procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 522. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should take the necessary steps to initiate active negotiations seeking agreement with the Soviet Union on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear test explosions, to work toward extension of a prohibition against nuclear testing to the other nuclear powers, including France and China, and to declare and observe an indefinite moratorium on all nuclear test explosions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CONTE, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. STRATTON):

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the current situation in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOW, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LINK, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. MYERS):

H. Res. 799. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 800. Resolution to provide funds for the second session, 92d Congress, for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 217; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FORESTRY INCENTIVES ACT OF 1972

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 92d Congress faces an unusually complex and broad challenge. The range of issues and problems demanding action by the Members of this body is immense. A sense of urgency is evident throughout—including real concern over the great need to enhance and protect our priceless natural environment.

In comparison, my purpose today is a simple one but it does deserve priority attention. It does provide an important opportunity to strengthen the Nation's forestry programs and this, of course, can be of immense value in the years ahead.

A few short months ago the House of Representatives unanimously voted in favor of H.R. 8817—a bill that I am very proud to have introduced. This prompt action and strong support by the Members of the House did not surprise me. All of us have a deep awareness of the vital importance of the renewable forest resources on which our Nation relies. It was obvious that the highly successful cooperative wildfire protection program under the Clarke-McNary Law of 1924 should not be allowed to be constrained by dollar ceilings on Federal participation that was set many years ago. Similarly, we saw that it was time to remove the constraints set more than 20 years ago on Federal participation under the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950. In the latter case we also recognized and met the need to broaden the scope of the law to include technical assistance in protecting and establishing trees and shrubs which are needed to enhance the environmental quality of urban areas and communities. Your unanimous support last year paved the way for urgently needed, intensified and broadened Federal participation in funding forest resource protection and technical assistance in forestry and related activities.

Additional legislation is urgently needed to complement and roundout cooperative forestry efforts. This is the bill I am introducing today. I am speaking of a forestry incentive program. This bill is built upon the foundation of time-tested procedures and arrangements between the U.S. Forest Service, and other Federal agencies, State forestry organizations, private landowners, and others. The bill provides renewed emphasis, a broadened scope of activities, and a positive-effort toward motivating nonindustrial forest landowners to increase the flow of public benefits from the management and use of the resources they control.

The Members of this distinguished body need no reminder of the fact that the public spotlight is on the Nation's forest lands. Never, have I seen more intense interest in what is taking place in the woods. Battle lines are drawn between those who would lock up and preserve the forest landscape intact and those who see the need to increase the flow of timber, water, wildlife, and outdoor recreation opportunities to meet the urgent needs of the American citizen of today and tomorrow. To date the debate has centered on the public lands—particularly the National Forests. Difficult problems exist and hard decisions must yet be made by the Congress in this regard.

But, happily, there is another side to the coin—another string to our forestry bow, if you will—the 300 million acres of timberland owned by some four million Americans. These smaller tracts constitute 59 percent of the Nation's productive forest land base—more than three times the comparable acreage in the great National Forest System. These lands already—in the aggregate—produce huge amounts of the pulpwood, sawlogs and other timber products needed by America's growing economy. However, these small properties are producing at only a fraction of their potential—half or less in terms of wood products. In terms of wildlife production; use for hunting, hiking, and other outdoor recreation activities, the fraction is probably even smaller. Natural beauty and watershed protection are examples of additional public benefits that can be substantially increased from these lands.

When protection from wildfires and adequate technical assistance to guide their efforts are assured—the last remaining obstacle preventing owners of small forest properties from managing and developing their resources is the motivation and the funds needed to make the necessary investments. Planting trees, cultural work in established stands, seeding to prevent soil erosion, creating improved wildlife habitat, providing public access for recreational use—these all cost money. Prospective dollar returns on investments to produce benefits to the public frequently are insufficient to encourage the landowner to make the necessary additional expenditures. Now it should be noted that landowners already are making a sizeable investment. The purchase price of the land, or income foregone that could come from sale of the land, the annual taxes, and other expenses are borne by the landowner. A program of financial incentives is needed to trigger the forestry investments that can result in major increases in public benefits from these lands. That is what my new bill is all about. I consider such incentives justified because the public benefits that accrue from well tended forest land are significant.

Without going into detail regarding these public benefits, let me cite just three examples. Expanding demands for lumber, pulp and other products needed to meet housing and other needs are clearly evident. For example—housing starts in 1971 set an all-time high. These pressures will increase the relative prices to be paid by future consumers unless well-planned investments on these lands are made now. To dampen future price rises, we need to assure an abundant supply of timber of the species and sizes needed in the future. Clearly it is better to provide Federal incentive funds now rather than permit wood to price itself out of much of its present and potential market. Significantly higher prices will add to consumer costs, and worse, will encourage use of substitutes which must come from the Nation's store of nonrenewable resources rather than its renewable forest resource. These 300 million acres can indeed hold the key to the adequacy of future supplies.

As another example, if we are successful in meeting an increased portion of the total timber demand through harvests on these lands, the extreme pressures falling on public forest lands will be eased. As landowners are motivated

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to manage and improve the productivity of their forests there should be a significant "trade-off" that could help achieve the more balanced use and development of the National Forests that my good friend Ed Cliff, chief of the Forest Service, and others are seeking.

Another obvious benefit from investments is that thousands of idle acres of forest land can be made productive. Many new jobs will be created in performing the needed cultural, tree planting and other work in the forests. Employment will be multiplied in the future as the results of this work are translated into more jobs in timber, recreation and related industries. Rural communities and families will receive a much needed economic boost now and in the years ahead. New jobs are important, too, in the stimulus to rural areas which obviously can result.

The need for this proposed incentives program is well established. It has been clearly identified by the U.S. Forest Service and other Federal agencies. According to recent national inventories, millions of acres of nonindustrial private forest land needs reforestation—and almost half of the 300 million acres in these holdings need cultural treatment to improve the growth and quality of the stand and to replace diseased and defective trees. Forest industries, particularly in the South, have spelled out in detail what is needed. Many of my colleagues are well aware of the report "The South's Third Forest"—a comprehensive review of the current and prospective need for forestry incentives in that key region of the country. State Foresters and their staff people have long urged action to motivate forest landowners toward making the necessary investments—as well as to protect their lands from wildfire and to manage the resources they have available to work with on the ground. The American Forestry Association and their cooperators in the current "Trees for People" movement are also working hard to shape and encourage a forestry incentives program. The National Association of Conservation Districts is another example of a major organization that has long recognized the need for forestry incentives.

In short, there will be strong and widespread support for the approach proposed in the forestry incentives bill. Enactment of this legislation should rank in long-term significance with other milestone forestry laws. It will add to the framework of the cooperation between private-State-and Federal partners that is the hallmark of American forestry.

The essence of the "Forestry Incentives Act of 1972" is encouragement of nonindustrial forest landowners to apply forestry practices that will result in a wide range of public benefits. The primary incentive will be to share the costs of installing these practices. For example, tree planting, or land treatments to prevent soil erosion. The Federal or "public" share of the cost will not exceed 80 percent of the total expenditures in installing the practices. However, cost-sharing or grants up to the full cost of establishing specific practices designed to improve wildlife habitat, conserve soil and water, and protect or enhance environmental quality will be possible.

Cost-sharing will also be made available to local associations or groups of nonindustrial forest landowners to help secure the equipment, trained manpower, planting stock or other materials needed to carry out the practices. State Forestry Conservation Committees will be formed to determine needs, allocate funds by counties, and establish the level of cost-share payments appropriate for approved forestry practices installed under the act. Membership will include landowners, the State Forester, the Director of the Rural Environmental Assistance program, and others. Private consultant foresters will be invited to be represented. Forested counties may establish a similar committee. Full use will be made of existing County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

State committees may elect to allocate Federal funds available to them for cost sharing by using a bid system. If so, landowners contracting to carry out specific practices at the lowest Federal cost per acre or other unit of measure shall have first priority.

Other incentives to be explored by the Secretary of Agriculture under this bill are loans, loan guarantees, and annual payments for establishment and maintenance of approved practices. Pilot programs to test these and related types of incentives are authorized—for example, low-interest, deferred payment and long-term loans.

This act is designed and intended to complement and supplement and be coordinated fully with existing related programs. Full use will be made of private firms, agencies, and individuals available and interested in furnishing services and materials needed in the application of practices included in this program.

Mr. Speaker, the Forestry Incentives Act of 1972 is legislation that I am proud to present for consideration by you and our colleagues in the Congress. I know that many Members share my recognition of the needs that must be met. We know that hundreds of thousands of landowners and millions of citizens are deeply interested in growing trees and doing what they can to protect and improve the natural environment. They will support the approach outlined in the Forestry Incentive Act and applaud enactment of this vital new piece of conservation legislation. I urge your consideration and welcome your support.

NIXON'S ARMS BUDGET HARDLY SEEMS "PROMISCUOUS"

HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon recently submitted his defense budget to Congress and we again hear the hue and cry of the antimilitary establishment. It is time to stop and seriously evaluate just what we are really talking about in terms of defense posture and force modernization, particularly vis-a-vis the growing strength of the Soviet Union. I read with particular interest a recent column by Crosby S. Noyes in the Washington Star and include this article at the conclusion of my remarks:

NIXON'S ARMS BUDGET HARDLY SEEMS "PROMISCUOUS"

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Undoubtedly, the most controversial item in President Nixon's budget request for next year is an increase of $6.3 billion for the Defense Department. Undoubtedly also, the controversy to come will have very little to do with the real defense needs of the country.

The money is needed, according to the President, for an essential modernization of our defense forces. The bulk of the new money would go toward the development of a new family of long-range missile submarines, the construction of modern ships, planes and other weapons whose acquisition lagged during the Vietnam war, and higher pay, aimed at an all-volunteer armed service by the middle of next year.

Mr. Nixon noted that "A demagogue may find it easy to advocate that we simply allocate necessary defense dollars to social programs," and he is right about that. Immediately his budget was roundly denounced by his political opposition as "too pro-military," whatever that may mean. So far as Sen. Edward M. Kennedy was concerned, he deplored what he called the "promiscuous increase of billions for defense, when what we really need is billions for schools, homes and health. . . ."

It is not to be expected that the coming debate will provide anything resembling a full and rational discussion of our real defense needs. The political perception these days is that any attack on the military and the defense establishment, whether justified or not, is sure-fire stuff with the voters, and the image of an overgrown and wasteful "military-industrial establishment" is firmly engraved in the public consciousness.

It is also very difficult for the average citizen to choose between the generalities with which he is confronted. He is told by the President that, "We can only negotiate and maintain peace if our military power is second to none."

But he also is told that our reliance on "military solutions" to the problems of the world is the surest way of getting involved in more Vietnams.

Among the Democratic candidates, only Sen. George McGovern so far has attempted a rational analysis of our defense needs. Starting from a number of optimistic assumptions about the mission the forces will be called on to perform, the capability potential of enemies and the performance of our potential allies, he has come up with a defense budget figure of $54.8 billion for 1975. This, he figures, is some $20 billion less than the present Nixon budget, translated into 1975 dollars.

His program includes some startling departures, including the virtual scrapping of our present land-based strategic weapons system, the reduction of American NATO forces by 180,000 and the reduction of our force of aircraft carriers from 16 to 6. Whether or not one agrees with McGovern's basic assumptions, he has at least come up with a plausible version of his own concept of "sufficiency" in national defense.

There is, however, a very serious flaw to any concept of sufficiency as fixing sound and stable limits to what is required in the way of military hardware. It steadfastly ignores what the enemy is trying to do in developing his own military capability and assumes that enough's enough in any circumstances.

In the case of Russia and the United States, it overlooks the extraordinary efforts that the Soviet Union has been making in recent years to establish a position of clear predominance in every field of weaponry. Today the Russians greatly outclass the United States in all classes of strategic nuclear weapons,

except submarine-launched missiles—and they are building those at a rapid rate. Their ground forces heavily outnumber ours.

As a Naval power, the Soviet Union is also now in a position to challenge the United States. It has the largest fleet of conventional submarines, cruisers, destroyer escorts and patrol boats in the world. It has by far the strongest force of surface to surface missile launching ships. In contrast to the American Navy, most of whose ships are more than 20 years old, the Soviet fleet is newer, faster and equipped with far more advanced weapons than ours.

A recently released report by some members of the President's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel draws a somber conclusion: "In the most optimistic view, a precarious order will continue as the two superpowers maintain an uncertain balance of deterrence. A less optimistic view, and one supported by the weight of the evidence, is that the United States will become a 'second rate' power subordinate to manifest Soviet military superiority."

In that case, Mr. Nixon's "promiscuous" budget request seems modest enough.

FCC TO INVESTIGATE THE AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was as pleased as probably most Members of this House were to read in the Federal Register this weekend that the Federal Communications Commission has made the monumental decision to reverse itself once again and accept its responsibility to pursue an investigation of the operations and earnings of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I know I am speaking for my many constituents confronted with the possibility of increased charges, in hoping that this investigation will not be just another case of lipservice to the idea of effective Government overview of such a vital industry, but that it will in fact yield the information necessary if an agency such as the FCC is going to perform the job entrusted to it by Congress many years ago. For the RECORD, I include at this time, my correspondence with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, urging that he reconsider his earlier decision to discontinue the investigation:

JANUARY 21, 1972.

DEAN BURCH,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: I was deeply upset to learn over the Congressional recess of the decision of your agency to discontinue any further investigation into the reasonableness of prices and profits of the American Telephone and Telegraph complex. To me, such an investigation seems to be long overdue and perfectly in order. I might also add it also would appear to be perfectly in keeping with your functions as this nation's regulatory agency in such matters. As I understand it, the primary factor in arriving at your decision was the limited budget and resources of your agency and the extremely high cost of such an investigation. I can only indicate that I would be much more in sympathy with a decision based on these factors, had your agency petitioned Congress unsuccessfully to begin with for the necessary funds to conduct such an investigation. To my knowledge, such an attempt, however, was not made, certainly not with any degree of determination or publicity.

I hope that any explanations from the F.C.C. to my inquiry will not be couched in legalese or references to legislation dating back many years, creating your agency. The country, the field over which you have regulation, and most importantly, consumer concern, have all grown tremendously since those days. If an agency such as yours is to continue to operate effectively and to fulfill its mission as the nation's watchdog over an industry which needs regulating, it must adapt, expand, and grow with the times. Otherwise it will petrify and its very raison d'etere will be under increasing challenge. Mr. Chairman, whether it is stronger enabling legislation you need to increase your powers of supervision and investigation or whether it is a larger budget that you need, I encourage you to approach Congress in a spirit of cooperation and I feel certain you will be amazed at our willingness to return the cooperation. With all good wishes, I remain

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

BOY SCOUT, JOHN T. LYONS, OF MOBILE, ALA., COMMENDED

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's largest youth organization, the Boy Scouts of America, is in the midst of celebrating its 62d anniversary this month. In recognition of this occasion, 15 active and outstanding young men have been selected from BSA's 6½ million members to represent the organization.

One of those so honored is John T. Lyons, of Mobile, Ala., in the First District which I represent. On Thursday, February 3, 1972, I will have the privilege of meeting this fine, young American at a special congressional breakfast honoring all 15 members of the delegation. While in Washington, the group will also share the opportunity of meeting President Nixon and reporting to him on developments in this year's Scouting program.

Mr. Speaker, John Lyons, like the other 14 members of his group, is more than just a representative of Boy Scouts of America. He is the epitome of the brand of leadership and loyalty to country this Nation was founded upon and which free men everywhere respect.

A sophomore at McGill Institute in Mobile, John has been involved in Cub Scouting and Scouting for more than 6 years and is a member of the Order of the Arrow, Scouting's honor camping society. When he finishes high school, John plans to study for a career in conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to be able to note my personal commendation to John Lyons in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NIXON-KISSINGER DESIGN

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, foreign policy in every administration must have a design. In spite of the fact that our bipartisan foreign policy since the end of World War II has had one design, it seems to have escaped most of those columnists who consider themselves experts in the field of foreign affairs.

Joseph Alsop, in an article in the February 2 issue of the Washington Post, has put it brilliantly and concisely.

In spite of the fact that the two major news magazines of this week carried Henry Kissinger on the front of both magazines, the writeups failed to cover the Nixon-Kissinger design.

I recommend this brilliant article to my colleagues. It is the best thumbnail sketch I have seen in the last 2 years of our design in the world—which is by all means to avoid world war III.

The article follows:

ON NIXON-KISSINGER

(By Joseph Alsop)

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger is big news, nowadays. The two national news magazines have him on their front covers this week, for example. But even their vast staffs do not seem to have got to the inner essence of the man, which also explains his peculiar relationship with President Nixon.

