & Technology), ODDR&E.

Lt. Colonel John M. MacCallum, Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Dr. Michael M. May, Director, and associates, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

Mr. Walter McGough, Acting Special Assistant (Threat Assessment), ODDR&E.

Mr. Rodney W. Nichols, Special Assistant to the Deputy Director (Research & Technology, ODDR&E.

Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, USN, Director of Nuclear Power, Naval Ship Systems Command.

Rear Admiral Levering Smith, USN, Director, Strategic Systems Project Office, Naval Material Command.

Dr. Eugene Wigner, Professor of Physics, Princeton University.

SUMMARY

General Comments

1. The Task Force considered the matter of classification from several viewpoints; however, it focused its main attention on the classification of scientific and technical information.

2. The Task Force noted that it is unlikely that classified information will remain secure for periods as long as five years, and it is more reasonable to assume that it will become known by others in periods as short as one year through independent discovery, clandestine disclosure or other means.

3. The Task Force noted that the classification of information has both negative as well as positive aspects. On the negative side, in addition to the dollar costs of operating under conditions of classification and of maintaining our information security system, classification establishes barriers between nations, creates areas of uncertainty in the public mind on policy issues, and impedes the flow of useful information within our own country as well as abroad.

4. The Task Force noted that more might be gained than lost if our nation were to adopt—unilaterally, if necessary—a policy of complete openness in all areas of information, but agreed that in spite of the great advantages that might accrue from such a policy, it is not a practical proposal at the present time. The Task Force believes that such a policy would not be acceptable within the current framework of national attitudes toward classified Defense work. A number of areas of information in which classification may be expected to continue are listed in the text.

5. The Task Force noted that the types of scientific and technical information that most deserve classification lie in those phases close to the design and production, having to do with detailed drawings and special techniques of manufacture. Such information is similar to that which industry often treats as proprietary and is not infrequently closer to the technical arts than to science. The Task Force believes that most of the force of attention in classifying technical information should be directed to these phases rather than to research and exploratory development.

6. In the opinion of the Task Force the volume of scientific and technical information that is classified could profitably be decreased by perhaps as much as 90 percent through limiting the amount of information classified and the duration of its classification. Such action would better serve to protect that information necessarily classified since then the regulations concerning the enforcement of classification could be applied more rigorously than at present.

Recommendations

General

1. *Selectivity in classifying.* In overhauling our classification guides the advantages that might accrue from inhibiting the acquisition of the information by a competitor or potential enemy through classification should be balanced against the advantages of possibly speeding development in the U.S. through not classifying the information.

2. *Time limit on classification.* Whenever a document is classified a time limit should be set for its automatic declassification. This time limit should be adapted to the specific topic involved. As a general guideline, one may set a period between one and five years for complete declassification. (Note, however, the exemptions stated below for certain types of information.) This time limit should be extended only if clear evidence is presented that changed circumstances make such an extension necessary.

3. *Declassification of material now classified.* All material now classified should be reviewed as soon as possible after the adoption of the new policy; we hope this might be accomplished in as short a time as two years. The review should either declassify the document or set an appropriate date for its declassification.

Research, development and deployment

1. As a general rule, research and early development should be unclassified. Thus in the main, 6.1 and 6.2 should be open, while 6.3 may be classified. The partition between 6.2 and 6.3 is not rigid, and classification should be tailored to fit the individual circumstances.

2. In general, we expect classification to be most justifiable when the development approaches the "blueprint" stage. This coincides with the phase when expenditures become substantial. Protection is most desirable when an item requiring a considerable lead time for development is being prepared for deployment.

3. After deployment, classification may be reduced or canceled. At that stage, the information will have been disseminated to many people so tight classification may no longer be realistic. Secrecy will usually be most valuable in maintaining a technological lead during the period of development.

4. The Task Force believes that the "Confidential" category is not appropriate for R&D programs and that "special access" limitations are more likely than not to seriously impede difficult technical programs.

PLANS AND OPERATIONS

1. In contrast, the information involved in high-level planning requires rigid protecon a need-to-know basis. To declassify such information would not speed technical development; the contingencies envisaged in such planning may never arise, and their publication may cause ill feelings. The only reason for declassification is the interest of the historian. Stringently limited distribution and extended classification time limits may be justified in this category.

2. Information relating to specific operational plans should remain classified as

long as the plan is in effect—and perhaps even beyond, insofar as declassification could reveal genuine details of possible use to a potential enemy in develping countermeasures. If secrecy is required, the best protection is afforded by frequent changes in the pattern of operations. Classification of a specific operational plan should be promptly canceled if it becomes irrelevant.

Responses to Specific Questions

The Task Force's responses to specific questions posed in its charter are as follows:

Question: Is our security system generally effective in denying to potential enemies DoD information that affects the national security? As a corollary question, how long can we reasonably expect that classified information will remain unknown to potential enemies?

Response: Security has a limited effectiveness. One may guess that tightly controlled information will remain secret, on the average, for perhaps five years. But on vital information, one should not rely on effective secrecy for more than one year. The Task Force believes that classification may sometimes be more effective in withholding information from our friends than from potential enemies. It further emphasizes that never in the past has it been possible to keep secret the truly important discoveries, such as the discovery that an atomic bomb can be made to work or that hypersonic flight is possible.

Question: Granted that excessive use is being made of classification and limitations on distribution, what practical steps can be taken to better define the DoD information that should be protected in the interest of national security? Consideration of this question should include the cost and effect of controlling DoD information to the U.S. and its allies, versus the benefits to potential enemies of its open release.

Response: Starting from the premise that the interests of an open society and the speedy exploitation of technology are best served by minimal classification consistent with essential security, the Task Force identified a number of critical areas to be discussed below, in which continued classification appears justified. These critical areas span a much narrower region, however, than is now included under existing classification rules.

The Task Force felt equipped to recommend only general philosophy, as opposed to detailed classification guidelines. Also, we did not consider monetary costs of security measures but only their likely inhibition on U.S. technological development.