The essence can be put in four words: Balance of power politics. The fact is that both the President and Henry Kissinger broadly believe that the world balance of power is the mainspring of history. Although younger, both belong to this reporter's generation; and we had a good, hard lesson about *that*.

The lesson was simple enough. The British and French, who had the main responsibility in those days, let things slide until Germany's rearmament under Adolf Hitler had caused the balance of power to go to hell in a hack. Whereupon the British and French inevitably discovered that they had no remaining choices, except to fight like cornered rats or to give in.

Fortunately for every one of us, the British, particularly, chose to defy the apparent odds, and to fight with measureless courage. The British leftwing intellectuals, symbolized by that virtuous old fool, George Lansbury, were responsible for the silly slogans that largely produced the Second World War, such as "Arms Races Cause Wars." Some British rightwingers, symbolized by the Marquess of Halifax, also played their own sordid roles, now revealed by the publication of the cabinet papers.

At any rate, this was the central experience, in very different ways, in the lives of Richard M. Nixon and Henry A. Kissinger. It brought the U.S. into the Second World War. Thank God it did, too. For where should we be today, if the U.S. had stood aside, and successful Nazi Germany had been the first to develop a full panoply of nuclear weapons?

It is this oddly, very differently shared experience, in turn, which underlies the relationship between Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger. The two men, so different in all other ways, none the less talk the same language—the balance of power language that most American intellectuals no longer understand, because they never read history.

These two men's shared belief in balance of power politics further explains just about

everything that President Nixon has done in the foreign arena, with Dr. Kissinger's advice and help. Take the Vietnamese war, as the most important example.

When President Nixon was elected, he asked Dr. Kissinger to explore every possible American course of action—including what would have amounted to abject surrender. In 1969, even the most abject surrender would have been loudly applauded.

But the President and Kissinger concluded that such an American surrender would have disastrous effects on the over-all world balance of power. They further concluded that these effects would be widely felt, in Israel, for example, where the Soviet threat was already grave. So they decided on the middle course of Vietnamization.

The same theme runs straight through the Chinese story. In 1969, the Soviets approached the White House, pretty directly, to ask whether we would look the other way while they undertook the nuclear castration of China. President Nixon replied with a very loud raspberry—not at all because he had illusions about Communist China, but because China's nuclear castration would have caused (and may still cause) a most unfavorable upset in the world balance of power.

By the same token, balance of power considerations played the decisive role in the arrangements for the forthcoming Nixon visit to China. The Chinese Communist leaders are still deathly afraid of nuclear castration, because of the enormous Soviet investments in a vast additional military build-up on their frontier since 1969. The President, and Dr. Kissinger, too, are still afraid of the same upset in the balance of power that they feared three years ago.

So the true object of the Nixon visit to Peking will be to deter the Soviet attack on China, if this can possibly be done. And the same theme even ran through the much misrepresented White House management of the Indian crisis.

The President took great risks in the Indian crisis, both at home and abroad. Either you must suppose that he is irrational, or you must believe that he credited the intelligence that the Indians were getting ready to dismember and destroy West Pakistan, under the aegis of the Soviets. Balance of power considerations therefore required him to take the risks he did take, with the result that the Soviets called the Indians off.

The balance of power is in truth the key to the Nixon-Kissinger relationship.

NEW OIL TALKS COULD RESHAPE WORLD ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL MAP

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a front-page article which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, January 29, under the headline, "New Oil Talks Could Reshape World Economic, and Political Map."

The story, by Bernard D. Nossiter, analyzes the alliance of oil-producing countries in the Middle East and elsewhere which now threatens to control the price and availability of oil to the consumer countries of the world.

The article refers to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—OPEC—one of the most important international developments in recent years.

OPEC is of immense political and economic importance to the United States in view of our own domestic gas supply shortages and our increasing dependence on oil from OPEC members.

Today we receive about 23 percent of our oil from foreign sources. But present projections indicate that in the next 10 or 15 years we may be approaching 50 percent dependence.

We are clearly faced with a set of circumstances that must be understood, and I assure you that I will have more to say about the fuels and energy situation in the weeks ahead.

The article follows:

NEW OIL TALKS COULD RESHAPE WORLD ECONOMIC, POLITICAL MAP

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

GENEVA, January 28.—In Jeddah, the Saudi Arabian capital, two men are due to begin talks on Tuesday that could drastically reshape the world's economic and political map.

Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the Saudi petroleum minister, will meet in his office with Frank Jungers, president of Aramco, the Arabian oil producing creature of four giant American concerns. They will discuss an innocuous sounding word, "participation." It stands, however, for nothing less than a demand from the oil states of the Middle East to tear up their old concession agreements and deal themselves in for a share of the ownership in the companies exploiting their one great resource.

For a starter, the oil nations are demanding at least a 20 per cent share. But they also insist on a fixed timetable that would ultimately assure them 51 per cent, effective control.

In brief, the oil states—not only in the Middle East but also in Africa, South America and Southeast Asia—have now determined to end their role as more or less passive collectors of royalties on the oil that Western companies extract from their lands and seas. National governments want to become first junior and then senior partners in managing and controlling their most valuable asset.

In Jeddah, the resourceful Yamani, an elegant man who sports a black mustache and goatee, will speak nominally for the Persian Gulf producers alone—Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Qatar, Kuwait, and Abu Dhabi. In fact, he talks for five other nations as well who are joined together in the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries or OPEC. The other five are Libya, Nigeria, Venezuela, Indonesia and Algeria. Together, the OPEC nations account for about seven of every eight barrels of oil exported to the non-Communist world.

Jungers, in turn, will nominally speak only for Aramco. But behind him stand Aramco's four parents—Standard Oil (New Jersey), Standard of California, Texaco and Mobil. Moreover, alongside this quartet are the other four decisive oil "majors"—Gulf, British Petroleum, Shell (a British and Dutch concern) and the Compagnie Francaise des Petroles (CFP). The big eight, locked together in exploiting consortia all over the globe, extract three of every four barrels shipped to the non-Communist nations.

The eight, plus the independent Atlantic Richfield, have already met once with Yamani and representatives of all the other OPEC nations except free-wheeling Libya. That took place here in Geneva on Jan. 21. At this preliminary meeting, Yamani sketched out what participation means. The well-coordinated company men listened, and, by pre-arrangement, each addressed himself to one specific difficulty posed by the demand.

CRUCIAL POINT

The crucial point, however, is that the companies did not say "yes," and they did not say "no." In private, some of their key executives in London acknowledged that national share ownership is inevitable; the only questions—enormously difficult to resolve—are how soon and on what terms. Indeed, as these company men point out, the new, and generally less profitable concessions now being granted, typically provide for some ownership stake by the host country.

To appreciate the importance of all this, the decisive role of oil as a source of energy, as the fuel for factories, cars, heat and anything that requires power, must be understood.

No less than 80 per cent of Japan's energy comes from oil; for Western Europe, the figure is 55 per cent and for the United States, 44 per cent. OPEC nations, in turn, supply 80 per cent of Japan's oil and 87 per cent of Western Europe's.

The organization's members provide now only about 17 per cent of the heavily-protected American oil supply, and that is largely from Venezuela. But the demand for energy is rising so rapidly that the industry estimates that by 1980, the United States will be importing about 7 million barrels daily from the Middle East alone, nearly 30 per cent of a predicted 25 million barrels daily consumption.

Who controls oil, then, plays a central role in any modern economy.

VERY GRAVE SITUATION

"This is a very grave situation, very worrying," says one important oil company executive who, like his fellows in the industry, agreed to talk with this reporter only on condition that he not be named. The executive, an American, makes this argument against participation:

As the concession arrangements stand now, the companies are a buffer between the producing and consuming nations. The companies have only economic, not political interests, and thus can better assure an uninterrupted supply of oil.

Once the national governments are cut in on the ownership, they will be unable to resist demands from their own people or more radical brethren, like Libya, to use oil as a political weapon, to cut the supply when a Western government offends them by, for example, support for Israel. Participation, in short, means politicizing oil.

Indeed, last November, President Ahmad Hasan Al-Bakr of Iraq spoke in just those terms. "The strategic aim of the revolution," he said, "should be to liberate fully the country's oil resources from foreign exploitation and control . . . to turn them into an effective instrument in the struggle against imperialism and Zionism."

NATIONAL CONTROL

Moreover, oil companies say, national control will wreck the industry's price structure, flood the world with oil, thereby reducing profits for both the companies and the host nations. The point here is that the big eight are a cartel, imperfect because they no longer control all the foreign oil, but largely effective. In a variety of ways, they carve up the world's markets among themselves and limit supply to prop up the price.

Although independent firms now extract about one-fourth of the oil that moves in world trade, they too have been impressed into the cartel. The U.S. Justice Department saw to that by providing an immunity from antitrust laws that permits all the companies not only to bargain as one with the equally cartelized OPEC, but also to give each other oil if one is cut off by an angry producer nation.

The companies are now saying, in effect, that national majority share ownership will upset this delicate arrangement, that each producing nation will be under strong pressure from its own citizens to step up the flow of its own oil, thereby breaking down the supply discipline that keeps up the price.

Finally, the great international concerns point to the need for billions of dollars of

new capital investment needed to enlarge supplies in an "orderly" way to meet the growing oil demands of the 1970s and 80s. The company men argue that investors will be frightened off if Arab and other states move in on ownership, that the investment will simply not be forthcoming.

OPEC UNIMPRESSED

OPEC is singularly unimpressed by the political argument and its leaders even stand it on its head. At the organization's Vienna headquarters, the secretary general, Nadim Pachachi, a gifted Iraqui, replies:

"If we wanted to stop oil to the United States, the lack of participation would not stop us. That is the right of a sovereign state, regardless of whether it owns shares in a company. Look how your government cuts off strategic materials to the Soviet Union without participation in companies. The political weapon is already there. Fifty one per cent participation won't change it."

At his handsomely furnished Lausanne apartment, Oil Minister Yamani took up the theme from a different stance. He observed that Algeria has already taken over its oil; that the Iranian concession runs out in 1979 and that Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlevi has said no new one will be granted; that Venezuela is preparing to take over its oil when its concessions expire in 1983; that Libya has nationalised British Petroleum's assets. "The others," he said, "have to do something politically speaking for their own public opinion. We must start quickly on the participation process to assure the companies any participation in the concessions."

For Yamani, the alternative is plain: either the companies sell the government a share in their concerns or the pressure from within their own countries will force every oil state to nationalize the properties.

Pachachi, the OPEC official, scoffs at the idea that national governments cannot run a cartel. "We are not stupid enough" to break the price of oil by flooding the world with it. "We want to utilize this asset. We are as interested (as the companies) in maintaining the price level. It is a wasting asset, not replaceable. So we must make the maximum use of it."

He concedes that heavy investment will be needed to expand supply and satisfy the growing demand. He concedes, too, that only Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait will have idle resources for this task and that inevitably Western capital will be required. But Pachachi argues that Westerners need not be scared off by a participation arrangement, that the companies will still be shareowners, that both countries and companies have a joint interest in rational and profitable operations.

COMPANIES DIVIDED

In fact, the companies are far from single-minded about the principle of cutting the governments in. According to insiders, Shell, CFP and Gulf have virtually accepted the notion. Gulf has traditionally been a hard-line company but the Mellon family, its dominant owner, is said to have shaken up the management. Last year, I. G. Davis, Gulf's executive vice president, told the New York Society of Security Analysts: "One can understand the desire of the producing country to have a more effective voice in the planning, producing and disposal of crude oil produced in their country. This is particularly so where petroleum is the principal and sometimes only natural resource and finite and depletable resources at that. One can even foresee a beneficial mutual understanding resulting from joint consultation. . . ."

The big eight's undecided members are said to be Jersey Standard, British Petroleum and Mobil. Only Texaco and California Standard are reported to be insisting that a deal is a deal, a concession is a concession until it expires, and no rewriting shall take place.

UNITED ON TACTIC

Whatever their differences on the principle, the companies are united on their tactic: let us not hurry any changes. They argue that last year's big bargain at Tehran, where the companies agreed to a stiff increase in the royalties they pay the host nations (in foreign oil, royalties are called taxes so that the American firms can offset them against taxes that they would otherwise pay to Washington) was opposed to assure five years of "stability."

Even the most outgoing concerns insist that participation should not begin until the Tehran deal runs out at the end of 1975.

The companies have just reluctantly agreed to enlarge the Tehran deal, increasing their payments by 8.5 per cent or about another $700 million a year to the Persian Gulf states alone. But that settlement was made to compensate for the devaluation of the dollar, the unit of account in which oil royalty-taxes are figured, and thus is not seen as a violation of the "stability" principle.

OPEC ARITHMETIC

On the other side, Yamani regards delay over the participation question as politically impossible. He will not spell out the OPEC demands in detail. But he hints that a start on participation, the granting of a minority share, must be made soon and that OPEC expects its 51 per cent share within a decade.

Apart from the time scale, the other great issue in these crucial talks is how much the producer governments will pay for their shares. Yamani says that OPEC has determined to give no more than the net book value of concessionaires' assets above the ground.

Assume, for example, that Aramco has $800 million worth of rigs and the like but, after depreciation, now values these installations at $300 million. Then Saudi Arabia would pay only one-fifth of this total or $60 million for its initial, 20 per cent share.

That kind of arithmetic horrifies the companies. They insist they are entitled to be paid for the loss of their future profits on oil in the ground, profits they expected to reap during the lifetime of their concessions. Since many of the concessions do not run out until the next century—one in Kuwait expires in 2026—the companies are asking a lot of money.

How much is their secret since they do not reveal domestic companies have suction, although this is understood to be the most profitable part of their global operations. In any event, it is likely that the difference between the country proposals and the company position is several billion dollars.

However the lengthy negotiations beginning at Jeddah this week turn out, it is also clear that consumers in the West can only shudder at what is happening. Even if the two cartels—companies and nations—reach an amicable agreement that assures the supply of oil, both have a vested interest in pushing prices higher and the means to do so.

Some help will come from the growing discoveries of oil in the Western-controlled North Sea. Some may come from Alaska if the ecological worries can be laid to rest. Additionally, exploration off Indonesia's shores is likely to yield more oil.

EXPANDING DEMAND

But all these sources together, it is estimated, can not possibly replace over the next 20 years the Middle East and African oil needed to satisfy the expanding demand.

Moreover, the bulk of these concessions, too, will almost certainly be held by the big eight's cartel. At best, these new sources then will provide some safety margin for supplies but their exploitation will be controlled to prevent any fall in price.

It is clear then, from both the point of view of supply and price, that new energy sources must be tapped as long as wealthy nations demand rising material standards. These sources exist—oil from shale and tar sands, nuclear energy, possibly energy from the sun.

Typically, however their exploitation has been held back, often at the insistence of oil companies that do not want rival fuels developed. Shale oil is the classic case; there both the major international concerns and domestic companies have successfully prevailed on the U.S. Interior Department to lease the shale lands only recently and then on the smallest scale.

Elsewhere in the world, rich nations like Japan are making a determined effort to free themselves from both OPEC oil and from the big eight companies. By 1980, Japan is expected to cut its dependence on oil as an energy source from 80 per cent to 68 per cent. And a smaller share of that oil will be coming from OPEC members.

For American consumers, the major policy question posed by the new round of cartel-to-cartel talks is this: how to find new sources of energy and how to exploit them outside the existing corporate structure.

CONVENTION CENTER-SPORTS ARENA

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, since the discussion of the Convention Center-Sports Arena for the District of Columbia, financed by tax-supported, tax-guaranteed bonds, is under wide discussion at the present time and as there have been a multiplicity of ideas, I have been approached by a group of citizens who have some rather forceful ideas on the subject. So that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to review all facets of the project, I am taking this opportunity to include their letter to President Nixon in the RECORD. Thoughtful consideration should be given all argument regarding this proposed construction before authorization and appropriation measures are offered.

The letter follows:

Re: Your visit to the historic Chinatown area of the Nation's Capital. Have lunch in one of our world-famous restaurants and save the historic Chinatown area on H and I Sts. NW in the Nation's Capital, on the eve of your historic trip to China, and the business-residential area in which it is located, from destruction by the Federal bulldozers.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been asked to send you with comment the enclosed pictures and petitions signed by more than 100 Chinese families, business leaders, owners of famous Chinese restaurants, as well as by others doing business and living in the area sought for the *convention-sports complex* by certain powerful groups who do not do business in the area and who do not own property in the area.

The petitioners request you to visit our area which is only a few blocks from the White House before your departure to China. The petitioners not only are Chinese, but include Black businessmen and others as well. It would be a tragic mistake to destroy Chinatown *before* or *after* your trip.

We believe the petitioners make a persuasive case for locating all facilities needed by the Government on Government-owned land

in D.C. and they point out that the Federal Government owns nearly half of the land area of the District of Columbia and the use of this land for government facilities would prevent huge acquisition costs and the heartbreak and losses of displacement and relocation. As you know, the Kennedy Stadium is located on land leased for $100.00 a year—since it is a financial disaster, how can the proposed sports-convention complex pay its way if located on high-cost land? In view of the multi-billion dollar Federal budget deficit, it seems to the petitioners that the Federal urban renewal funds should be used to rebuild the burned-out areas instead of building a convention-sports center in an area which can and will renew itself if the heavy hands of the bureaucrats are stayed.

The Brookings Institution study of "Direct and Indirect Subsidies to Professional Sports," December 1972, estimated that a realistic figure for total subsidies to professional sports teams now amount to at least $40 million annually and it says (p. 69) that: "Although the justification offered for public ownership of sports facilities is shaky, vast amounts of local government resources have been (and continue to be) devoted to these 'monuments of civic pride'. At the same time, the local property tax base continues to shrink and sorely needed public services normally provided by local governments continue to go begging for funds." In view of the desperate needs of the District, these needs have a higher priority than sports and convention facilities.

We note with some concern that the Booz-Allen-Hamilton-GSA report on the proposed convention center-sports-arena does not look at the total budget needs, but as the Washington Post points out (December 26, 1971) this report did find that "The center would operate with an annual estimated profit of $2.9 million but this would not be enough to cover the $6 million retirement of the bonds that would be sold to finance its construction." In view of this set of facts, the petitioners call for making the Kennedy Stadium a financial success. No one could argue with the view of the petitioners that "The Kennedy Stadium should not be a tax burden on District citizens as it has been for ten years". Let me assure you that all of the petitioners welcome your plan that you have funds included in the Federal Budget to have the Federal Government help the District pay off the bonds on the Kennedy Stadium. However, since this project was promoted as a National Memorial Stadium, it is clear the total cost should have been borne by the Federal Government, from the beginning.

I am sending you pictures of the many fine buildings and businesses in our area—all of which would be destroyed by the convention-sports center—just in case you can't find time to visit our area, *before* or *after* your China visit. The petitioners point out that being in an urban renewal area they are protected by the *Workable Program* which 42 U.S.C. 145(e)(2) requires the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal to find—

"Clear evidence that the community provides and continues to expand opportunities for citizens . . . to participate in all phases of the related HUD-assisted renewal and housing programs . . . the community must demonstrate . . . that it provides clear and direct access to decision making, relevant and timely information, and necessary technical assistance to participating groups and individuals in programs covered."

The Workable Program provisions were ignored when the Convention-Sports Center was located in our area, as were the affected businessmen.

Sec. 307 of the Housing Act of 1964 which the petitioners cite requires the Secretary of HUD to find that the area cannot be rehabilitated. The Secretary of HUD has made no such finding with regard to the area sought for the convention-sports center.

The petitioners cite the National Environmental Policy Act in their behalf. This Act of Congress is undoubtedly being invoked increasingly these days against an overbearing Federal Government. Congressman John D. Dingell placed in the *Congressional Record* (Jan. 18, 1972, pages E76 on) a report by the Council on Environmental Quality's January 1972 issue of "102 Monitor" which says that: "In two short years since the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted, Federal courts across the country in widely varying fact situations have proved that the '102' provisions are court enforceable . . . these decisions have proved Courts of Appeals decision (and) 48 District Court opinions". The petitioners say: "the National Environmental Policy Act requires detailed reports on alternatives. Why should there be provision of parking for 5,000 cars at the convention-sports arena which Secretary John Volpe has repeatedly called instead for use of buses and commuter trains which have not been instituted here.

The petitioners want the Kennedy Stadium made successful and suggest 6,000 more seats, artificial turf (suggested by Senator Eagleton), and year-round use. They support your plan to have the Federal and District Governments share the construction debt of the Kennedy Stadium as set forth in your budget message to Congress.

Finally, let me point out that the *New York Times* (Jan. 23, 1972) reported that the Federal Government has not opposed the choice of new sites for the Bicentennial in Philadelphia. Since this is true, why should the Federal Government not consider locating the convention-sports arena on its own land and eliminate altogether the displacement and destruction of small businesses and Chinatown, which the suggested site in our area will wreck?

We include for your information pictures of many of the buildings in our area, and many of the businesses and Chinatown which the unwise and unjustified location of the site in our area will cause. As the petitioners point out, "President Dwight Eisenhower, when he was in the White House, as you know, worked diligently to bring jobs and industry and business to the Nation's Capital to broaden and strengthen the economy in the belief that more was needed than the Federal government (to provide) employment."

We invite you to tour the area on behalf of the petitioners, and please let us know when you can come. After all, as the petitioners point out, our area is only a few blocks from the White House, and is much closer than China, which you will visit next month.

Now, in closing, let me point out to you that Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R–Va.), the principal backer of the sports-convention complex, testified before the House Public Buildings Subcommittee on March 29, 1971, on H.R. 5635 that: "Such a facility may require 15 to 20 acres. But we feel, Mr. Chairman, that it can be developed here in Washington as part of the downtown urban renewal area, without the necessity of displacing any homes of the citizens of the District of Columbia."

This is demonstrable nonsense and is deliberately misleading to the Committee, and the Congress.

We hope you will visit the historic Chinatown area, between 5th and 10th Streets, and including H and Eye Streets NW, as well as the rest of the area sought for the Convention-Sports Arena so you can see for yourself that it is an area of homes, businesses, jobs, and that it pays a large sum in taxes, and can be rehabilitated. We also hope you will have lunch at one of our world-famous Chinese restaurants.

The Chinese community was uprooted in the 1930's to make way for the Federal Triangle and this resulted in great tragedy and loss and this must not happen again.

We will be presenting this letter, and the petitions to Congress, so we hope you will give the petitioners the consideration which they so clearly deserve. These are some of the major points of the petitioners.

May we hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully yours,

LEON WEINBAUB, *President.*

ESTIMATE OF BUSINESS AND FAMILY DISPLACEMENT AND OF RELOCATION COSTS

PROPOSED DOWNTOWN CONVENTION CENTER/SPORTS ARENA AREA AT MOUNT VERNON SQUARE

Square	Number of businesses	Relocation costs [1]	Number of families	Relocation cost [2]	Number of individuals	Relocation cost [2]	Number of parcels
374	29	$140,800	30	$12,000	39	$11,700	28
373	32	176,000	21	8,400	62	18,600	35
403	12	60,000	13	5,200	61	18,300	14
404	10	57,900	8	3,200	0	0	11
427	7	62,100	0	0	0	0	13
428	10	$69,800	2	$800	3	$600	9
453	20	191,700	8	3,200	18	5,400	30
452	9	104,500	12	4,800	5	1,500	23
Total	129	862,800	94	37,600	187	56,100	163

[1] Estimate, based on visual inspection; assumes no property loss payment.

[2] Estimate, based on average relocation costs established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; assumes no replacement housing payments.

A NEW VOICE FOR CHILDREN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman and past assemblyman in the California Legislature, I have often supported legislation to restrict the political influence of special-interest lobbyists representing large and powerful economic organizations.

Today, however, I would like to speak in support of a different kind of lobby, hoping that its power and influence will be felt in many future debates.

The way we treat our children—the opportunities and environment we provide—is crucial to the future of this Nation. Realizing this, we should recognize that the institution of a children's advocate organization in our State legislatures and on the Federal level is an important step which, I am surprised, did not occur until recently.

A recent article in McCall's magazine entitled "A New Voice for Children" and authored by Doris Silverton, more fully describes the nature of this new children's lobby:

A NEW VOICE FOR CHILDREN

Wig-makers have a paid lobbyist in Sacramento, California. So do the abalone, wine, mortuary, and motorcycle associations, to name just a few. The fact is that 650 special-interest groups have a "voice" in the halls of the state legislature. But until recently, a crucial segment of the population has been unrepresented—children and young people under the age of eighteen. This year, some Californians got together to do something about this voiceless—and voteless—minority. Result: The California Children's Lobby—a citizens' coalition that flatly declares that it aims to play politics for children. It is the first children's lobby in the nation.

Not that this country lacks child-service organizations. (California itself has more than 200.) The trouble is they have no political clout. None can lobby openly without losing its tax-deductible status. Each concerns itself with a different aspect of child welfare. As a result, legislative efforts on behalf of children are fragmented and weak.

The California Children's Lobby remedies the situation in two ways. First, it is incorporated as a non-tax-deductible organization, which means it *can* lobby. Second, it can serve as a spokesman for all child-service groups in the state and thus represent the "total" child at the legislative level. Wigs are wigs, and abalone is abalone, but child-advocacy deals with a staggering array of problems: education, welfare, foster home, juvenile courts, Head Start, day care, group homes, institutions, the adopted child, the unwed mother, unwed father, the mentally retarded, physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, mentally ill, abused, delinquent, and predelinquent. In California, where children under eighteen comprise more than one-third of the population—and one in six is on welfare—the Children's Lobby will have to raise a very loud voice indeed.

Acknowledged "father" of the group is Donald Fibush, a retired business executive. For 20 years he has been a volunteer leader in the child-welfare field—consulting, testifying, and "watchdogging" legislation for child-service groups throughout the state. The father of five adopted children, Fibush was a delegate to the 1970 White House Conference on Children and Youth. It was there that Jule Sugarman, New York City's Social Services Commissioner, introduced the concept of the nonprofit, non-tax-deductible organization. Two months later, child-welfare leaders in California asked Fibush to organize a children's lobby for the state.

To date, more than 400 people have made contributions, even though they cannot take credit on their tax returns. The money, which is still in short supply, will be used to send a lobbyist to Sacramento, conduct continuing legislative research, circulate newsletters and position papers, and coordinate other volunteer groups for political action on behalf of children's rights. (Next year's agenda is already laid out. Eighty percent of Governor Reagan's recent budget cuts directly or indirectly affect the health, education, and welfare of children.)

Youth will be served—and youth will serve. Two teenagers have just been nominated to the 35-member board of directors. Chairman of the board is Robert Pauley, twenty-six, a consultant to the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Warren Widener, Mayor of Berkeley, sits on the board along with one of his own constituents, a twenty-two-year-old girl who is a Berkeley college student. A twenty-one-year-old boy from Hayward State College also serves.

Child advocacy is long overdue. Look for other states to follow California's lead, Georgia and Michigan are now talking about it, and Jule Sugarman is organizing a lobby at the federal level. For more information write: California Children's Lobby, 1731 "I" Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S CREDIBILITY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has been the recipient of a great deal of verbal abuse, charges of bad faith in peace negotiations, and in specific instances has even been accused by some of lying to the American people.

Last week, the President set the record straight with a complete and unadorned report to the people of these United States concerning the painstaking efforts of his administration to run to earth every possible avenue that might lead to an honorable peace in Indochina. As the Wall Street Journal has editorialized:

Let us mark up for the government those times when it has behaved better than its critics have charged.

I include in the RECORD at this point, the excellent editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 1, entitled "A Lesson About Credibility":

A LESSON ABOUT CREDIBILITY

Whenever anything is disclosed about the inner workings of foreign policy, the important thing to look for is what light it sheds on the government's credibility and trustworthiness—or anyway, so we have gathered from what has captured headlines these past few years. Somehow, though, this instant tradition seems to have been ignored in the case of the newly disclosed efforts to negotiate a Vietnam settlement.

It's a pity, for quite a bit can be learned about our times by setting the public record of the last few years beside the secret negotiating efforts disclosed last week. There is a lesson about credibility, and that lesson should not be ignored simply because it's not the currently fashionable one. What the comparison reveals is that just as the administration was doing everything it could imagine to strike a compromise with Hanoi, its credibility was taking beating after beating for failing to do enough to strike a compromise with Hanoi.

Remember the public record: Senators were suggesting that the administration could not be trusted to do its best at negotiating, so legislation was necessary to compel it to be more forthcoming. Prestigious commentators and editorialists were saying the solution in Vietnam could come only when the administration dropped its thoughts of a "military solution" and finally got serious about negotiating.

Senators, newsmen and others interviewed the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris, and found they were models of reasonableness, ready to settle the war if only Mr. Nixon were not so blind and intransigent. Assurances from our negotiators that this attitude did not prevail at the actual bargaining table were quickly dismissed on the ground that everyone knows the government lies. In short, the administration found its credibility constantly impugned.

All this, until last week, the administration bore in silence. The President and his top officials never disclosed what they knew: That in fact ever since 1969 Henry Kissinger had been periodically winging off to Paris for the most serious bargaining. That in fact the Americans had offered to set a withdrawal deadline. That in fact the Americans and South Vietnamese had offered that fondest dream of the doves, the resignation of President Thieu. That in fact Hanoi spurned all this, all the while publicly denouncing the United States for failing to respond to *its* proposals.

The administration did not disclose this, did not defend its credibility, because it feared that doing so would jeopardize whatever chance might actually remain of negotiating a settlement in the secret talks. In other words, it was precisely because the American government was doing the honorable and responsible thing that its credibility was under attack, that an acid was eating away at that most precious asset of a democratic government, the trust of its citizens.

The administration's decision to make the record public reflects its judgment about the balance between the benefits of secret negotiations and the damage to its credibility. It's not difficult to conclude that since Hanoi is obviously not about to budge at a secret offer, perhaps a public one is worth trying. And in making the record public Mr. Nixon is asking for a bit more trust from the people and the Congress.

The President has a point. If we are to mark up against the government every deception anyone can uncover or concoct, let us also mark up for the government those times when it has behaved better than its critics have charged. And here is an instance, and scarcely a small one, that gives no support to the view that the American government is somehow sinister.

In this instance, rather, the record supports the view that as human institutions go a democratic government is reasonably trustworthy, that the American leaders are selected from among the American people, and that by and large they are more likely than not to do the decent thing.

NIXON'S OFFER JUST BASIS FOR NEGOTIATING END OF WAR

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, following the President's statement to the Nation on his efforts to negotiate peace in Southeast Asia, the Denver Post carried an editorial which deserves the attention of all Members of the House.

The editorial correctly assesses the President's proposals to Hanoi as being just. While the public utterances of the North Vietnamese at the Paris peace talks continue to demonstrate inflexibility, it is, as the editorial states, hard to see how the other side can simply turn its back on the Nixon initiatives.

The President's plan merits the support of all of the American people. I prayerfully hope that the North Vietnamese will continue to look at the offer which has now been made public, so that the conflict can come to an end and our prisoners of war can be returned home to be reunited with their families.

The statement follows:

NIXON'S OFFERS JUST BASIS FOR NEGOTIATING END OF WAR

President Nixon now has on the table the essential elements of a settlement of the Vietnamese war. In fact, he has finally disclosed, he has been busy for two years doing

in private what many of his critics have been calling on him to do: making constructive proposals that could lead to such a settlement.

He has made, his Tuesday night announcement reveals, two offers:

1. He is willing to withdraw U.S. troops within six months of any agreement, in a deal by which South Vietnam's President Thieu would resign a month before an election to be supervised by an international body and run by an "independent body" representing all political parties in South Vietnam—including the National Liberation Front. This in exchange for a ceasefire and return of all war prisoners.

2. Or he is willing to withdraw all U.S. troops within six months of a simple agreement for a ceasefire and return of war prisoners—leaving the Vietnamese to work out a political settlement among themselves.

Hanoi's informal replies to these two proposals—there has been no formal reply as yet—insist that the Americans overthrow the Thieu regime before they leave. They also oppose a ceasefire.

Some of the Democratic contenders for the presidency are saying that, although the Nixon proposals look fair to Westerners, Hanoi will never accept them. Perhaps—but Nixon's proposals may carry some weight with the North Vietnamese if they are regarded as fair by the South Vietnamese.

A South Vietnamese journalist remarked that "the Communists will probably curse the proposal as another imperialist plot, but they will have to move closer to our proposals behind the scenes, until finally a compromise is reached that will satisfy both sides."

Indeed, it is hard to see how the North Vietnamese or the NLF can simply turn their backs on the Nixon offers.

He is offering peace and withdrawal. Will Hanoi keep insisting on war?

Nixon is offering, by Vietnamese standards, a fair election to give the Vietnamese people a choice of their rulers. Can Hanoi insist that the South Vietnamese people should have no choice?

True, there is a third alternative. Hanoi can keep on fighting while Vietnamization—strengthening of the South Vietnamese armed forces—proceeds.

But can Hanoi any longer expect to get a better deal this way than by negotiating a settlement?

We doubt it.

The fact is that North Vietnam's chief negotiator in Paris became "sick" back in November, just three days before he was scheduled to reply to Nixon's proposals, and there has been no formal North Vietnamese reply since, suggests that Hanoi has been thrown into a deep dilemma by Nixon's proposals.

No matter what the North Vietnamese may say publicly, we hope they finally choose the constructive, peaceful way out of their dilemma. The time has come to finally end this war.