Specifically, it is recommended that the present emphasis, that promotes classification, be reversed to discourage classification by requiring in each instance of classification:

A meaningful written justification by the initiator of the classification action; and

A time limit on the classification, as short as possible, which could be extended with detailed justification.

Question: Are there key points in the research, development, production and deployment cycle at which information should be controlled? That is, should we adopt the policy that all DoD research be unclassified and freely available and therefore impose controls only on information pertaining to specific pieces of hardware? One point which should be carefully considered here is the additional lead time that will be available to a potential enemy if he obtains knowledge of our significant research and technology activities and thus can predict its end use in a weapon system.

Response: The Task Force has weighed the detrimental effect of security controls on the conduct of R&D programs against the need to meet other national objectives and to avoid disclosures beneficial to potential enemies. It appears that little is to be gained by classifying basic research; it is noted that DoD policy and practices are already in virtually complete accord with this view. Similarly, it seems that, as a general rule, much of the early exploratory development could be kept unclassified. Exceptions should require formal documentation and formal approval by OSD; each approval of classification in this category should be accompanied by a rigid deadline for declassification.

For all other development work, including advanced exploratory development and advanced development, classification procedures similar to those employed today are suitable. The criteria should be sharpened, however, so that classification may be imposed only to preclude major technological advantages to potential enemies, to prevent disclosure of information of major importance in the development of countermeasures, or to support national policy directives and regulations. Within this framework, the classification of each system, component, subsystem or technique in advanced development should be considered individually on its own merits. Here, too, a rigid schedule for declassification should be imposed from the beginning.

Major programmatic changes in any category of classified R&D should be accompanied by reconsideration of the program's security classification. Particularly, when a system is operationally deployed, the large increase in known system technology and its diffusion among many people should be recognized and classification should be revised accordingly, with major emphasis on preventing disclosure of system vulnerabilities and on forestalling the early development of specific countermeasures by potential enemies.

DISCUSSION OF PRIME FACTORS AND EFFECTS IN CLASSIFICATION

1. General signification of classification

Although the Task Force was composed of individuals whose backgrounds are in science and engineering, the group sought responses to its assignment from a broader viewpoint since it was felt quite strongly that the issue of classification and the way it is handled has a significant effect on the posture of our nation in the international community, particularly in relation to our ability to unite and strengthen the free nations of the world. To emphasize this point, one of the members quoted an opinion expressed by Niels Bohr soon after World War II that, while secrecy is an effective instrument in a closed society, it is much less effective in an open society in the long run; instead, the open society should recognize that openness is one of its strongest weapons, for it accelerates mutual understanding and reduces barriers to rapid development.

We believe that overclassification has contributed to the credibility gap that evidently exists between the government and an influential segment of the population. A democratic society requires knowledge of the facts in order to assess its government's actions. An orderly process of disclosure would contribute to informed discussions of issues.

When an otherwise open society attempts to use classification as a protective device, it may in the long run increase the difficulties of communications within its own structure so that commensurate gains are not obtained. Experience shows that, given time, a sophisticated, determined and unscrupulous adversary can usually penetrate the secrecy barriers of an open society. The Soviet Union very rapidly gained knowledge of our wartime work on nuclear weapons in spite of the very high level of classification assigned to it. The barriers are apt to be far more effective against restrained friends or against incompetents, and neither pose serious threats.

Beyond such general matters, the Task Force noted that there are frequent disclosures of classified information by public officials, the news media and quasi-technical journals. While the reliability and credibility of such information frequently may be in doubt, the magnitude of leaks indicates that, at present, our society has limited respect for current practices and laws relating to secrecy. It would be prudent to modify the present system to one that can be both respected and enforced.

2. Some major areas in which classification should continue

The Task Force recognized that there are major areas in which classification is either traditional or expected. The Task Force did not attempt to reach unanimity on the extent to which such classification is necessary. The following are examples of such areas:

2.1 International Negotiations

There are many international negotiations in which discussions are facilitated by secrecy, even though the results may eventually be disclosed. Secrecy permits greater freedom of discussion at the conference table and the consideration of a much wider framework of new ideas and proposals than might otherwise be the case.

2.2 Plans for Hypothetical Emergencies

It is frequently advantageous to classify plans for assumed emergencies in order to limit their circulation. Such plans may include alarming contingencies that may never occur at all—or, at least, not be realized in the way assumed when the plans were developed.

2.3 Tactical and Operational Plans

There are many tactical and operational plans that would lose their effectiveness, or even be jeopardized, if they were not maintained secure for at least a limited period of time. For example, detailed plans for the disposition and operation of the Polaris fleet, or the state of readiness of combat groups prior to engagement may, for purposes of effectiveness, deserve to be classified for a specified period of time.

2.4 Intelligence Information

Information gained through intelligence channels often must be classified for a period of time in order to protect the sources of information, that would dry up if revealed. Nevertheless, intelligence that is critical to an understanding of our national posture should be disseminated as soon as possible, and in as much detail as feasible (consistent with not compromising our collection capability). Careful consideration should be given to the question: To what extent could openness and international sharing of information gathered by physical observation improve our position?

2.5 Specific R&D efforts

There may be a good reason for limiting disclosure of the magnitude and direction of our efforts in specific fields of research and development for a time, when plans for production are congealing, in order to maximize the advantages gained through lead time. In all such cases we must continue to recognize

that the lead gained will be transitory unless each advance is followed by another.

2.6 Vulnerabilities

It appears essential to restrict information concerning major weaknesses of operational systems, particularly before remedies for those weaknesses are completed. At the same time, one must ensure that such restrictions do not result in the lack of recognition of the problem or in failure to remedy the situation.

3. General classification philosophy

Some members of the Task Force are inclined to view that, as a nation, we would have more to gain in the long run by pursuing a policy of complete openness in all matters. For example, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) might be more realistic if they were accompanied by a full and open public disclosure of knowledge of weapons capabilities and state-of-the-art developments, preferably by both sides, but at least on our part—especially what we know about Soviet systems. In this way, the Congress and the general public would be better informed regarding the significance of the SALT discussions. Similarly, some members of the Task Force feel that public discussion of matters such as the Safeguard system would be given a more realistic basis if intelligence information and analysis were made openly available, even if this meant disclosing information on certain collection techniques, providing these would not be jeopardized by open discussion.

Nevertheless, the Task Force eventually agreed that it would be very difficult to obtain broad acceptance of highly radical changes in classification at this time because of understandable conservatism and deeply ingrained attitudes. Such attitudes would make it difficult to alter significantly present laws and regulations. The most that can be hoped for in the short run is that the present system might be overhauled extensively in order to make it more realistic, in which case it could be respected and enforced far more completely.

In spite of this area of agreement concerning the necessity for secrecy in limited cases, the Task Force emphasizes that there are very great disadvantages to extensive reliance on secrecy in our society.

4. Classification of technical information

With respect to technical information, it is understandable that our society would turn to secrecy in an attempt to optimize the advantage to national security that may be gained from new discoveries or innovations associated with science and engineering. However, it must be recognized, first, that certain kinds of technical information are easily discovered independently, or regenerated, once a reasonably sophisticated group decides it is worthwhile to do so. In spite of very elaborate and costly measures taken independently by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to preserve technical secrecy, neither the United Kingdom nor China was long delayed in developing hydrogen weapons. Also, classification of technical information impedes its flow within our own system, and, may easily do far more harm than good by stifling critical discussion and review or by engendering frustration. There are many cases in which the declassification of technical information within our system probably had a beneficial effect and its classification has had a deleterious one:

(1) The U.S. lead in microwave electronics and in computer technology was uniformly and greatly raised after the decision in 1946 to release the results of wartime research in these fields.

(2) Research and development on the peaceful uses of nuclear reactors accelerated remarkedly within our country, as well as internationally, once a decision was made in the mid-1950s to declassify the field.

(3) It is highly questionable whether transistor technology would have developed as successfully as it has in the past 20 years had it not been the object of essentially open research.

As a result of considerations of this kind, the Task Force believes that much of research and exploratory development (essentially all of 6.1, most of 6.2 and some of 6.3) should generally be unclassified; at the same time, we realize that the greatest value of classification rests in the preservation of designs and specialized techniques close to assembly and production and more akin to the technical arts.

In this connection one of the members emphasized that, to the extent that technical information should be safeguarded in behalf of national security, the greatest importance should be attached to what might be called proprietary technical information—information not unlike that relating to fabrication and production which industrial organizations attempt to preserve from competitors. Thus, significant advantages can be obtained in some areas of categories 6.4 and 6.6 by classification. Even here, however, it should be recognized that restrictions on the dissemination of such information may impede its exploitation within our national community at least as much as it impedes these foreign nations which would not scruple to attempt to obtain it through espionage.

5. Classification criteria and limitations

It is the considered opinion of the Task Force that past procedures—according to which classification rested largely on the desire to withhold information from other nations—should be modified to give greater consideration to the effects of classification on our own progress. It should be emphasized that a strong voice, that of the U.S. Congress, is primarily influenced by the requirement to withhold information from others. The effects of classification on our own progress will have to be carefully discussed. We believe that scientific and engineering information, short of detailed blueprints and critical techniques relevant to production, should be classified only after having been justified by very special reasons. At the time of classification, a date should be specified after which the classification would be removed. This period should be as short as possible, and an extension should be granted only when fully justified.

At present, a major proportion of technical information classified Top Secret is subject to a declassification pattern designated as 3–3–6, whereby they are downgraded to Secret in three years and to Confidential in another three, and made open after an additional six years. We believe that, for most technical items, this is much too long.

The Task Force was inclined to the view that the classification category of "Confidential," as applied at present to research and development not bearing immediately on field problems of military interest, is probably useless, or even detrimental, for it prevents normal diffusion of information without providing a really effective barrier to leaks. It probably would be much more realistic to confine this category of classification to matters bearing on military plans and readiness.

For somewhat different reasons, it appeared to the Task Force that the category of "Special Access," as applied to areas of research and technology, should be carefully monitored to avoid unduly limiting the number of competent technical minds that provide innovative contributions in the area. In the one case examined (Eighth Card), the Task Force believes that Special Access should never have been applied. In circumstances such as those that prevailed during World War II, when most of the best scientists and engineers were engaged in classified defense research, on a full-time basis, it may be feasible to bring to bear a suitably diverse spectrum of minds and talents even on those areas designated "Special Access." But this would be exceedingly difficult under present-day conditions when so many competent technologists are associated, if at all, only peripherally to military research and development. The more open the areas of investigation, the more dynamic will be our national approach to the exploratory phases of research and development.

6. Other observations

As a result of limitations on time and staff, the Task Force could not explore all facets of the field of classification. It did, however, attempt to gain an understanding of the way in which classification procedures work at the detailed level in a few cases. The following observations may be made:

(1) Although there are many alert and imaginative professional experts engaged in assigning and administering classification, as long as the classified material remains so voluminous it is obvious that routine procedure can become too burdensome. There is also a quite understandable bureaucratic tendency to overclassify and to continue classification too long. If the amount of classified material could be reduced to, say, 10 percent of its present volume, a much more thoughtful and effective control could be established across the board.

(2) It was noted that the laboratories in which highly classified work is carried out have been encountering more and more difficulty in recruiting the most brilliant and capable minds. One member of the Task Force made the pessimistic prediction that, if present trends continue for another decade, our national effort in weapons research will become little better than mediocre. In classified work, the increasing isolation and limited accountability to one's scientific peers contribute to this degradation. In addition, it is worth noting that the many scientists and engineers in academic circles who are willing to work on problems related to national defense would find it somewhat easier to do so in the environment which prevails at present if the classified areas were reduced greatly, as the Task Force believes should be the case.