And the President is to be commended for developing the proposals which should make it possible.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD ON H.R. 12714

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 27, 1972, indicates that H.R. 12714 was introduced in my name. This bill provides the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen.

Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce H.R. 12714, nor did anyone on my staff authorize its introduction. I do not know who introduced H.R. 12714. I did not.

I am sending a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics informing him of this matter and stating that I did not introduce this bill which was referred to his committee.

MEMORIES OF THE "LITTLE CAMPUS"

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the historic sites in Austin is known as the old "Little Campus" dormitory.

Originally it was the building built for the State school for the blind and has been used for various purposes over its 116-year history. Austin citizens will recall it alternately as the "Old Blind Asylum" and as the place where General Custer stayed or the World War I air academy.

Many of us, however, know it as "Little Campus" dormitory, a haven for poor boys who came to the University of Texas during the depression days of the 1930's.

At that time university officials opened up five different wings and the buildings were known as buildings A through E. A full complement of some 140 boys lived in the dormitory. Most of them ate one or two meals there, did their own washing and ironing, and lived together as a unified body. Though tuition in the depression days only amounted to $25 a semester and $50 for a room, this was the best bargain around. Without these low rates hundreds of Texas boys could never have gone to the university at all.

I was one of those privileged to spend 4 years at "Little Campus." It was here that I best learned how to live with individuals, how to understand various viewpoints and to mix and mingle with my fellow students. The pine floors, old steam pipes, and iron spring beds gave us no concern. We had a warm room, a roof over our heads, clean floors, and the happy privilege to attend the great university.

Though some of the buildings of "Little Campus" have now been demolished, I am glad that part of the structures are still there and I hope the University of Texas extension offices will also stay there a long time.

Mr. Speaker, the Austin Citizen captures part of the spirit of this institution in a recent article and I am pleased to include it at this point:

HISTORIC SITE LIVES ON BORROWED TIMES

(By Monica Reeves)

Should a secretary working late at The University of Texas Extension offices on the "Little Campus" feel inclined to see ghosts, they will be interesting ones.

For a grand old building on the 19th and East Avenue block, known as the "Old Blind Asylum," housed then Major George Armstrong Custer, his staff and family shortly after the Civil War.

Custer, later to make a place in history at the Battle of the Little Big Horn, was in Ausin to command federal troops occupying Texas during Reconstruction. The building they lived in, part of the complex erected in 1856 for the State School for the Blind, still stands as center of extension services.

An early photograph shows Custer, his wife Elizabeth Bacon Custer and his brother Thomas on the porch of the blind institute building.

In Mrs. Custer's book, "Tenting on the Plains, or General Custer in Kansas and Texas", she talks of how happy she was to see Austin after their trek from the north in 1865.

"We pitched our tents on rolling ground in the vicinity of Austin, where we overlooked a pretty town of stuccoed houses that appeared summery in the midst of the live oak's perennial green. The State House, Land Office and Governor's Mansion looked regal to us, so long bivouaking in the forest and on uncultivated prairies," she wrote.

She was also delighted by the lodgings offered by the governor for their stay.

"This (the asylum, then closed) possessed one advantage we were glad to improve: there was room enough for all the staff, and a long saloon parlor and dining room for our hops during the winter."

Later, various buildings in the complex housed military units during World War I, among them the School of Military Aeronautics. Here Air Corps enlistees took their ground school training before going to flying fields.

In 1967, the UT Board of Regents ordered demolition of this building, as well as others, on the Little Campus. But until an alternate spot for extension offices is found, it has a reprieve. General Custer's former headquarters lives on borrowed time.

BIRTHDAY OF FDR

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, just 3 days ago, January 30th, marked the 90th birthday of one of the most outstanding Americans in our history, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the 32d President of the United States.

This man stands in the memories of all Americans as a symbol of strength to this nation. Barely able to walk because of polio, he assumed office as President in 1932 and brought a crippled nation to its feet. As no other president, he shaped the direction of this country in such a way that his concerns for social reform, and his progressive legislation remain the direction of this country 27 years after his death. This is surely a testimony to greatness.

The years this man spent as President corresponded to the first 12 years of my life. This is the man who served as an example to me as I grew toward manhood, and it is for this reason that I am proud to call attention to this event.

Born January 30, 1882 in Hyde Park, N.Y., Roosevelt graduated from Harvard University and Columbia Law School. He was, in turn, a New York State Senator, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, nominee for Vice President, candidate for the U.S. Senate, Governor of New

York and four times President of the United States.

In his life he braved the many obstacles which would have crushed lesser men. Just after his defeat as a Vice Presidential candidate in 1920, Roosevelt succumbed to poliomyelitis, which paralyzed him from the waist down. By great courage and effort, Roosevelt managed to walk by wearing braces on his legs and using crutches. In 1924, he returned to national politics as a thrilled convention watched him master his crippling illness as he walked slowly to the podium to nominate Alfred E. Smith for President.

In 1932, he ran on the Democratic ticket for President and soundly defeated the incumbent, Herbert Hoover. He inherited a Nation crushed by depression, and threatened by war clouds over Europe.

In his four terms, he effected more legislation than any other President, lifting the Nation from the depths of a depression to its former greatness.

Although he tried to keep America out of World War II, on December 8, 1941, he addressed a joint session of Congress, and described "a day that would live in infamy," the bombing of Pearl Harbor the day before. The same day Congress declared war, a war he would bring nearly to victory.

On April 12, 1945, a month before Germany surrendered, Roosevelt suddenly died at Warm Springs, Ga. He was buried at Hyde Park, the place of his birth.

This was the path of greatness for the man known as "FDR," and this is the man who has had a profound influence on my approach to history and to my interest and participation in the political life of this country.

PERSONNEL OF USDA VERSUS PRODUCERS OF USA

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, this commentary is premised on the impact of policies originating in the Department of Agriculture against the interests of farmers and producers of agricultural commodities in the United States of America. The Secretaries of the USDA have changed—the policies remain the same.

The basic issue is a deficiency of income to farm families and the deterioration of the economy in rural communities as a result thereof. The argument is fundamentally a controversy as to applicable alternatives to increase income to producers. There are short-term and long-term solutions. The existing facts and history of past and present programs to increase farm income are briefly recognized for appropriate evaluation of the future.

The objective of past programs of USDA was to influence market price by supply management—that is, price supports and production controls. That theory has not changed. It is a theory that has not resulted in a stabilized market price on farm produced commodities. The basic premise is wrong and the alternatives are impossible.

Producers of commodities must depend upon gross income for sufficient cash receipts to pay expenditures. When prices are low—production is up. Gross income must be equal to production costs or the producer is forced out of business and off the farm. The corn farmer cannot grow rubber trees and the wheat producers of the plains States cannot sell coconuts. The alternative is not easy. Too often the shift is to nonfarm jobs. Millions of families have bid farewell to the farm and left the land they loved. The economic coercion accelerated a transition of rural to urban migration with rapidity. And with that abnormal shift of population came the social ills of a modern megapolistic American society of the industrialized urban centers.

The agrarian society of a young America is now no more—the benefit or burden of the folly of the past is not to be easily determined. Social ills have erupted—conjestion, crime, degredation, drugs, immorality, unemployment and welfare of the industrialized urban society have replaced the birds on the wing, the smell of upturned soil in spring and the pioneer spirit of the West for all that has been lost in the might of an empty quest. Whatever the assessment—it did not just happen. It was planned, pursued and produced. The national agricultural policies and programs from the outset have contributed to the strange but real phenomenon of economic, social and political maladjustment. Most simply stated, the existing problem of our time is that we have too many people and too much wealth of this great country in too few places. Not since the time of Abraham Lincoln have we attempted national policy to redistribute population and wealth to the sprawling communities of rural America.

Rhetoric is not relief. The more than 86,000 employees of USDA and the experts on domestic and international affairs have ambitiously pursued a psychological program to convince American grain producers that positive steps have been taken to increase the prices of farm commodities in the market place. Those policies and words of rhetoric have not been productive.

Far worse is the record of the so-called experts of USDA in opposing all efforts of the Congress to increase farm income on a short-term program that would have increased Commodity Credit Corporation loans by 25 percent on the 1971–72 crop year production. The hearings of record reflect the truth of that testimony in opposition to the interests of farm people. The effectiveness of the opposition of the present administration was recorded in the final vote of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the outset of the second session of the 92d Congress when the House-passed bill providing for a strategic grain reserve and 25 percent increase in Commodity Credit Corporation loans was killed. The farm families of America lost millions of dollars as a result of the opposition of USDA and the policies of the present administration.

The classic game-play and cost-price squeeze continues and the farm families of America remain in the middle without relief. The newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture moved to bolster farm income through continued psychological rhetoric and a mass of news releases to the media that has not resulted in relief. For instance, a recent USDA news release announced purchases of 1.425 million bushels of corn on the open market at prices up $1.30 per bushel.

I have been unable to ascertain from any source where any of the corn purchased by the Government was in fact purchased from farmers and the policy of buying in the open market resulted in a windfall to the grain trade that had accumulated corn from farmers at prices that were reported to be as low as 75 cents per bushel. The "trickel-down" of USDA has not resulted in any appreciable price increase to corn producers. The only increase that resulted in the open market prices to farmers followed the action of the House-passed bill that would have increased the loan level rate through Commodity Credit Corporation loans to farmers.

Further, the USDA has reported that 10 million bushels of corn has been shipped to Russia under a recently negotiated agreement between the United States and Russia. The news media reported this transaction widely throughout the grain producing States. The fact is that the United States has never had any agreement with Russia and that no transactions have occurred between the United States and Russia. It is true that two large corporations of the grain trade have successfully negotiated the sale of grain to Russia. They are Cargill, Inc. and Continental Grain Co., Inc. and they have a contract for delivery of grain sales to Russia. Before hearings of the House Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, it was ascertained that the officials of USDA estimate a total of 80 million bushels of corn may be shipped to Russia under the provisions of the agreement that Cargill and Continental have negotiated with Russia.

The best information available at this time indicates that approximately one-half of the 10 million bushels of corn delivered to Russia by the aforesaid firms was in fact, purchased and shipped from Argentina.

The Continental Grain Co., Inc. bought 300,000 metric tons of oats for as little as 40 cents per bushel from USDA at a time when the Minneapolis open market prices on oats were at 65 cents per bushel and the Kansas City prices on the oats at that time were quoted at 70 cents per bushel.

The Cargill Co. purchased 11.5 million bushels of barley for 91 cents per bushel from USDA at a time when Minneapolis grain quotations on barley were at $1.20 per bushel.

An Assistant Secretary of Agriculture of the U.S. Department of Agriculture testified before the subcommittee that all such sales of grain from the United States were purchased by the aforesaid corporate dealers in the trade from commodities under loan with the Commodity Credit Corporation and held under the custody and control of USDA. He indicated in his testimony that the rationale

for selling below the market was based on the savings to USDA in a sum total of approximately $9 million a year because if the grain was not sold at the aforesaid prices far below the market, the $9 million annually would be paid in storage. It is not clear how much of that estimated $9 million storage payment would have been paid to farmers on farm stored grains, but in any event it was not paid to anyone for storing CCC grains in the United States, but the windfall was to the dealers on the contract or to Russia and the American farmers in effect, must subsidize the Russian livestock and poultry business that ultimately becomes competitive in the international red meat market.

The Assistant Secretary of USDA testified before the hearings that no American farmer could buy the grain out of his own bin on his own farm at the same price that USDA was willing to release and sell for delivery to Russia on the future contracts held by Cargill and Continental and there seemingly is no concern about the impact of such policies against the interests of the producers of food and fiber in this country.

Admittedly the domestic market and international grain exchange is indeed a most complex system of management, manipulation and speculation. The officials of USDA are in a position to know the circumstances and interplay. The farmers and producers of this country are not. Reasonable arguments can be advanced that to dispose of so-called surpluses at below market prices is in the long-term, advantageous to the recipients of the discounted labor of every producer in America. The American farmer is placed in jeopardy before the market without security for the future. He cannot sell to the USDA for the prices they pay and he cannot buy from USDA at the prices they sell. Yet he should silently permit large grain handling firms to buy far below the market price and forego storage income because that somehow is economically advantageous to his country. The fact is that the producers on the farms of America are subsidizing foreign sales of feed grains without any benefit from an appreciable increase in farm prices paid for his crops produced because of the adamant position of USDA in opposing short-term emergency farm legislation to increase Commodity Credit Corporation loans by 25 percent, as provided in the House-passed bill in December 1971.

The "trickle down" policies and procedures of USDA are of no benefit to the American farm people or to any businessman in the rural communities of this country and the possible effect of such "make-believe" farm policies and programs will not be advantageous to the producers of food and fiber in this country at any great economic acceleration until a gallon of water at the top of a cottonwood tree overcomes the drought of shrinking roots in the soil.

The gross error of USDA and the Nixon administration is the failure to recognize farmers and producers of the food and fiber of this Nation as the king-pin for a viable and prosperous rural economy.

An honest attempt at economic recovery and social stability cannot be achieved in America until the caretakers recognize that it is more important to soak the roots instead of lightly spraying the tops of the trees with too little—too late in a trickle-down economic theory that has not worked, cannot work and will not work for farmers in the future. "Jawboning" may keep prices down but all the rhetoric in the world will not keep prices up. The roads to recovery require more than rhetoric.

The Secretary of Agriculture has all essential authority under the Agricultural Act of 1970 to increase the loan level of Commodity Credit Corporation stored grains, to set acreage limits and to provide for additional diversion for wheat and feed grain. The Honorable Earl L. Butz joined the USDA in opposition to the House-passed Strategic Reserve Act which provided for authority to establish a commodity reserve of corn, grain, sorghum, barley, oats and wheat and would also have increased the loan rate 25 percent on all such commodities produced in 1971 and 1972 in an attempt to provide emergency legislation to increase income to the people of rural communities. The extension of the sign-up deadlines announced by USDA during the hearings before the Senate committee may have been coincidental but it was effective along with other attempts of the administration to kill the House-passed emergency relief for the people of rural America. The emergency farm legislation (H.R. 1163) is dead but farmers live. It was not a victory for our country, for our farmers or for the future. The burden is on Butz—the time for action is now. The administration and USDA should take notice accordingly.

EPA ASKS COURT ACTION TO STOP POLLUTION OF LAKE SUPERIOR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1972, the Environmental Protection Agency announced that Administrator Ruckelshaus had sent a letter to Attorney General Mitchell under date of January 19, 1972, requesting that a suit be filed against the Reserve Mining Co., to halt pollution of Lake Superior by Reserve's ore processing plant at Silver Bay, Minn.

I wholeheartedly agree that Reserve should be forced to immediately cease polluting Lake Superior. I looked upon the request of Administrator Ruckelshaus as an indication that the administration intended to move forthwith to accomplish this objective. However, it now appears that the administration may not intend to move with all possible speed to save Lake Superior.

These doubts as to the Nixon administration's intent were brought to my attention by an editorial in the January 24, 1972, issue of the Detroit, Mich., Free Press and an article in the January 23, 1972, issue of the Duluth, Minn., News-Tribune.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of the situation with regard to the continuing pollution of Lake Superior, I insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of the EPA press release, Administrator Ruckelshaus' letter to Attorney General Mitchell, the Detroit Free Press editorial and the Duluth News-Tribune article.

The articles follow:

EPA ASKS COURT ACTION TO STOP POLLUTION OF LAKE SUPERIOR

William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, today asked the Department of Justice to file suit against the Reserve Mining Co. to halt pollution of Lake Superior by Reserve's ore processing plant at Silver Bay, Minn.

In a letter to Attorney General John N. Mitchell, Ruckelshaus said that Reserve's daily discharge of 67,000 tons of taconite tailings "endangers a unique natural resource". The volume put into the Lake by the company is many times greater than the total volume of material carried into the Lake by its tributaries, he added. The Environmental Protection Agency Administrator requested the Department of Justice to institute legal action requesting a federal district court to set "a schedule of time within which the company must terminate the pollution."

Ruckelshaus added that a notice had been issued to Reserve on April 28, 1971, calling formal attention to its violation of water quality standards, and that in an effort to reach an amicable solution, EPA had employed the consulting firm of Roy F. Weston, Inc., of West Chester, Pa., to determine the feasibility of alternative methods of total and partial on-land disposal. Weston, after extensive investigation, reported five alternative plans, all of which were rejected by Reserve Mining Co., leading to the present impasse.

The EPA Administrator said that Reserve raised many objections to each of the plans, and that this could have led to "endless discussions and technical arguments, with little possibility of a fruitful conclusion." Ruckelshaus said, "My responsibility is to protect the environment, and I intend to discharge that responsibility as expeditiously as possible." He further said, "I have concluded with regret that our dispute cannot be resolved without the assistance of the court, and for that reason I have on this date forwarded the matter to the Department of Justice for appropriate legal action."

Ruckelshaus noted that the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan have frequently expressed a continuing concern in protecting the purity of Lake Superior. These States are parties to the Lake Superior Federal-State enforcement conference. For that reason, he said he has written to the respective Governors suggesting that they consider intervention in the proposed action and participation with EPA and the Department of Justice in seeking an end to the pollution.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1972.

HON. JOHN NEWTON MITCHELL,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL:

The taconite processing plant of Reserve Mining Company, located at Silver Bay, Minnesota, is presently discharging 67,000 tons per day of industrial wastes into lake Superior.

Reserve's discharge endangers a unique natural resource. Lake Superior, the largest body of fresh water in North America, has an extraordinary purity and clarity. Even without considering the composition of Reserve's discharge, it can be seen that the volume of sediment put into Lake Superior by Reserve is many times greater than the total volume of sediment contributed by all the streams that flow into the Lake. Reserve was notified on April 28, 1971, that its dis-

charge violated established standards. The company has not offered a satisfactory plan to clean up its operation at Silver Bay.

In view of the seriousness of this problem, it is hereby requested that you institute immediate legal action.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 24, 1972]

AS WE SEE IT: TOUGH TALK ON RESERVE DOES NOT HIDE WEAK ACTION

For all his tough talk, the administrator of the federal Environmental Protection Agency is turning out to be a paper tiger in his attempts to stop the Reserve Mining Co. of Silver Bay, Minn., from dumping its wastes into Lake Superior.

One can not blame William D. Ruckelshaus too much, He is under intense pressure from the White House and other governmental agencies to go easy on Reserve, a division of Armco and Republic steel companies. The administration owes many favors to past and present officers of the two firms.

Mr. Ruckelshaus has finally asked the Justice Department to bring suit against Reserve. But instead of requesting that Reserve go to land disposal of its taconite tailings or stop operations, Mr. Ruckelshaus merely asked that the courts "set a schedule of time within which the company must terminate pollution."

This could mean anything. Reserve has argued for months that the 67,000 tons of tailings it pumps into Lake Superior daily do no harm. an opinion disputed by the EPA. Although it is the only one of a number of taconite processors on Lake Superior that dumps in the lake, Reserve argues that the iron ore it is working with is low grade and it cannot compete without using cheap dumping.

Reserve also hints that the ore from which it manufactures taconite, used in steel production, will run out soon, and going to more expensive disposal techniques would not be economically feasible.

Reserve's reserve may indeed run out before it is forced to join the 20th Century. The firm has been dumping in Lake Superior, America's largest body of fresh water, for more than 20 years.

Ruckleshaus gave Reserve 180 days last May to stop dumping in the lake. One delay has followed another and taking the matter to court could result in an indefinite postponement of action. It is quite conceivable that Reserve's ore will run out before it can be civilized.

The EPA rightly considers Reserve one of the most crucial issues facing it. It is a test case on whether a public agency can force a private corporation to stop massive pollution. If it cannot, there is no way to prevent rape of the environment.

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, Jan. 23, 1972]

OF POLLUTION POLITICS—RESERVE CASE CALLED CLASSIC

(By Albert Eisele)

WASHINGTON.—A few minutes after President Nixon warned Congress in his State of the Union message last week that the "forces which threaten our environment will not wait while we procrastinate." the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received a call from Nixon aide John Whitaker.

Whitaker, the top environmental specialist in the White House, gave EPA the green light to go ahead and announce that it was seeking court action to force the Reserve Mining Co. in Silver Bay to stop its daily discharge of 67,000 tons of taconite tailings into Lake Superior.

At almost the same moment, Edward Fride, a Duluth lawyer who represents Reserve, was checking out of the Skyline Inn Hotel a few blocks from the U.S. Capitol to catch a plane back to Duluth.

Nixon's statement of concern for a threatened environment provided an ironic backdrop for a mosaic of behind-the-scenes activity by Fride, Whitaker and many others. EPA's original request for a court order to stop the discharge of tailings into the lake was sidetracked. It was replaced with a less specific letter asking only that the Justice Department start undefined "legal action" against Reserve.

It is doubtful—although not certain—that Nixon himself has been directly involved in the case, but enough high-level political and economic pressure has been applied over the past three months to provide a classic example of the politics of pollution.

The Reserve case poses a crucial test of the Nixon administration's commitment to cracking down on industrial polluters—many of whom are generous Republican campaign contributors. The case also illustrates the discouragement and difficulty the government and private citizens face as they try to clean up the nation's waters.

Among the elements present to the Reserve cases are these:

Lake Superior is one of the world's largest and cleanest bodies of fresh water. It is the last of the five Great Lakes still virtually pollution-free. Many experts think its ultimate survival is at stake;

Reserve Mining Co. is one of the largest employers in job-scarce Northeastern Minnesota, providing some 3,000 jobs and a $35 million annual payroll. Its operation is vital to the area's economy;

The plant is located in the congressional district represented by Democrat John Blatnik, chairman of the House Public Works Committee and chief architect of the nation's water pollution laws, including the one Reserve is charged with violating.

EDA Administrator William Ruckelshaus has staked his reputation as a tough foe of polluters—and his political ambitions—on the outcome of the Reserve case;

Reserve is an offspring of two industrial giants, the Republic and Armco Steel corporations, whose top executives have excellent connections in the White House and elsewhere in Washington.

All these elements began coming together in May 1969, when a Lake Superior Federal-State Enforcement Conference concluded that discharges from Reserve—timely-ground tailings left over after iron is extracted from low grade ore from the Iron Range—had a harmful effect on the lake's ecology.

Since then, the federal government, first through the Administration and then through the newly-created Environmental Protection Agency, has tried unsuccessfully to persuade Reserve to dispose of its tailings on land instead of into the lake.

Three enforcement conferences followed the May meeting, each without causing any change in the company's operations. In August 1970, the company was ordered to submit preliminary abatement plans. In January 1971, the conference found the plans "unacceptable."

Finally, after the fourth enforcement conference in April of last year, Ruckelshaus, acting under the authority of the 1965 Water Pollution Control Act authored by Blatnik, gave the company 180 days to come up with a plan to quit polluting the lake, after which he promised court action.

At the same time, Ruckelshaus announced that EPA had hired—at a cost of $94,000—a private consulting firm, Roy F. Weston, Inc., of West Chester, Pa., to conduct a six-month study of possible on-land disposal methods.

When the 180-day period ended last Oct. 28, Weston's five alternative plans calling for total or partial on-land disposal of the tailings were presented. Ruckelshaus then gave Reserve 30 more days to comment on the plans, which ranged in cost from $74 million to $48 million.

Reserve, meanwhile, mounted an aggressive lobbying effort in Washington to plead its case. Fride, Reserve's general counsel, joined with Reserve President Edward Furness, Armco President C. William Verity, and Republic Chairman Willis Boyer, as well as a half-dozen other executives and paid lobbyists, in an effort to forestall federal action.

Reserve argued it was not polluting the lake, that on-land disposal was unfeasible and too costly (Reserve's estimate was $200 million) and that the tailings could be disposed of without ecologic peril by piping them to the bottom of the lake.

The lobbyists wheeled out charts, brochures and voluminous scientific and engineering data in such profusion that one dazzled congressman called the presentation "Reserve's Dog and Pony Show."

As an example of Reserve's political clout, the "Dog and Pony Show" was booked into the Executive Office Building next door to the White House on Oct. 5, where Reserve presented its case to Whitaker, Russell Train, chairman of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, and presidential assistant Peter Flanigan.

The fact that the meeting took place did not become public until some days later when Democratic Congressman Robert Eckhardt of Texas obtained a copy of an Oct. 19 letter from Fride. In it Train was thanked "on behalf of Reserve Mining Co. . . . and its shareholders, Armco Steel Corp. and Republic Steel Corp. . . . for the opportunity to discuss the Reserve Mining Co. situation on Oct. 5 in your office."

Eckhardt made the letter public because Flanigan, who is the President's liaison between industry and the various federal agencies, and Whitaker had intervened with the Justice Department in October to get Armco a six-month delay after EPA ordered the company to stop dumping cyanamide wastes in the Houston, Tex., ship channel.

Armco's case was helped by the fact that Verity raised $14,000 for Nixon's 1968 presidential campaign and had become friendly with Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans, the man in charge of Nixon's fund-raising. Stans, ironically a native of Minnesota, has been one of the strongest opponents of strict federal action against industrial polluters and as a result has clashed frequently with Ruckelshaus.

Reserve continued to procrastinate after the 30-day extension granted by Ruckelshaus ran out. In December, two key meetings were held with EPA officials at Chicago in which Reserve attacked the Weston study plans as unfeasible and too costly.

Sandwiched between the Dec. 7 and 22 meetings were various conferences with EPA officials in Washington. On one occasion, Tom Truitt, an attorney in the EPA general counsel's office, went to Silver Bay to meet with Reserve executives.

At about the same time, Ruckelshaus said in an interview he had told Stans and the White House aides "to stay out (of the Reserve case) so that we can look at the facts, and make a decision on what is the best thing to save Lake Superior." He added that he felt the company had been "stalling" and that it could continue to stall in the courts, perhaps for years.

Ruckelshaus also noted that Reserve, in apparent anticipation of court action, had already directed some of its lobbying efforts at Assistant Attorney General Shiro Kashiwa (since named a federal judge), who handled pollution cases for the Justice Department. In fact, Kashiwa was given a tour of Reserve's plant by Fride late last summer.

Finally, two weeks ago, Ruckelshaus concluded that there was no other recourse except to take Reserve to court. He ordered his staff to prepare a letter asking Attorney General John Mitchell to start legal action requesting a federal judge to set a deadline for Reserve to stop its pollution of the lake.

That letter was the basis of last week's

announcement by EPA. Interestingly, Ruckelshaus was prepared to take much stronger action before Fride and apparently Stans, Whitaker and Flanigan got into the act last week. A copy of a draft letter to Mitchell prepared by Ruckelshaus on Jan. 12 shows that the EPA chief wanted to seek a court injunction against Reserve forcing the company to immediately halt its discharges into the lake.

Ruckelshaus' actual letter to Mitchell, sent Thursday, ended with the words, "In view of the seriousness of this problem, it is hereby requested that you institute immediate legal action against Reserve Mining Company." The draft letter ends with the same words, but adds a request that Mitchell seek a "court order prohibiting Reserve from discharging or depositing any tailings from its taconite ore beneficiating process into Lake Superior or such other relief as the court determines to be appropriate."

Nobody is saying why the last-minute change was agreed to, but apparently the behind-the-scenes machinations of Stans and White House aides Flanigan and Whitaker had something to do with it. Meanwhile, Reserve's discharges go on.

JOHNSON CITY HAS MAJOR STAKE IN PARIS OPERA HOUSE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the night of February 10, 1972, will mark a significant occasion at the Paris Opera House. For the first time in history, an American work will play at the world's largest opera house.

The First District of Tennessee has a special interest in this occasion as the opera's composer is a native of Johnson City. Mr. Kenton Coe, composer of "South," spent 5 years working on the project.

"South" had its world premier in Marseilles in 1965 and Wolfe Kaufman wrote in Variety that Kenton Coe may be heading toward an important international career.

Indeed, this outstanding young man is one of the country's most gifted composers. He recently visited his mother and aunt in Johnson City and the Johnson City Press-Chronicle carried an interesting article on Mr. Coe. I would like to make this story available for readers of the RECORD.

The story follows:

[From the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, Dec. 26, 1971]

JOHNSON CITY HAS A MAJOR STAKE IN PARIS OPERA HOUSE

Johnson City seems a little bit removed from the opera stage of Paris.

Yet, in February, Johnson City will have a very major interest in the Paris Opera House.

"South," the first opera of Kenton Coe, will have nine performances beginning Feb. 10.

Coe is the son of Mrs. C. B. Coe of Johnson City. He was born and reared here.

Most important, "South"—or "Sud"—will mark the first time that an American work has been played in the Paris Opera the world's largest opera house.

Coe sees the staging of his opera in Paris with mixed emotions. It is an important and prestigous first for him—but he has no hand in its preparation, a fact that irks him. "They don't want me around," he said.

The opera goes into rehearsal on Jan. 10 in Paris.

"South" made its first appearance in 1965 in Marseilles and was well received. It's based on a complicated, turbulent play by French writer Julian Green who was educated in Virginia.

When "South" had its world premiere at Marseilles, Wolfe Kaufmann wrote in "Variety," " 'South' is a new American opera rather unexpectedly given its world premiere in southern France . . . the event and the date is worth noting because the composer, Kenton Coe . . . may be heading towards an important international career. Judging by this work, the stuff is there."

Coe calls "South" a romantic tragedy with a cast of about 15. It took him five years to compose it. " 'South' was a good first opera," Coe said in retrospect. "But it had some weaknesses which I corrected."

He said it was not a traditional opera—"It's a drama sung with an orchestra. There's more continuity," he said.

A huge stage at the Paris Opera contains the setting for "South." It's a two-story plantation house with gardens, Coe said.

With "South" being presented in the Paris Opera, Coe said, there is now an increased chance that it may be presented in Washington season after next.

Earlier this year, the New Yorker commented, "On Feb. 10, 1972, the date of the Academie Francaise reception in honor of the bilingual Virginia-educated novelist Julien Green, the Opera itself will give the premiere of Kenton Coe's operatic setting of Green's 'Sud,' a Confederate play staged here in Paris several years ago with quite some success. The premiere of 'Sud' will be the most snobbish intellectual first night of the Opera's post-holiday 1972 season."

Coe laughs about that, particularly the reference to "the most snobbish intellectual first night."

Another Coe work, a one-act comic scene, "Le Grand Siecle," will be performed at the Opera of Nantes on Feb. 28 and 29.

He is in the process of completing his second opera, "The White Devil," an Elizabethan play made into an opera. This will be a revenge tragedy with a lot of social comment, Coe said.

"The White Devil" is an opera in the round, designed to be staged in an arena with film projection and electronic sound, he said.

"I never thought I'd come this far," Coe said. Asked how he chose to compose operas, he replied, "If it's any success at all, you can make a name quicker than in any other way."

The theatrical side of opera attracts more attention, he said.

"The music has to be worked with the drama," he said, "in time relation. The composer must have directorial vision."

He concentrates on Europe because of the contrast between the United States and Europe. There are few opera companies in the U.S., he said, but every city of 50,000 in Europe has an opera house.

The Italians—with whom opera is most frequently identified—"like voices," Coe said. The opera in Italy is simply a vehicle to allow someone to sing, he said. He calls the Germans and English most knowledgable about music.

"The English have a sincere appreciation of music," he said.

The most fun—and the most income—came to Coe when he wrote the score for a movie in 1968 which was filmed in Paris. "Birds of Peru" starred Jean Seberg; it played here in 1969 at the Majestic Theatre.

Coe said he had to work hard for three months on the score—in contrast to the years involved in composing an opera—but the film is still playing all over the world. "The royalties are still coming in," he said.

Doing the score was fun, he said, because of his involvement with the movie-makers, particularly the technical people. At the same time in the same studios, he said, Jane Fonda was doing "Barbarella," a far-out science-fiction movie.

Critics didn't care much for "Birds of Peru," Coe said, "but it grows on you the more you see it." He laughed again. "I've seen it at least 50 times," he said.

Coe is in and out of Johnson City, visiting his mother and his aunt, Louise Summers. He arrived on this visit earlier this month and plans to leave this week.

MRS. MILES IS STUDENT—AT 85

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, following is the inspiring story from the Burlington, N.C. Daily Times-News of a courageous lady who proves that you are never too old to learn:

MRS. MILES IS STUDENT—AT 85

(By Kathy Stark)

"They say you never get too old to learn," the little old lady said with a twinkle in her eyes. "And I never thought I was!"

That was Mrs. Ella Miles' comment to questions about her age, which is at least 85, and the fact that she is enrolled in one of the Technical Institute of Alamance's basic adult education programs. What that means is that Mrs. Miles is going to school to learn to read and write.

A native of Person County, Mrs. Miles was born and reared on a tobacco farm. She attended school for a brief while, but left the classroom to go to work in the fields. All she can remember about her schooling now is " 'A' as in 'rat', 'B' as in 'bat' and 'C' as in cat'."

But she never stopped "wishing" for an education. Over the years, she married, at about age 18 for the first time, moved to Alamance County, had 12 children and buried four husbands. She saw her children's children's children have children. And she told them all, she recalls, to learn all they can.

"Dropping out of school is wrong, sugar," she told me. "I tell the children to go to school, to learn all they can. I used to tell them I wished I had the opportunity they have to go to school."