(3) The Task Force emphasizes that modifications in the pattern of classification alone will not be a panacea for the difficulties the Defense establishment faces.

THE GROWING SURGE IN CAPITAL SPENDING

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the recent issue of Business

Week contains a report on the growing boom in capital spending that I think bodes well for the continuing recovery of the economy. As I am sure my colleagues are aware, capital spending increased by only 1.9 last year, a figure which implies an actual decline in real outlays if inflation is accounted for. However, since the inauguration of the President's new economic policy last August, the picture has been steadily improving. When McGraw-Hill took its first survey of business spending plans for 1972 in the fall of last year, businessmen projected a moderate 7-percent increase in capital outlays. A second survey completed earlier this year indicated a considerably more healthy 11-percent increase in spending for plant and equipment. And now the results of the last survey, taken between mid-March and mid-April, reveal plans for a vigorous 14-percent expansion of capital outlays, the highest rate of increase since 1966.

Mr. Speaker, throughout modern times a strong upswing in capital spending has been the backbone of a healthy economic recovery. We are in the midst of such an upswing now, which, in my view, demonstrates that the President's economic program is proving to be a success—all the carping of the critics notwithstanding. Moreover, the current surge in capital spending underscores the wisdom of the President's proposals last year to liberalize depreciation of capital assets and to restore the investment tax credit. While I would certainly agree that the 15-percent increase in corporate profits that was registered during the first quarter of this year is primarily responsible for this new willingness to invest in plant and equipment, I do not think it can be denied that these tax measures have contributed in an important way to the corporate cash flow and liquidity that is a necessary precondition for expansion of outlays. It would therefore ill-behoove us, I think, to heed the advice of those who would now call for the repeal of these measures in the name of tax reform just when they are beginning to register a real impact on the economy.

CALIFORNIA'S 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—A RICH AGRICULTURAL AREA

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to report to my colleagues that the two counties I am privileged to represent in the House of Representatives were ranked again last year as two of the richest agricultural producing counties in the Nation. Tulare County ranks second in the Nation with a 1971 total field crop revenue of $402,550,000 and Kern County is third with a total revenue of $360,555,980. Fresno County, the No. 1 county, is adjacent to Tulare County.

My district is located in the agricultural heartland of California, an area which many years ago was a dry barren land. But now it is one of the richest agricultural areas in the world. In fact, agriculture is our number one industry.

Our farmers produce a wide variety of top quality food and fiber, including sugar beets, barley, tomatoes, table grapes, fruit and nuts, potatoes, livestock, dairy and poultry products, and cotton to mention only a few.

I would like to call attention to a May 15th article in the Bakersfield Californian entitled "Tulare Still Second in Ag Wealth" by Pat Geisler. This very fine article provides many facts and figures about the valuation of the 1971 crop in Tulare County, which is my home county. I recommend this article to my colleagues:

[From the Bakersfield Californian, May 15, 1972]

TULARE STILL SECOND IN AG WEALTH

(By Pat Geisler)

PORTERVILLE.—Despite a $5,498,000 dip in field crop revenues last year, Tulare County still is one of the richest agricultural counties in the nation.

It ranks second only to Fresno, which reported a 7 per cent increase of $507,930,000. Kern County is third at $360,555,980.

In his annual report, Agricultural Commissioner Elvin O. "Butch" Mankins of Porterville says field crop revenue dipped 6 per cent from the preceding year, accounting for $4,713,000 of the total decrease from $408,039,000 to $402,550,000.

Field crop valuation was $75,756,000, compared with $80,469,000 in 1970. Declines were noted in sugar beets, from $3,785,000 to $1,649,000; barley, $6,532,000 to $6,480,000; seed cotton, $5,272,000 to $4,027,000; alfalfa hay, $24,400,000 to $22,470,000. Biggest drop was in grain hay, from $210,000 to $81,411.

In most instances, less acreage was harvested than in 1970.

On the plus side, vegetable crop revenue rose 25 per cent from $10,820,000 to $13,526,000. Livestock and poultry revenues went up approximately three per cent, due to higher prices for beef, from $65,082,000 to $66,909,000.

Dairy and poultry products, through production of more milk and a higher price than in 1970, showed a 9 per cent gain at $52,329,000, compared to $48,111,000.

Bearing acreage in citrus was up more than 6,000; almonds, more than 400, wine grapes about 2,000; and orchards, nearly 3,000 acres. Walnut plantings accounted for half the increase; prunes, almonds and citrus, all the rest.

Table grape acreage decreased more than 2,000 acres and nearly 1,500 fewer acres were planted to raisin grapes.

Biggest element in increased vegetable crop revenue was a steady price on tomatoes for most of the season. Increases were noted in squash, cucumbers, peppers and green beans.

A total of 87,658 acres were planted to citrus in 1971; 68,739 in grapes; and 157,907 in deciduous orchards. Of the total, there were 74,026 bearing acres of deciduous and grapes.

Tomatoes harvested on 1,347 acres produced $9,988,000 in revenue compared to $7,095,000 for 1,248 acres in 1970.

Cucumbers grossed $247,000 compared to $153,000 the year before. Green beans for the fresh market brought $145,000 compared to $46,400; but beans for the cannery dropped from $637,000 to $594,000.

Fruit and nut crops were valued at $109,795,000 in 1971, compared to $200,221,000 in 1970; nursery products at $2,874,000 were down from $3,046,000; and apiary products stood at $200,000 compared to $194,000 in 1970.

Seed crop valuation was $101,000; vegetables, $13,526,000; fruits and nuts, $190,795,000; nursery products, $2,874,000; livestock and poultry, $66,969,000.

Mankins' report points up the growing dairy industry, noting that one new dairy comes into Tulare County each month. Dairymen are moving their operations here from Southern California because of increased land costs and the urban squeeze. Also, because the climate, location and "abundant availability of feed makes it even more profitable," said Mankins.

Most herds in the county are Holsteins, but some Guernsey, Jersey and Brown Swiss contribute toward the $45,519,000 in milk production and $2,653,000 in manufactured milk products.

FREDERICK POST EDITORIAL HAILS SUPREME COURT DECISION

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on a case involving the education of children of an Amish sect in Wisconsin. The Frederick Post of Frederick, Md., wrote an excellent editorial on this decision which I would like to share with my colleagues. The editorial follows:

RESTORING LIBERTIES

In a sweeping six to one decision of broad implications, the new Nixon Supreme Court has struck a blow for religious freedom sharply curbing the powers of the states in the field of public education.

With only ultra-leftist Justice William O. Douglas dissenting, the majority opinion read by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger has ruled unconstitutional a Wisconsin law requiring its tiny fragment of the 300-year-old Amish citizens to violate their "religious prohibitions" by sending their children to that state's public high schools.

These tightly knit Amish and some of their fellow Mennonite citizens, of whom there are several thousands near Frederick, both in Maryland and Pennsylvania, have, as the Chief Justice pointedly says in his majority opinion:

"Held for more than 300 years as part of their pacifistic and non-worldly religious creeds, ending the educational training of their children at the sixth grade; won the constitutional right to continue to do so, even though state laws prohibit such action."

Justice Burger's carefully drafted majority opinion, striking down the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruling and similar laws in other states, adds:

"Even a state's paramount responsibility to educate its children and young people must yield precedence when it impinges upon other, and, as in this case, rare instances, of fundamental rights and interests such as religious freedom and the traditional concern of parents with their children's religious upbringing."

But Justice Burger's ruling was careful to spell out that it was a "decision unique unto itself;" and that it should not serve as a "pretext for recent converts to some progressive or more enlightened processes for rearing and educating their children" to find in this placing a more than three centuries old tiny sect of rigid faith above the educational powers of the States," any hope that they, similarly, can hope to find legal sanctuary for defying the educational laws of any state."

In its six to one decision striking down the Wisconsin Supreme Court's decision ordering its Amish citizens to send their young people to public high schools, there are broad implications.

The Amish descendants of the 16th century Swiss *Anabaptists* founded by that great theologian, John Calvin, are dedicated to the Biblical command:

"Be not conformed to this world."

When Charles II of England, who owed the father of Quaker William Penn, the late Admiral Sir William Penn, what was in 1680 the huge debt of $80,000, he paid it off by granting to the humanitarian heir "a deed in fee simple conveying to him and his heirs all of the lands in North America west of the Delaware River between our colony of New York and Maryland;" together with such unlimited powers as to make him in essence a "sovereign," His Majesty asked only that it be named "Pennsylvania" in honor of his late beloved Admiral.

It was Penn, who by sending agents to the various minor German courts offering "complete religious freedom and generous land grants to settlers of all faiths," who first brought the persecuted Amish and Mennonites to America.

Here they by their closely-knitted hard-working, thrifty farming turned Central Pennsylvania and western Maryland into a "land literally flowing with milk and honey."

In his famous diary, our second President, John Adams, describing his visit while en route to the Continental Congress to their "magnificent church and finest organ in America" at Lancaster, Pa., wrote:

"Although they are pacifists and will not bear arms, even General Washington in a letter to the Continental Congress explaining that he has accepted their offer to permit their young men to serve as teamsters with the army in lieu of bearing arms, added that they are a highly admirable people, completely loyal to the Cause, and absolutely sincere in their peculiar religious creed."

Chief Justice Burger's six to one ruling upholding the 300-year-old deeply held nonconformity of these sectarians—who refuse to send their children to public high schools where they will receive no religious instruction of any character or even compensating moral or ethical training—means that carefully planned preliminary steps of the Amish to abandon the United States and emigrate to Canada will now be abandoned.

The Pilgrim Fathers on the cockleshell "Mayflower," who after a three-month saga of incredible suffering in crossing the North Atlantic in the dead of winter, paid an almost incredibly high price to "worship God according to their consciences" in tiny Plymouth Colony; like the Amish placed God above the State.

A decade later, the first tiny vanguard of the more than 50,000 similarly dissenting Puritans landing in Salem Harbor on the "Arbella" (to found the Massachusetts Bay Colony) served as an inspiration to the Amish and Mennonite dissenting sects gratefully accepting William Penn's not only pledged but fulfilled to the letter "guarantee of complete religious freedom," in his new completely owned colony of Pennsylvania.

Justice Burger's re-affirmation 300 years later of the transcending paramount right of "freedom of religious conscience" over the bureaucratic and naked exercise of the power of the state is a most welcome and clarion blow for "religious freedom."

This is the freedom for which our forefathers, at great sacrifice and property loss, abandoned their native European environments to carve out of the virgin wilderness this America, which today we so callously in the name of "conformity" would erode priceless liberties for which brave men and women paid an incalculable price in blood, sweat and tears.

This is more than a victory for a tiny sect refusing, even at the cost of again—after more than 300 years of living as highly respected Americans—fleeing to the sanctuary of neighboring Canada rather than consent to become mere "rubber stamps" of dominating state bureaucracies.

It is a straw in the wind. The new Nixon court in the days just over the horizon may, hopefully, restore to a constantly harassed formerly free American people some of the other "liberties" ruthlessly taken from them in the name of that sacred God—Conformity—by the Warren Court for which their forefathers paid a price so high that it cannot even be calculated today even by the most sophisticated computer.

SMITHSONIAN DRUG EXHIBIT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in this Saturday's New York Times entitled "Smithsonian Perspective." In this excellent article, Dana Adams Schmidt comments upon a most intriguing drug exhibit now being conducted at Washington's Smithsonian Institution.