Now, Mrs. Miles has the opportunity. A neighbor recently told her of a class being held in Mebane by the Technical Institute of Alamance and asked her if she'd like to enroll.

"I was real anxious to go, to learn to read and write," Mrs. Miles says. She hopes someday to be able to sign her name, to write letters of her own, to read her own mail and the treasured family Bible.

Some of her children live out of town, some out of state. She receives letters often and cards on special occasions from her many descendants, but she's always had to ask someone to read them to her.

"I'd ask anybody I could get," Mrs. Miles says. Asking someone to write a letter for her came harder, however. She never felt comfortable in making such a request, and often the letter just never got written. On occasions when she had to sign her name, it was a mark that served as her signature.

Mrs. Miles, who has lived for many years in the White Level community on Rt. 3, Mebane, is proud of the fact that she is learning to read and write. She practices her letters, attends classes regularly and hopes, eventually, to learn numbers.

It's hard to image how she's managed all these years, and Mrs. Miles admits that not having an education is a handicap. She could keep up with her children's ages only long enough to know when its was time to send them to school. Then, she says, keeping up with their ages became their job.

Her calendar is her little portable television, a big comfort to her now that she lives alone and is retired from the field and domestic work that occupied most of her days. She still cares for a couple of her smallest great-grandchildren, however.

Mrs. Miles has no idea how old she is, but there are some who believe she is closer to 100 than 85, maybe even older. It isn't really of much concern to her, however. She says simply that she's been around for many a year and that her health allows her to get around pretty good. For her, that's all that matters.

As far as her education goes, she hopes to learn all she can. Even without the benefit of book learnin', she has a keen interest in the news and has very definite opinions about such "ridiculous" matters as war—"all that fightin' and killin' "—and about a certain politician's "dirty deeds".

Mrs. Miles doesn't really understand yet what the Technical Institute of Alamance is or why it is that, even at her age, she has an opportunity to make her dreams come true. What is important is that she understands that an education is vital and that she has another chance to learn.

Her classmates include a married couple, a mother and daughter, an educated immigrant learning to spell in his adopted tongue and a number of others who are taking advantage of a chance to become better equipped for life. They're all much younger than Mrs. Miles, but they couldn't be more thrilled with the prospect or grateful for the opportunity.

NEW HOPE FOR THE OLD

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, as the problems of our elderly citizens are finally beginning to receive the attention they deserve, I think it only right and proper to single out for praise some of our younger citizens who already are working to reduce the isolation in which so many older people find themselves.

Two such young men are the Reverend David Freitag and the Reverend Sloan Lister, both of Louisville, Ky., who have joined the growing number of clergymen dedicating their careers to ministering to the aged.

Accordingly, I commend the following article which appeared in the Louisville Times, written by reporter Becky Homan, to the attention of my colleagues. It is entitled "New Hope for the Old."

The article follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Jan. 19, 1972]

NEW HOPE FOR THE OLD

(By Becky Homan)

Clara was once "a woman of looks and interests," according to a friend.

But as she grew older, she lost her eyesight, part of her hearing and a lot of her spunk . . . and eventually came to live at the Louisville Christian Church Home, 924 S. Fourth.

Her world, like that of thousands of other elderly people admitted to nursing and personal-care homes, was dramatically reduced to one room. She became despondent about the losses in her life. But more than anything else, she missed her church and frequent visits with her minister.

That was before the young Rev. David Freitag came to the home last August as its first full-time chaplain.

Now that he pays her daily visits, Clara (not her real name) has gained a new confidence.

"By simply being a representative of the church and by showing some personal interest," says a staff member, "he has helped to allay her insecurities and to dispel her withdrawal."

Mr. Freitag, 27, is no miracle worker. He is a young man interested in the plight of institutionalized people and, perhaps more important, one of a growing number of clergyman who are making a career of ministering to one specific group: the elderly.

Their concern is part of a growing national awareness that America is herding its older citizens into segregated, ghetto-like existences. They feel that the church, like the community, has neglected many of the needs of these people.

For these and other reasons, local churchmen such as Mr. Freitag and the Rev. Sloan Lister, chaplain at Woodhaven Medical Services, are dedicating their already dedicated lives to helping the aged.

They've taken cues from people like a local nursing-home administrator who says, "I learned the first year here that you can't expect the neighborhood pastor to spend much, if any, time visiting the patients. It's usually just a Sunday-service-only thing."

This administrator sensed a real need for regular counseling, so he hired a seminary student part time.

"We felt we needed somebody who could establish confidential relationships and watch out for moods or attitudes that other staffers might miss.

"Now, our part-time chaplain is closer to the patients' here than anyone else," he said.

After 5½ months on the job, Mr. Freitag has learned that being a full-time monitor of emotions is probably his most important role.

There is a battery of professionals at the Christian Church Home: a program director, a social worker, physical therapists, doctors and nurses.

"But," says the earnest young minister, "each resident, when he's talking to one professional, will usually communicate only what he thinks that professional wants to know. He'll tell a doctor about his pains, but probably not about what's getting him down.

"I'm here to detect illnesses related to spiritual or psychological problems."

It's part of what Mr. Freitag calls "a wholistic approach to care."

Mr. Lister has similar duties at the 270-bed nursing home on Dixie Highway. He thinks he was probably the first full-time "minister to the elderly" in this area.

His approach, he says, isn't much different from that of a pastor to a congregation of all ages.

"Elderly people are people," says Mr. Lister. "Ministering to them doesn't require a whole different approach."

He and others agree that older people, especially those in institutions, have certain needs requiring that a ministry to them be specialized in some ways.

Mr. Lister says, for example, that most of his "flock" would rather be back in the community. They all have experienced losses of freedom or relationships. Most have to cope with loneliness, and as they begin to reevaluate their lives, many of them have to deal with feelings of guilt.

"Looking at life from this end of it makes many of them say, 'If only I could go back, I would do it all differently,' " says Mr. Lister.

"One thing I've learned not to do is to have an easy answer ready . . . generally when I visit, I listen, talk a little and put an arm around a shoulder or two."

Mr. Lister also organizes daily group discussions around current topics and encourages debate and interrelationships.

He has bitter feelings about society's isolation of the elderly into nursing homes. He brings people in from the community to visit the homes as much as possible.

He says he would like to see local homes establish programs such as he's read about, in which elderly residents can come and go for weeks at a time "so they're not coming here as a dead end."

TELEPHONE SERVICE OFFERED

Mr. Lister hasn't limited his ministry to the elderly at Woodhaven. He's helped establish a Telecare Phone Service, which gives the elderly out in the community a central number to call for help or for a chat when they're lonely.

And he's also been certified by the National Association of Clinical Pastors to train seminary students for this kind of ministry.

Mr. Freitag will be working for the next three years to get his certification as a trainer. He says Louisville needs more outlets for a student to get practical experience. Currently, students go to work in hospitals, prisons and rehabilitation centers.

His approach to a ministry for the elderly is one of a man who dislikes the depersonalization in any institution, "where people are lonely and taken out of their place in life." He was trained in hospitals and mental institutions and says he would have become a military chaplain if he'd had the chance.

He describes growing old as a "depersonalizing process" but one that isn't dissimilar to adolescence.

BOTH ARE CRISIS TIMES

"Both are crisis times of life when these sets of people have to reorganize their goals and values: the adolescent is moving away from a dependent to an independent state and the elderly person is moving from an independent to a dependent state."

A blue notebook full of plans for putting his ideas to work sits on Mr. Freitag's desk.

As for now, however, he's concentrating on each Sunday's door-to-door communion services and on getting to know the patients as individuals.

On a recent weekday he visited the room of a sick and angry woman whose pencil-thin frame shook under the bed linens when she talked.

She didn't believe her doctors were really trying to relieve her pain and she told Mr. Freitag so.

He held her hand and reassured her that everyone was doing all he could.

Then he left the room and hurried to register his observations on her medical chart for the doctor's benefit.

He told a reporter . . . "That woman really was in pain from a heart attack and bladder infection . . . but the grief is coming out hostility." Several months ago, he added, there might have been no one to listen to her complaints . . . "and it's her hostility that's probably preventing her from getting well."

TRIBUTE TO BOB JONES

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I was unable to attend the anniversary party for our friend and colleague, ROBERT E. JONES of Alabama, on Friday, January 28. However, I want to extend congratulations to him on having given 25 years of outstanding service to the Eighth District of Alabama, and to the Nation.

Since I was first elected to the Congress in the 86th Congress, I have been privileged to serve with this fine southern gentleman on the Commitee on Pub-

lic Works. Throughout the years we have worked on water pollution problems, disaster legislation and legislation pertaining to public buildings and grounds. It has been a pleasure to work with him and to have the benefit of his leadership and counsel. I hope that I will continue to have an opportunity to work with him for many years to come.

He is an expert in many fields and has never been too busy to discuss, with his colleagues, problems affecting their districts, and he has been particularly helpful to me and to the State of California on the many disasters such as floods and earthquakes which have occurred in our Golden State.

On behalf of the citizens of California I want to commend and thank BOB JONES for his 25 years of outstanding service, and to wish him every future success.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, Youth for Understanding—an international teenage student exchange program—has established an excellent record of success. I join in the special order by Members of the 92d Congress on this 2d day of February 1972, to appropriately recognize the commendable record of education and human understanding that has resulted from 21 years of administration of a rather difficult program of coordination for the benefit of many, many young people in countries all over the world.

The goal of the nonprofit educational program is to foster mutual understanding through the exchange of American students and international students in foreign countries and to enhance the objectives of peace. Participants live with native families, attend school, and participate in community affairs. The program has been successful as evidenced by the increased number of countries participating therein. The record number of participating youths has increased annually.

There are now 47 countries participating in the youth for understanding program and 25 countries have a sustained interest in the program. There was a total of 30,000 students enrolled and participating in the 1971–72 academic year.

At present, the YFU includes five programs:

First. International students—high school program students stay in American homes for 6 to 11 months.

Second. Mexican program—Mexican students live in American homes for 6 weeks.

Third. American students—summer program—American students live for approximately 2 months in foreign countries—includes Jr. high students.

Fourth. American students—YFU music programs—after several months of preparation American students conduct a summer tour.

Japanese teachers have been placed in California, South Dakota, Arizona, Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa, and New York.

There were 68 South American students and 53 international students on the exchange program in South Dakota during the 1971–72 academic year.

I am proud of the record of the program and the record of the many, many young people that have participated therein. The Youth for Understanding curriculum has a human and worthwhile objective for the mutual benefit of all mankind.

The genuine interest of the people in my State, in the State of South Dakota, has been demonstrated by active and hospitable participation in the program by opening their homes to young people from various parts of the world. The Indian schools in South Dakota have made a great contribution to YFU students. Private homes of many American families have been opened to exchange students from foreign countries but equally important is the hospitality of administrators of the program and of the schools of this Nation.

I join my colleagues in recognition of 21 years of success. I commend personnel engaged in the Youth for Understanding programs and the successful administration thereof. The international teenage student exchange program may well be our greatest instrument of peace—it is a just cause for mutual understanding among leaders of the future. I am hopeful that it may be expanded and that it may continue with equal success for the benefit of all mankind and that all participants will progress from participation therein. It is a proven program of the past and it is a program of hope for peace in the world of the future.

RECORDED TELLER VOTING

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the recorded teller vote—a major step toward giving our constituents a chance to know how we really vote on crucial issues—is under attack. Despite studies which indicate that this type of vote is neither time wasting nor frivolous, forces within the House are preparing to make it far more difficult to obtain recorded tellers.

The Democratic Study Group has compiled a fine study of the first year's experience with the recorded teller procedure, and today's New York Times contains an editorial on the subject. The DSG report shows that the procedure has been a successful one, and the Times editorial considers some of the reasons why the procedure is under attack. I hope that each Member of the House will have an opportunity to read this material, which follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1972]

HOUSE REFORM IN DANGER

A serious move is afoot to undo one of the most important advances that Congressional reformers have managed to put through. Eighteen months ago they won a change in the rules of the House of Representatives to allow just twenty members to demand a recorded teller vote when that chamber, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, considers amendments to pending legislation. The reformers did away, in effect, with that ancient hypocrisy whereby a Congressman could vote aye on a bill, for the record, the day after he had anonymously voted to wreck it with crippling amendments.

The current effort to weaken this reform by requiring that many more than twenty members—perhaps as many as forty out of a quorum of a hundred—would be needed to force a recorded vote is offered as a way of "correcting abuses." Chiefly the alleged abuses are repetitive and frivolous demands for recorded votes, resulting in an inordinate waste of time.

But figures compiled by the Democratic Study Group indicate the flimsiness of the charge. On 102 rollcalls in the House itself the losing side had less than fifty votes. Since critics of the recorded teller vote use this sort of lopsidedness as an index of frivolity, it may be noted that only two recorded teller votes have been in that category. Where the average margin between ayes and nays on House rollcalls was 229, the margin on recorded teller votes averaged only 91. As for time, a House rollcall takes about 35 minutes; a recorded teller vote, twelve.

There is obviously, then, more to attacks on the reform than a sudden concern with efficiency. The recorded teller vote has been responsible, among other things, for the defeat of the SST, funding of the District of Columbia subway and notice to the Administration of hardening sentiment against the war in Vietnam. It must be conceded that it has also stiffened Congressional stands against busing as a way to achieve integration. But, on the whole it has given liberal Representatives a much greater voice in the amending process and forced wider participation in that crucial House activity.

For these reasons, efforts to erase the reform can be expected from the same sources that originally opposed it: committee chairmen, who found the old unrecorded teller vote more reliable; to so-called "gym crowd," who resent having to spend more time in the chamber; and finally those members, liberal and conservative alike, who simply do not relish having their votes on such delicate issues as busing spread all over the record.

Fortunately, any attempt to cancel the recorded teller vote will itself be recorded—and, we hope, carefully watched by constituents with a distaste for anonymous lawmaking.

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP SPECIAL REPORT: THE FIRST YEAR OF RECORD TELLER VOTING

This report examines the first year's experience with record teller votes—the most significant change in House operations and procedures in more than half of a century. Most observers feel the record teller reform—which was won through a DSG initiated, bi-partisan reform drive—has been an unqualified success.

Nonetheless, it is being proposed that the number of Members required to obtain a record teller vote be increased to eliminate alleged misuse and overuse of the record teller procedure. (The current requirement is one-fifth of a quorum which means that 20 Members are required to obtain a record teller vote in Committee of the Whole and 44 in the House.)

It is the purpose of this Special Report to examine the validity of the complaints against the record teller reform. The report consists of the following sections:

I. Summary of Criticisms and Findings.
II. The Record Teller Record.
III. Responses to Criticisms.
IV. Some Possible Changes.

Attachments: List of Record Teller Votes and Comparisons With Roll Call Voting.

SECTION I—SUMMARY OF CRITICISMS AND FINDINGS

Critics contend there have been "repeated record teller votes on the same proposal with minor variations" and many record teller votes which are either "frivolous" or pointless due to overwhelming sentiments for or against approval, and that as a result Members are being forced to spend too much time voting. They also express fears that an organized group of 20 Members could tie up the House indefinitely with frequent "nuisance" votes—similar to a Senate filibuster.

Supporters counter that the record teller reform is working better than anyone thought possible and that there is no justification for curbing its use. They add that increasing the requirement for obtaining a record teller vote would result in an increase in demands for quorum calls by Members who intend to seek a record teller and want to make sure they have enough supporters on the floor to meet the higher requirement.

Findings

Despite the increase in overall number of record votes (roll call and record teller) to an all-time high, the House actually spent less time voting in 1971 than in 1970.

There have been only a few instances where it can be claimed there were "repeated" votes on the same issue.

Only a few record teller votes could be defined as frivolous or pointless. However, the labels "frivolous" and "pointless" can easily be applied to a great many roll call votes—more than 100 of which involved lopsided margins.

More Members participated in record teller votes than in roll call votes. This is further evidence that record teller votes are generally more important—and less frivolous—than roll call votes.

There was only one instance where a record teller vote was requested after a non-record vote showed less than one-third support for the proposal involved.

There has been a dramatic increase in non-record vote participation.

Over one-fourth of the 101 amendments voted on by record teller vote were approved.

The record teller procedure was used about equally by Republicans and Democrats.

The majority of record teller votes were on major questions such as foreign and defense policy, school busing, and appropriations.

While conservatives won twice as many record teller votes as liberals, the record teller reform represented a significant gain for liberals since they rarely ever won a vote when votes were not recorded.

SECTION II—THE RECORD TELLER RECORD

This section summarizes the record of the first year of record teller votes. It analyzes the number of votes, member participation, types and sources of amendments decided by record teller vote, etc.