This exhibit is noteworthy, as Mr. Schmidt so well points out, for its objective, historical approach to the centuries-old phenomenon—the use of narcotics—which is too often the subject merely of propaganda and scare tactics. For too long now our drug education campaigns have perpetrated the illusion that drug abuse is a problem which developed in the modern age, and that the connection between drugs and artistic or religious expression over the centuries is somehow qualitatively different from what is going on today on the street corners of our cities.

Actually, our society has blinded itself to the long history of drug use and abuse, thereby failing to learn from past mistakes—or even to benefit, medically, from past successes.

Educational campaigns in all the media depicting the horrors of narcotics abuse in current times are, of course, a necessary element of an ordered contemporary society. However, an objective investigation into the what, how and why of drug use over the ages can only further our attempts to understand this practice today.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I insert into the RECORD the following informative article by Mr. Schmidt:

DRUGS THROUGH THE AGES, A SMITHSONIAN PERSPECTIVE

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—The season's tourists now beginning to flood into Washington may be puzzled by a "special exhibition" about drugs that they can hardly avoid.

Under a red-and-white canopy in the center of the most frequented building of the Smithsonian Institution, in the midst of the most popular attractions around the Mall, between the Capitol and the Washington Monument, it is "special" in the sense that it does not overtly preach the horrors of drug addiction.

Instead it employs all the devices of classical art, commercial art, pop art and graphic arts—plus neon lighting, vending machines and folk music.

The Smithsonian has tried to put drug abuse into the perspective of the drug-prone culture out of which it grew and of other drug-taking cultures both past and present.

From the permanent collection of space capsules and Charles A. Lindbergh's plane, The Spirit of Saint Louis, hanging from the ceiling of the Industries and Arts Building, the visitor is attracted to a 60-foot-high column whose four sides are illuminated in flashing red, green, blue and yellow lights spelling out the word drugs.

A TRIP TROUGH THE AGES

But first he must pass an expanse of hugely enlarged classic paintings beginning with Michelangelo's 16th-century painting, Expulsion from the Garden of Eden, from the Sistine Chapel ceiling in Rome.

Ronald Beckman, the director of the Research and Design Institute of Providence, R.I., which created this exhibition for the Smithsonian, views the snake depicted in the painting as the original pusher and Adam's acceptance of the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil as the first example of drug abuse.

Other paintings such as Hieronymous Bosch's Garden of Earthly Delights; the Mandala of Shamvara, a 16-century work from a Tibetan lamasery; and The Dream by Henri Rousseau, painted in 1910; were selected to show "what people have been questing after, the visionary and seemingly extrasensory, through the centuries," Mr. Beckman said.

EXPRESSIONS OF THE PAST

On the back of the portable racks displaying these paintings, a collection of old advertisements for patent medicines, many of which purveyed alcohol and morphine, has been assembled that will stir nostalgic sighs from those over fifty. Mr. Beckman sees a relationship between the two displays.

"The elevated experience, the great themes of civilization, which the artists expressed by their skill, this was sought by all in our culture, instantly, chemically," he said.

Here are Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound; Ayer's sarsaparilla, which "purifies the blood, clears the complexion and make the weak strong," and Grove's "tasteless chill tonic," which "makes children and adults fat as pigs," and Burnett's "cocaine for the hair."

From a loudspeaker above one hears appropriate folk tunes, including a German ditty about a Dr. Eisenbart who sings that he "gave 10 pounds of opium to the sexton's son in Didelbaum. He slept night and day for years and hasn't wakened yet."

Around the top of a vending machine, a moving ribbon of illuminated words conveys information about drugs. One sample reads as follows: "Inhalants are airborne drugs, tobacco smoke, laughing gas, paint thinner, moth balls, aerosols, glue, pollutants."

To get into the next attraction, an inflated bubble containing five talking dummies, one must obtain from the machine for 25 cents a brightly colored box with a message about drugs on the back.

The dummies are translucent and illuminated from within by moving film strips of the live model, so that the illusion of life is startling.

Even more startling is the discovery that the dummies—an American Indian, a black man, a housewife, a hippie, and a Burmese woman—do not preach against drugs. Each simply defends his or her own particular kind of drug use.

A collection of photographs entitled "The Human Condition" illustrates the use of drugs in ritual, in medical science, as solace, and in a civilization of abundance.

The last panels display Carl Mydans's famous painting, "Singapore Opium Den," and other scenes of Bowery bums, addicts "shooting up" and a continuous moving picture of a heroin addict "nodding out."

Finally, under the heading "Deceased," are pictures of Marilyn Monroe, Edward R. Murrow, Janis Joplin and Jimi Hendrix, all of whose deaths could be attributed to some form of drug.

These and a concluding set of graphic statistics are the only touches of grimness in an exhibit whose message, according to a notice at the entrance, is that "drug use, misuse and abuse always occur in every * * *

FIFTH ARMY ADJUTANT GENERAL SERVES RESERVISTS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to Secretary of the Army, Robert Froehlke, requesting an exemption from summer camp duty for Vietnam veterans. Most of these men have already served their country on the battlefields of Vietnam. They believe, and justifiably so, that they have already been trained in combat.

Unfortunately, Secretary Froehlke was unable to grant a categorical exemption But I was informed that the Adjutant General's Office would consider exemptions and deferrals on a case-by-case basis. The Adjutant General's office has developed a fairly liberal policy in excusing men from summer camp duty on the basis of employment, family, personal hardship, or community hardship.

Twenty of my constituents have requested my aid in winning exemptions or deferrals. The Adjutant General's Office in St. Louis has made a decision in 12 of the cases. Eleven veterans have been granted an exemption from summer camp duty. There has been only one refusal.

The Adjutant General's Office in St. Louis has been quick, fair, and sympathetic in granting these exemptions. In a day when many citizens complain about a faceless bureaucracy, the Fifth Army Adjutant General's Office is clearly an exception.

I have written to the Adjutant General of the Fifth Army, Brigadier General Prost, and congratulated him for providing such prompt and efficient service to reservists who have a legitimate excuse from summer camp. The letter follows:

MAY 22, 1972.