Number of record votes

There were a total of 108 record teller votes during 1971—103 on amendments and motions in Committee of the Whole and five on matters in the House itself when the record teller procedures was used in lieu of the roll call. The 103 record teller votes in Committee of the Whole included 101 votes on amendments and 2 votes on important procedural motions. Twenty-eight requests for record teller votes were rejected due to lack of support from 20 members. Overall, there was a total of 320 record votes in the House in 1971—108 record tellers and 212 roll calls. This is the largest number of record votes ever taken in a single year. The previous record was 266 in 1970. The average for the past four years is 230.

Number of nonrecord votes

As might be expected, the number of nonrecord teller and division votes dragged sharply. Non-record teller votes were all but eliminated as their number dropped from 51 in 1970 to 2 in 1971. Non-record division votes were still frequently used, however. They only declined from 123 in 1970 to 98 in 1971.

Participation in record votes

More members participated in record teller votes than in roll call votes. An average of 375 members voted on each record teller vote compared to only 365 on each roll call vote. The following chart shows the average number of members voting on record tellers, roll calls and quorum calls and what percent of the total House each average represents:

	Average number members voting	Percent of total House
Record tellers	375	86
Rollcalls	365	84
Quorum calls	351	81

Participation in nonrecord votes

An unexpected effect of the record teller reform has been a dramatic increase in the number of members participating in non-record votes in Committee of the Whole. Since only two non-record teller votes were taken in 1971 they do not provide an adequate base for comparison. But a comparison of participation in division votes during 1970 and 1971 shows a 48% increase.

	Average number of members voting	Number of times less than 100 voted	Number of times more than 100 voted
1970 division votes	90	82	41
1971 division votes	133	30	68

The division vote data indicates that a quorum (100 members) was *not* present for 82 or two-thirds of the votes in 1970. In 1971, however, the situation was reversed with a quorum being absent for only 30 or less than one-third of the votes.

Amendments

A total of 348 floor amendments were offered during 1971. Over 70% of these amendments were handled by non-record vote procedures—177 by voice vote, 68 by division vote, and two by non-record teller votes. The remaining 101 were decided by means of a record teller vote.

Twenty-seven amendments were adopted by record teller votes—10 liberal, 11 conservative and 6 neither. In 13 instances record teller votes changed the decision of non-record votes which preceded them. Six amendments (3 liberal and 3 neutral) which had been defeated on non-record votes were subsequently approved on record teller votes. Similarly, seven other amendments (1 liberal, 3 conservative and 3 neither) were rejected on record teller votes after having been approved on non-record votes.

Overall, 141 amendments were approved while 207 were rejected. Following is a breakdown showing the disposition of all amendments offered.

AMENDMENTS

	Total	Approved	Rejected
Handled by:			
Voice vote	177	97	80
Division	68	16	52
Nonrecord teller	2	1	1
Record teller	101	27	74
Total	348	141	207

Source of amendments and record teller requests

Two-thirds of the amendments decided by record teller vote was sponsored by members (including chairmen) of the committees which reported the bill. Only 37 or one-third were sponsored by members of other committees. Following is a breakdown of sources of the 101 amendments determined by teller vote in Committee of the Whole.

8—sponsored by Chairman or officially by Committee.

56—sponsored by other members of the Committee.

37—sponsored by members of other committees.

There were also two record teller votes on procedural motions in Committee of the Whole and five instances when the record teller procedure was used in lieu of a roll call in the House.

Democrats sponsored 61 amendments while Republicans sponsored 42. However, for one-third of the amendments a member other than the sponsor (usually an opponent) requested the record teller vote. Following is a party breakdown showing the number of instances where the record teller vote was requested by the amendment sponsor and the number of instances where another member requested the record vote.

	Sponsored amendment and requested recorded teller	Sponsored amendment only	Requested record teller only
Democrat	40	21	18
Republican	31	11	14
Total	71	32	32

As mentioned earlier, requests for record tellers were rejected in 28 instances. In all but four of these cases, the member requesting the record teller vote was the sponsor of the amendment.

Types of amendments decided on record teller votes

Nearly one-fourth (24) of the 1971 record teller votes were on amendments dealing with foreign affairs, defense policy, the war and related matters. For example, there were seven record tellers on amendments to the military authorization bill, six on the draft extension bill, and five each on the defense appropriation bill and the foreign affairs appropriations bill. None were approved.

Thirty-one of the 103 record teller votes (including 10 of the above) were on amendments to appropriations bills. Six were approved: four liberal, one conservative and one neither. Amendments to appropriations bills included votes on SST funding and release of D.C. metro funds.

The most record tellers on a single bill was 18 on H.R. 7248, the Higher Education bill. Many of the votes involved the controversial school busing issue. Eleven amendments were approved: Two liberal, seven conservative, and two neither. Other bills on which there were several record teller votes included H.R. 11060, Election Law Reform, and H.R. 10351, OEO-Legal Services. There were five record teller votes on each.

Liberal versus conservative

Overall, conservatives won about half of the 103 record teller votes in Committee of the Whole while one-fourth represented a victory for liberals and one-fourth was mixed or neither. This represents a significant advance for liberals in that prior to 1971, few liberal amendments could survive the conservative-dominated Committee of the Whole. For example, not a single liberal amendment of any substance was approved during 1970 prior to the advent of record tellers.

SECTION III—RESPONSES TO CRITICISMS OF RECORD TELLER VOTING

This section examines the validity of criticisms directed against the record teller procedure.

Too much time spent voting

Despite the increase in number record votes to an all-time high, less time was spent taking record votes in 1971 than in 1970.

In 1970 the House spent about 155 hours taking 266 record votes (all roll calls).

In 1971 the House spent 145 hours taking 320 record votes (212 roll calls and 108 record tellers).

These time estimates are based on a formula of 35 minutes per call and 12 minutes per record teller. However, even a more conservative formula (e.g. 30 minutes per roll call and 14 minutes per teller vote), indicates that less time was spent taking votes in 1971 than in 1970.

Repeated votes on minor variations of the same proposal

There are only six instances where this criticism might apply. Most instances involved a compromise of a proposal which had just been rejected and in all cases it could be argued that the differences between amendments were significant enough to warrant separate votes. (The six cases do not include four votes on school busing because they were not votes on the same proposal but on different elements of the busing issue.) The six instances are as follows:

(1) Two amendments to the Draft Extension:

The Whalen Amendment extending the draft for one year instead of two as proposed in the committee bill.

The Carney compromise extending the draft for a year and a half.

(2) Three amendments to the Military Procurement Authorization proposing deadlines for withdrawal from Indochina:

The Mink Amendment cutting off funds unconditionally as of January 1, 1972.

The Nedzi-Whalen amendment setting a January 1, 1972 deadline, subject to a number of conditions.

The Pepper amendment setting a June 1, 1972 deadline and specific POW conditions.

(3) Two amendments to the legal services title of the Economic Opportunity Act:

The Devine Amendment killing legal services.

The Waggoner compromise authorizing legal services on an experimental 2-year basis.

(4) Two amendments to the Higher Education Act:

The Quie Amendment setting national standards for determining student need and altering the state allotment formula.

The Fraser compromise which altered the formula only.

(5) Two amendments to the D.C. Revenue Act for 1971 cutting the Federal payment:

The Gross Amendment cutting the payment by $44 million.

The Scherle compromise cutting the payment by $25 million.

(6) Two budget cutting amendments to the Defense Appropriations Act:

The Reigle Amendment limiting defense spending to 95% of funds budgeted, a cut of almost $5 billion.

The Aspin compromise setting a ceiling at the FY 1971 level, a cut of about $1.5 billion.

Too many frivolous votes

A good measure of the importance—or frivolity—of a vote is its closeness—the margin between the number of members voting YEA and the number voting NAY. The smaller the margin, the more important the vote; the larger the margin, the less important—or more frivolous—the votes. This is, in fact, the standard that critics of record teller votes use when they point to votes rejecting amendments by lopsided margins as examples of frivolous record teller votes.

In point of fact, however, such critics would be better advised to direct their attention to roll call votes rather than record tellers for these are far more frivolous and pointless roll calls than record teller votes.

For example, 120 or nearly 60% of the 212 roll calls taken in 1971 had a margin of more than 200 votes between those voting YEA and those voting NAY. Only seven or 7% of the record teller votes had margins of this magnitude.

Similarly, 82 or nearly 40% of the roll calls had margins exceeding 300 votes while only one record teller vote fell in this category.

The average margin on roll calls was 229 compared to only 91 on record teller votes (see Attachment No. 1).

Another indication of the importance or frivolity of a vote is the number of members who support the losing side. For example, many regard it as frivolous or pointless to require a record vote on propositions which cannot command the support (or opposition) of at least 50 of the 435 members of the House.

Again, such critics might examine roll call votes rather than record tellers. For a total of 102 roll calls in 1971—nearly half—involved votes in which the losing side had less than 50 supporters. Only two or 2% of the record teller votes fell in this category.

Even more startling is the fact that on 51 roll call votes the losing side could not garner even 10 votes. This included 22 instances of measures approved by margins of more than 300 to 0. Needless to say, these were no record tellers in this category. (See Attachment No. 2.)

Finally, examination of the record teller votes themselves and non-record votes which precede them indicates that they generally involve major substantive issues and have sufficient support to warrant seeking a record vote. For example, 28 of the 100 record teller votes were preceded by a division vote on which the losing side (the side which requested the record teller vote) averaged 44% of the total members voting. In only one instance did the losing side get less than 34% of the total vote. The remaining 72 record tellers were preceded either by a voice vote (30) or no non-record vote whatsoever (42). Thus it can hardly be claimed that members asked for record tellers when previous votes had demonstrated they had absolutely no chance of winning.

SECTION IV—POSSIBLE CHANGES

Following are some possible changes which have been suggested to ease some of the complaints against record tellers:

Use record tellers for rollcalls and quorum calls

In 1971 the House spent 200 hours—more than an entire working month—taking 212 roll calls (35 minutes each) and 152 quorum calls (30 minutes each). This expenditure of time could have been more than cut in half by using the record teller procedure (12 minutes) in lieu of calling the roll. The amount of time spent taking roll calls could have been reduced from 124 to 43 hours while the amount of time taking quorum calls could have been cut from 76 to 30 hours. The record teller procedure was used in lieu of roll calls on five occasions in 1971.

Pipe floor debate into Members offices

Instead of closed-circuit TV, why not closed-circuit sound? It would provide all of the advantages of closed-circuit TV with none of the disadvantages. Some Members have complained about difficulty adequately informing themselves on amendments they are called to the floor to vote upon. Closed-circuit sound would solve this problem by providing a means for Members to stay in touch with floor debate while working in their offices.

Similarly, committee and office staff could be better informed on floor activities and would be better able to advise Members and answer questions, etc. The speakers in Members' offices could be equipped with an unobtrusive signalling device so that those who wish to turn down the sound could be alerted when an amendment is offered, when some other legislative event occurs, or when the leadership wishes to make an announcement.

Provide more work space for members in the capitol

Some members complain about having to "chase back and forth" between the floor and their offices to vote. This problem could be greatly eased if rooms in the Capitol itself were available for Members to meet constituents, work with staff, etc. in more privacy than is afforded by the Rayburn Room. Such space could be made available if some of the indirect support services and other activities now housed in the Capitol were moved elsewhere. Note: The Capitol Diagrams on pages 412–421 of the Congressional Directory show that most of the space in the Capitol is currently used to house activities which have no need to be in the aCpitol itself: Repair and maintenance shops, airline and railroad ticket offices, storage of documents and other materials, committee staff, etc.

Eliminate non-record-teller votes or make it possible to request a record teller without requesting a non-record teller first

Under present rules a two-step procedure is required to obtain a record teller vote: The Member must first request a non-record teller and then "tellers with clerks" (record teller vote). The non-record teller procedure was used only two times in 1971 and could probably be eliminated altogether. Or, the rules could be changed to permit Members to request a record teller vote directly, without first requesting a non-record teller vote.

Do not require amendment sponsors and leaders of floor debate to serve as tellers

The practice of assigning the sponsor of an amendment and the leader of the opposition to serve as tellers for a record teller results in unnecessary delay. These Members should be left free to answer Members questions, lobby etc. Use of Members as tellers could be eliminated altogether or other Members not directly involved in the debate could be assigned.

Increase the time period for record tellers

Some Members have complained that the 12-minute time period allotted for Members to get from their offices or elsewhere to the floor is insufficient. This time could be increased by two or three minutes without serious damage to the effectiveness and efficiency of the record teller procedure.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1: COMPARISON OF VOTE MARGINS ON ROLL CALL AND RECORD TELLER VOTES

This chart compares the Yea-Nay differences for Roll Call and Record Teller votes taken during 1971. Column No. 1 indicates various categories of margins between the number of Yea and Nay votes. Column No. 2 indicates the number of Roll Call votes where one side exceeded the other side by that margin while Column No. 3 indicates the number of Record Teller votes which fell in that category.

1 Yea-Nay vote margin	2 Roll call votes	3 Record teller votes
Over 390	1	0
380 to 389	8	0
370 to 379	8	0
360 to 369	9	0
350 to 359	10	0
340 to 349	16	1
330 to 339	8	0
320 to 329	8	0
310 to 319	9	0
300 to 309	5	0
290 to 299	9	0
280 to 289	5	0
270 to 279	3	0
260 to 269	0	1
250 to 259	5	0
240 to 249	3	2
230 to 239	4	2
220 to 229	7	1
210 to 219	1	0
200 to 209	1	2
190 to 199	6	1
180 to 189	1	3
170 to 179	4	4
160 to 169	1	1
150 to 159	3	2
140 to 149	8	4
130 to 139	2	3
120 to 129	4	2
110 to 119	3	5
100 to 109	9	2
90 to 99	2	4
80 to 89	3	5
70 to 79	5	6
60 to 69	6	4
50 to 59	1	10
40 to 49	8	12
30 to 39	6	7
20 to 29	9	5
10 to 19	6	7
0 to 9	5	7

ATTACHMENT No. 2

This chart compares the number of roll call votes on which one side had less than 100 votes with the number of record teller votes where the losing side had less than 100 votes.

Column No. 1 indicates the number of votes on the losing side in categories of ten from 0 to 100. Column No. 2 shows the number of Roll Calls on which the losing side had that many votes while Column No. 3 indicates the number of Record Teller votes in that category.

Number of votes on losing side	Number of rollcalls	Number of record tellers
0	22	0
1 to 9	29	0
10 to 19	20	1
20 to 29	13	1
30 to 39	12	0
40 to 49	6	0
50 to 59	4	0
60 to 69	8	1
70 to 79	7	4
80 to 89	4	3
90 to 99	8	4
Total under 100	[1] 133	[2] 14
Total Under 50	[3] 102	[4] 2

[1] 62 percent.
[2] 14 percent.
[3] 48 percent.
[4] 2 percent.