Brig. Gen. LOUIS J. PROST,
Commanding, U.S. Army Reserve Components Personnel and Administration Center, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR GENERAL PROST: I am writing to express my sincere thanks for the cooperation and leniency you have shown veterans—especially Vietnam veterans—who have requested either an exemption or deferral from summer camp.

The prompt and sympathetic attention given to these requests by the Office of the Adjutant General is very much appreciated by me, as well as the veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

UNITED NATIONS DAY 1972

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has proclaimed by Executive order that—

On October 24, 1972, people around the world will celebrate U.N. Day.

In so doing, the President has proclaimed "honoring an international organization dedicated to the ideals of peace and justice among all nations."

Yet in his proclamation the President says:

Decisions by some members have prevented the United Nations from acting to stop wars.

War or peace no longer being an objective or purpose for the United Nations, the President lauds its "not-so-well-known activities as setting standards for social and technical legislation in many countries."

Perhaps the social standards referred to by the President include the comprehensive child development programs which as late as last month were attributed to UNICEF by U.N. Secretary General Waldheim when he said:

The process of child development has to be the concern of society as a whole—on the national and international level. From the very beginning, the leaders of UNICEF—both board and secretariat—clearly understood this, and I congratulate them for their foresight and vision.

If so, this was similar to the child development legislation that passed both houses and was vetoed by the President December 9, 1971. Despite the President's acknowledgement that the United Nations is not only inept, but refuses to act to stop wars and is dedicated to destruction of the American way of life, he would use his position to dignify a tax-exempt organization, the United Nations Association under the command of former Chief Justice Earl Warren by calling on the "people on all parts of our planet, State and local officials, citizens groups, and agencies of communication—press, radio, television, and motion pictures—to engage in appropriate observances of United Nations Day."

The tragedy of the world, the U.N., the defunct effort of men to realize our aspiration for peace is, therefore, used as an early effort for political expediency. The President has made his U.N. proclamation in May because he hopes that those who are uninformed will have forgotten about his international role by November when he again faces the American electorate, seeking their votes as an American leader.

I include the proclamation which appeared in the Federal Register, Volume 37, No. 100, Tuesday, May 23, 1972:

[From the Federal Register, Vol. 37, No. 100—Tuesday, May 23, 1972]

UNITED NATIONS DAY, 1972

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

On October 24, 1972, people around the world will celebrate United Nations Day. It is fitting that people on all parts of our planet should join on this day in honoring an international organization dedicated to the ideals of peace and justice among all nations.

The United Nations has faced great obstacles as it has worked toward the achievement of these goals. Political differences among nations have hindered its progress. Decisions by some members have prevented the United Nations from acting to stop wars. The organization's financial difficulties are also well-known.

Not so well-known, however, are many of the constructive activities of the United Nations which have achieved impressive successes over the years. The United Nations has made significant contributions, for example, by facilitating international transportation and communication, preventing the spread of diseases, and setting standards for social and technical legislation in many countries.

In recent months and years, the United Nations has also helped to establish safeguards to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, helped to establish the rule of law in outer space and the oceans, provided technical assistance to the developing nations, promoted family planning, and worked to protect the environment. In addition, it has taken important steps to curb the traffic in addictive drugs, to protect diplomats from terrorism and travelers from hijackings, and to protect the rights of refugees and prisoners of war.

Any balance sheet of the performance of the United Nations must take these activities into account. They indicate that the United Nations and its affiliated agencies are work-

ing to build the foundations for a better world.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Tuesday, October 24, 1972, as United Nations Day. I urge the citizens of this Nation to observe that day with community programs which will promote understanding and support for the United Nations and its affiliated agencies.

I have appointed Mr. Robert O. Anderson to be United States National Chairman for United Nations Day and, through him, I call upon State and local officials to encourage citizens' groups and agencies of communication—press, radio, television, and motion pictures—to engage in appropriate observances of United Nations Day in cooperation with the United Nations Association of the United States of America and other interested organizations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-two, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-sixth.

RICHARD NIXON.

[FR Doc. 72-7828 Filed 5-19-72; 2:01 pm].

RIOTING IN LITHUANIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the public is focused on the President's trip to Moscow, it is well for us to keep in mind that he is visiting the heads of a dictatorial state in which millions of non-Russians are constantly persecuted for their religious beliefs and their cultural and national traditions.

A story filed from the Chicago Tribune Press Service by its Moscow bureau chief, James Yuenger, which was carried in the Monday, May 22, edition of the Chicago Tribune, tells of a young Lithuanian Catholic who burned himself to death in protest against the oppression of Lithuanian people by the Russian occupiers of that previously free country. I believe this story deserves as much attention in Russia as it does here but, unfortunately, freedom of the press is not enjoyed in the USSR. This manipulation of the press is one of the vehicles used by the Soviets to suppress the nationalistic spirit of non-Russians such as the Lithuanians.

Mr. Speaker, I have written to our Embassy in Moscow enclosing this article asking that the President be appraised of this development.

The article follows:

IMMOLATION SPARKS RIOTING IN LITHUANIA

(By James Yuenger)

Moscow, May 21.—A young Lithuanian Catholic burned himself to death in the city of Kaunas on May 14, triggering two days of riots by young nationalists which brought the deaths of one and possibly two policemen.

There was no visible unrest in Kaunas today. Reliable sources reported that the streets of the big, bustling manufacturing city were still jammed with police arresting long-haired and other "suspicious" people.

POLICE STAND GUARD

The site near the center of town where suicide of Roman Talanta, 20, took place was cordoned off by police standing guard. Flowers thrown there by sympathizers had been removed.

The incident was the most striking in a week that has seen redoubled efforts by the authorities to prevent demonstrations during President Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union which begins tomorrow.

Scores of political dissidents and activist Jews have been warned to lie low during the visit. They have been threatened with terms in prison or labor camps. Jews were told that any demonstrating would foreclose their chances of emigrating to Israel.

JEWS SEND PETITION

Nonetheless, a new petition signed by 302 Jews from several cities has been forwarded to the American Embassy here. It speaks of new "reprisals" and appeals directly to Nixon to urge the Kremlin to permit more emigration of Russian Jews.

The story of Talanta's self-immolation filtered thru to Moscow during the last couple of days by telephone from Kaunas, a town of 400,000 which western newsmen are not permitted to visit.

All the details are not yet available, however, reliable sources provided this information:

Talanta, a factory worker and night school student, decided for "political reasons" to kill himself.

At noon on Sunday, May 14, he went to a park near the Kaunas Music Theater in the center of town, poured three liters of gasoline over himself, and set fire to it. He died 12 hours later.

The sources—which subsequently have been threatened with imprisonment on charges of "anti-Soviet slander" for transmitting the information to Moscow—were not able to say more about Talanta's motivations.

It is noteworthy, however, that he was Catholic. Lithuania contains most of the Soviet Union's estimated 3 million Catholics. Kaunas is a hotbed of both nationalist and religious feeling.

Two months ago its residents contributed a bitter petition in which more than 17,888 Lithuanian Catholics demanded of Communist Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev that he end suppression of Catholic religious practices there.

POLICE CAN'T CONTROL

Talanta's funeral was held Thursday. Almost immediately thousands of young Lithuanians swarmed into the streets shouting "freedom, freedom, freedom", and "Freedom for Lithuania."

Truncheon-swinging local police could not control them, and on Friday, troops of the feared "internal forces" were sent in.

The sticks and stones in the hands of the demonstrators were no match for the riot-helmeted troops, altho one policeman reportedly died later in a hospital of injuries inflicted by the rioters. The sources could not confirm that a second had died.

Apparently no guns were used by the authorities. Several hundred people were reportedly arrested. No count of total casualties among the rioters is available.

The rioting ended Friday. The local Communist Party newspaper, Kaunas Truth, said yesterday an examination of Talanta's personal effects showed that he had been mentally ill and a drug addict.

This report was predictable and widely disbelieved, the sources said. There is virtually no drug addiction in the Soviet Union and the authorities have often leveled the spurious charge that dissenters are insane.

CLAUD AIKMAN DISCUSSES MEAT PRICES AND THE FAMILY BUDGET

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently about the price of meat. Cattle producers have, erroneously, received much of the blame. The fact is that costs for all commodities and services have risen sharply in recent years. But very little of this can be charged to producers.

Only recently has meat prices to producers exceeded parity—for the first time in 62 years. Those who raise cattle are finally recovering to the levels of 20 years ago, and this does not take into account the depreciated dollar.

The USDA reports farm food prices are up 7 percent in the past 20 years; yet during that same period production costs to the farmer have doubled, not including real estate taxes, farm machinery prices, and other cost factors. And it is significant that during this same 20-year period farmworker's output is more than three times what it was.

It has been determined that most of the increase in costs to consumers must be attributed to the middlemen.

An interesting and revealing discussion of the meat aspects of the family budget is contained in a letter to the editor of West Texas Livestock Weekly, May 11, 1972, issue, written by Claud E. Aikman. It is well worth reading. The article follows:

[From the West Texas Livestock Weekly, May 11, 1972]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DEAR EDITOR: Along about the middle of April, I happened to be in Tulsa, and there picked up the April 14th issue of "Life Magazine." What prompted me, primarily, was the picture of a thick T-bone steak on the cover. Being near noon and a bit hungry, this appetizing picture made my stomach turn over, but the caption to the picture did a bit more than that to my feeble mind.

Said caption read: "Outrage at the check-out counter". "Who gets all that money for beef?" "How a family copes with food bills."

My hunger pains subsided as I eagerly opened the magazine to satisfy my mental hunger for the "vittels" within. Being a cattle raiser with a cow and calf operation up in the Flint Hills of Eastern Kansas, I knew for dadgum sure that I was not getting more than my fair share.

Turning to page 32B, there was the harried couple at the supermarket meat counter, and on page 37, there was the "meat" of this meaty deal, a porterhouse steak, cut up in five parts, each part showing how the cattle raiser, the feeder and others in the production line from the ranch to the table, divied up the ultimate selling returns from a pound of U.S. Choice steak.

The rancher came out tops with 81 cents, and down the line, the supermarket got 33 cents, the feedlot operator 30, the packing house 3 and the truckers also 3 cents. It seems that all made a little profit but no one got rich in the total operation.

On page 36, appear the Fred Green family, of Arizona, with their three children, Cheri, Robin, and Ricky. They are not what one

would call "poor," as between them they take home upwards of $14,000 a year. Peeking into their budget, I found that they allocated $165 per month for food, which is about 14 percent of their monthly take home pay. I might add that this is 2 percent less than that of the average American head of family, and about one fourth of that in Russia and the Iron Curtain Countries.

Out of this $165 monthly food bill they spend about $53 per month for meat and poultry, explaining that one night they have hamburgers, at 98 cents per pound, and a second night, hot dogs at 73 cents a package. Myrna laments: "We haven't had a steak for I don't know how many months" and she goes on: "Food isn't gold plated. Why should it cost so much?"

Looking into their way of life, there were two station wagons parked at the doors of the garage, and here's the one that had me reaching for the Kleenex, the swimming pool with upkeep or payments at $56 per month. This little item is larger than the entire meat bill for the family. Dispense with it and Myrna could stuff the kids with tender, juicy pot roasts and yard-cooked steaks several times a week. And the bill at the dentists, for $86 per month might be less on a better diet.

While my heart bleeds for the Green family and others in the same plight, I will save some tears for the little cattle raiser, holding his flock together during long drouths by the feed he can buy through the kindness of his local banker, and the farm feed-lot owner, slushing through the mud and snow of winter days, finishing the animals for the table. I wonder how many of these hombres have a swimming pool, or even two station wagons?

CLAUD E. AIKMAN.