ATTACHMENT NO. 3

RECORD TELLER VOTES DURING 1971

Date, bill number, and amendment sponsor and record teller requester	Amendment or motion	Nonrecord votes Yea	Nonrecord votes Nay	Record teller votes Yea	Record teller votes Nay
Mar. 3, H.R. 4690, Patman	Strike issuance of bonds without regard to interest ceiling			179	212
Percent				46	54
Mar. 18, H. J. Res. 468, Yates	Strike out further funding of SST			215	204
Percent				51	49
Mar. 29, S.J. Res. 55, Reuss, Patman	Equitable use of wage and price controls	60	106	143	183
Percent		36	64	44	56
Mar. 31, H.R. 6531, Harrington	Repeal President's induction authority			62	330
Percent				16	84
Mar. 31, H.R. 6531, Whalen	Extend President's induction authority for 1 year only			198	200
Percent				49.8	50.2
Apr. 1, H.R. 6531, Dennis	Eliminate punitive provisions re conscientious objectors	46	66	131	242
Percent		41	59	35	65
Apr. 1, H.R. 6531, Fraser	No draftees to Southeast Asia after Dec. 31, 1971		(1)	122	260
Percent				32	68
Apr. 1, H.R. 6531, Gibbons	Prohibit use of draftees except in declared war			97	279
Percent				26	74
Apr. 1, H.R. 6531, Carney	Extend draft only 18 months rather than 2 years			170	200
Percent				46	54
Apr. 6, H.R. 5981, Findley	Motion to raise and thereby kill sugar beet support bill			182	178
Percent				51	49
Apr. 7, H. R. 7016, Hathaway	Add $728,000,000 for educational programs			187	192
Percent				47	53
Apr. 7, H.R. 7106, Stokes, Conte	Strike Whitten provisions forbidding forced busing			149	205
Percent				42	58
May, 11, H.R. 8190, Giaimo	Restore $34,200,000 in subway funds for District of Columbia			170	219
Percent				44	56
May 12, H.R. 8190, Boland, Yates	Continue funding for SST			201	195
Percent				50.5	49.5
June 2, H.R. 8141, Esch	Restructure manpower program, stressing local control			182	204
Percent				47	43
June 16 H.R. 8687, Leggett	Cut $51,000,000 in ABM funds			129	266
Percent				32	68
June 16, H.R. 8687, Aspin	Limit authorization to fiscal year 1971 appropriation level			119	270
Percent				31	69
June 16, H.R. 8687, Pike	Delete $370,200,000 for development of B-1 bomber			98	307
Percent				24	76
June 16, H.R. 8687, Stafford	Cut R. & D. funds to fiscal year 1971 level, except for 5 percent inflation increase	67	111	136	258
Percent		38	62	35	65
June 17, H.R. 8687, Nedzi	Ban funds after Jan. 1, 1972, to support U.S. military in Indochina			158	256
Percent				36	67
June 17, H.R. 8687, Mink, Howard	Straight cutoff of Indochina support after Jan. 1, 1972			82	327
Percent				20	80
June 17, H.R. 8687, Pepper	Cutoff Indochina military funds after June 1, 1972, subject to certain POW provisions			147	237
Percent				39	61
June 22, H.R. 1, Ullman, Burleson	Strike family assistance title from H.R. 1			187	234
Percent				44	56
June 23, H.R. 9270, Conte	$20,000 farm subsidy limitation			214	198
Percent				52	(1) 48
June 23, H.R. 9270, Reuss	Ban funding of stream channelization projects unless started before July 1, 1971			129	278
Percent				32	68
June 23, H.R. 9270, Michel	Forbid food stamps to households of strikers			172	225
Percent				43	57
June 24, H.R. 9272, Yates	Add $11,600,000 for ILO dues	51	70	147	225
Percent		42	58	40	60
June 24, H.R. 9272, Gonzalez, Conyers	Cut $4,250,000 in community relations services	68	64	127	233
Percent		51	49	35	65
June 30, H.R. 9382, Clawson, Williams	Cut $3,000,000 counseling service from HUD	32	41	164	217
Percent		44	56	43	57
July 8, H.R. 8181, Vanik	Strike language exempting Eximbank budget from inclusion in U.S. budget			112	249
Percent				31	69
July 8, H.R. 8181, Wylie	Prevent Eximbank from financing exports to Communist countries			207	153
Percent				57	43
July 15, H.R. 9388, Skubitz, Hosmer	Cut out funds for national nuclear waste repository at Lyons, Kans	36	30	162	206
Percent		54	46	44	56
July 27, H.R. 10061, Giaimo	Add $82,400,000 for vocational rehabilitation			236	153
Percent				61	39
July 27, H.R. 10061, Yates	Add $200,000,000 for health programs			169	214
Percent				44	56

Footnotes at end of table.

ATTACHMENT NO. 3—Continued

RECORD TELLER VOTES DURING 1971—Continued

Date, bill number, and amendment sponsor and record teller requester	Amendment or motion	Nonrecord votes		Record teller votes	
		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
July 27, H.R. 10061, Burke, G. Ford	Add $64,000,000 for child welfare	162	148	185	201
Percent		52	48	48	52
July 28, H.R. 9092, Gross, Henderson	Eliminate certain DOD employees from pay raise	26	23	147	233
Percent		53	47	39	61
July 29, H.R. 10090, Clark, Bow	Delete $100,000 for Dickey-Lincoln project study	99	100	198	182
Percent		49	51	52	48
July 29, H.R. 10090, Mink	Prohibit funds for testing nuclear weapons in Aleutian Islands		(1)	108	282
Percent				28	72
July 30, H.R. 8432, Colmer, Dingell	Require 10 percent of Lockheed loan come from private sources			175	205
Percent				48	52
Aug. 4, H.J. Res. 833, N. Smith	Alternate formula based on ratio of State unemployment to U.S. unemployment		(1)	172	213
Percent				43	57
Aug. 4, H.J. Res. 833, W. Ford	Deny funds to government which may itself be an eligible applicant	101	114	171	219
Percent		47	53	45	55
Sept. 14, H.R. 234, Committee, Ichord	Prohibit detention by Executive order	(1)		290	111
Percent				72	28
Sept. 14, H.R. 234, Ichord	Strike language prohibiting imprisonment of soldiers			124	272
Percent				31	69
Sept. 16, H.R. 1746, Erlenborn	Substitute to Equal Employment Opportunity Act			200	194
Percent				51	49
Sept. 23, H.R. 9166, Gross, Morgan	Cut Peace Corps appropriations by $27,000,000	31	28	113	233
Percent		53	47	33	67
Sept. 30, H.R. 10351, Cordova, W. Steiger	Treat Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands as states for community action appropriations.	76	61	202	161
Percent		55	45	7	43
Sept. 30, H.R. 10351, Devine	Strike out Legal Services Corp. title		(1)	152	210
Percent				42	58
Sept. 30, H.R. 10351, Brademas, Perkins	Add Child Development Act to poverty bill		(1)	203	181
Percent				53	47
Sept. 30, H.R. 10351, Perkins	Reduce population level to qualify as child care prime sponsor			226	158
Percent				59	41
Sept. 30, H.R. 10351, Erlenborn	Reduce income level allowed for free child care		(1)	187	189
Percent				49	51
Oct. 4, H. Res. 596, Udall, Gross	Motion to rise and prevent unscheduled action on Federal employees pay			175	198
Percent				47	53
Oct. 12, H. J. Res. 208, Committee, Wiggins	Add "of any person" to equal rights amendment			104	254
Percent				29	71
Oct. 12, H.J. Res. 208, Committee, Wiggins	Adds exceptions to equal rights amendment for women			87	265
Percent				25	75
Oct. 14, H.R. 10835, Moorhead	Broaden Consumer Protection Agency's authority to represent consumers		(1)	160	218
Percent				42	58
Oct. 14, H.R. 10835, Fuqua, Waggonner	Limit Consumer Protection Agency to advisory status	51	56	149	240
Percent		48	52	38	62
Oct. 20, H.R. 10367, Udall	Require comprehensive land planning for Alaska		(1)	177	216
Percent				45	55
Oct. 28, H.R. 7248, Quie	Revise distribution of educational opportunity grants			117	257
Percent				31	69
Oct. 28, H.R. 7248, Fraser, E. Green	Alter formula for distributing educational opportunity grants to States	(1)		108	220
Percent				33	67
Nov. 3, H.R. 7248, Hawkins	Place maintenance of effort requirement on institutions	66	68	210	181
Percent		49	51	54	46
Nov. 3, H.R. 7248, White, Conyers	Cut interns for political leadership program	(1)		229	149
Percent				61	39
Nov. 3, H.R. 7248, Erlenborn	Strike out general assistance for higher education			84	310
Percent				21	79
Nov. 3, H.R. 7248, Quie	No general aid to colleges if Court bans aid to church schools		(1)	119	264
Percent				31	69
Nov. 3, H.R. 7248, Sebelius	Strike provision that Uniformed Services University be within 25 miles of the District of Columbia.	22	43	148	215
Percent		34	66	41	59
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Erlenborn	Exempt undergraduate admissions from sex discrimination prohibition			194	189
Percent				51	49
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Matsunaga, Goodling	Extend benefits of land-grant colleges of Virgin Islands and Guam			219	158
Percent				59	41
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Brademas, Ashbrook	Restore title establishing National Institute of Education	52	50	210	153
Percent		51	49	58	42
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Gross, Pucinski	Delete authorization for ethnic heritage studies			200	159
Percent				56	44
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Pickle	Weaker substitute youth camp safety program	52	53	184	166
Percent		49	51	53	47
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Broomfield, Ryan	Postpone District court orders to bus until Supreme Court rules	(1)		235	125
Percent				65	35
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Ashbrook	Prohibit funds to be used for busing			233	124
Percent				61	39
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, E. Green, Burton	Forbid HEW to force States to spend funds where Federal Government cannot	(1)		231	126
Percent				65	35
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Esch, Thompson, N.J.	Allow busing funds to schools desegregating by court order	95	162	146	216
Percent		37	63	40	60
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Pucinski, Mink	Add Emergency School Aid Act	157	101	211	159
Percent		61	39	57	43
Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, W. Ford	Substitute Emergency School Aid Act		(1)	92	269
Percent				25	75
Nov. 9, H.R. 10729, Dow	Retain essential use requirement		(1)	152	222
Percent				41	59
Nov. 9, H.R. 10729, Eckhardt	Forbid recovery of funds for pesticide removed from market	82	130	168	204
Percent		39	61	45	55
Nov. 9, H.R. 10729, Dow	Liberalize judicial review requirements	64	125	167	209
Percent		34	66	44	56
Nov. 10, H.R. 9212, Byrnes, Erlenborn	Cut disability payment to black lung miners			158	224
Percent				41	59
Nov. 10, H.R. 9212, Erlenborn	Strike out 2- year extension for State benefit compliance		(1)	133	246
Percent				35	65
Nov. 10, H.J. Res. 946, Seiberling	Halt all funding for Defense Department after Nov. 15, 1971			10	356
Percent				3	97
Nov. 11, H.R. 11341, Gross	Reduce Federal payment to the District of Columbia by $44,000,000		(1)	79	263
Percent				23	77
Nov. 11, H.R. 11341, Scherle	Reduce Federal payment to the District of Columbia by $25,000,000		(1)	119	210
Percent				36	64
Nov. 11, H.R. 11341, Jacobs	Extend minimum wage to the District of Columbia truckdrivers		(1)	139	179
Percent				44	56
Nov. 16, H.R. 11731, Bingham	Delete $801,600,000 for procurement of F–14		(1)	76	311
Percent				20	80
Nov. 17, H.R. 11731, Yates	Limit funding for additional active duty personnel		(1)	183	210
Percent				47	53

Date, bill number, and amendment sponsor and record teller requester	Amendment or motion	Nonrecord votes Yea	Nonrecord votes Nay	Record teller votes Yea	Record teller votes Nay
Nov. 17, H.R. 11731, Boland	June 1, 1972, Vietnam withdrawal deadline depending on POW release			163	238
Percent				41	59
Nov. 17, H.R. 11731, Riegle	Limit net expenditures to 95 percent of funds budgeted		(1)	74	307
Percent				19	81
Nov. 17, H.R. 11731, Aspin	Limit total appropriations to 1971 level			114	278
Percent				30	70
Nov. 29, H.R. 11060, Pickle, Stanton	Permit broadcasters to charge comparable rates in lieu of lowest charge	74	52	219	150
Percent		59	41	59	41
Nov. 29, H.R. 11060, Springer	Eliminate rate section for TV and newspapers			145	219
Percent				42	58
Nov. 29, H.R. 11060, Frey	Strike out equal time provision			95	277
Percent				26	74
Nov. 30, H.R. 11060, O. Hansen, Crane	Prevent unions from using dues for political activities	(1)		233	147
Percent				65	35
Nov. 30, H.R. 11060, Danielson, C. Brown	Strike requirement that candidates file statement with District Court	69	56	230	154
Percent		55	45	60	40
Dec. 2, H.R. 11932, Giaimo	Add $72,500,000 for the District of Columbia share of Metro funds		(1)	196	183
Percent				52	48
Dec. 2, H.R. 11932, Scherle, G. Ford	Halt Metro funding pending environmental compliance		(1)	163	205
Percent				44	56
Dec. 8, H.R. 12067, Fraser	Add $50,000,000 for U.N. development program		(1)	119	268
Percent				31	69
Dec. 8, H.R. 1163, R. Price	Provide storage of grain in producers' facilities	44	62	147	179
Percent		42	58	41	59
Dec. 8, H.R. 1163, Quie	Exclude 25-percent loan increase on wheat			128	222
Percent				37	63
Dec. 8, H.R. 1163, R. Price	Offer reserve commodities for sale at 100-percent parity	83	130	145	201
Percent		39	61	40	60
Dec. 8, H.R. 1163, Jacobs, Conte	Store grain in homes of hungry Americans	53	134	21	270
Percent		28	72	6	94
Dec. 10, H.R. 11309, Stephens, Patman	Restrict retroactive pay			209	151
Percent				58	42
Dec. 10, H.R. 11309, Badillo	Require Price Commission disclosure of information		(1)	73	275
Percent				21	79
Dec. 10, H.R. 11309, Landgrebe, Hanley	Require Presidential review of pension plans qualifying for special tax treatment	(1)		170	184
Percent				48	52

RECORD TELLER VOTES IN HOUSE IN LIEU OF ROLLCALL VOTES

Nov. 4, H.R. 7248, Erlenborn, Green	Vote in House on Erlenborn sex discrimination amendment approved in Committee of the Whole.			186	181
Percent				51	49
Nov. 10, H. Res. 696, Fraser	Motion to strike Rhodesian chrome provision from conference report			252	101
Percent				71	29
Dec. 2, H.R. 11932	Final passage of supplemental appropriations bill	(1)		269	20
Percent				93	7
Dec. 6, S.J. Res. 176	Final passage, mortgage interest rates bill (⅔ vote required)			357	4
Percent				99	1
Dec. 6, H.R. 10420	Final passage Marine Mammal Commission bill (⅔ vote required)			199	150
Percent				57	43

1 Voice

SECRETARY BUTZ TESTIFIES CONCERNING THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Earl L. Butz, Secretary of Agriculture, testified this afternoon before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Mr. Butz' remarks concerned the resumption of the west coast dock strike and the tremendous impact this work stoppage is having on the American farmers. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation that would attempt to solve the problem of emergency transportation strikes. My bill, which will be reintroduced tomorrow with cosponsors, would amend the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley Act in separate titles and provide the President with permanent mechanisms for dealing with these disputes. I would like to bring Mr. Butz' statement to the attention of my colleagues for it certainly points out the tremendous need for legislation in this area:

DOCK STRIKES AND AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

(Statement of the Honorable Earl L. Butz)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee and to discuss with you a matter of the greatest urgency. The West Coast dock strike is of the most serious concern to all of us having responsibilities in agriculture. It is of the deepest interest to every American farmer.

As a result of the various dock strikes in 1971—the West Coast, the East and Gulf ports, and the Port of Chicago—the farmer's exports have been reduced by almost three quarters of a billion dollars below comparable periods in the preceding year. That is a simple total of the reduced exports for the affected ports during the strike periods.

The situation would have been still worse—much worse—except for the Taft-Hartley injunctions that the President was able to obtain at all ports at different times. As of now, however, the 80-day injunction obtained for the West Coast has expired. This leaves the President without recourse either in the courts or in Executive action, and it is for this reason that he has asked for special legislation, H.J.R. 1025, to end the West Coast strike and submit the dispute to arbitration.

I might remind the Subcommitee that the President, almost two years ago, requested legislation to deal with transportation strikes—the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act. As recently as last December 15, he again asked for action on that bill. Now, since no legislation has been forthcoming, he has asked for emergency legislation to deal with a specific strike.

The strike *is* an emergency for agriculture. Historically, exports make up a major part of the farmer's market. In recent years, a great deal of work has been done by farmers and their leaders to expand this outlet—so that our agriculture and our Nation may benefit from our farmers' tremendous productive ability. Now, this market—and these gains—are being cast away by a small group of men who care nothing for farmers—in a dispute where farmers are not a party and have no voice.

This is the way it looks to me as a partisan of the American farmer. And this is the way it looks to the farmer, who has plenty of problems of his own without being victimized in someone else's argument. He thinks he has a right to look to his Government for fair treatment in this matter, and I agree with him.

Unless there is action by the Congress at this time, our agriculture is going to be hurt in the pocketbook every day that the strike continues. Moreover, the American farmer is going to be damaged further in terms of his future as an exporter—his reputation as a world supplier.

This is all very, very serious to an agriculture which has been exporting the product of one cropland acre out of every four. It is even more important to those farmers—soybeans and wheat, for example—who have been exporting one bushel out of every two that they produce. The export market is

essential to the continuation of agriculture on the scale that we know it in this country. Let's make no mistake about that.

In order to maintain this export market, our agriculture must have a fair chance to compete. With work stoppages in all our deep-water ports, as occurred in 1971, our ability to compete is severely restricted. One of the United States' major advantages in foreign trade is its traditional reliability as an overseas supplier every month of the year.

Not only did last year's dock strikes jeopardize that reputation, but their effect continues into the current year as our competitors continue to fill contracts that were negotiated during those strikes. No wonder farmers are concerned by a renewal of the work stoppages at West Coast ports. No wonder they are looking to Washington for relief from this strike.

WEST COAST

The short run impact of the dock strikes last summer and fall on agricultural exports is now apparent. The 100-day West Coast dock strike which began July 1, 1971 and was interrupted October 9 by a Taft-Hartley injunction reduced agricultural exports from the West Coast during the June–September period from $288 million a year earlier to $73 million in 1971.

Moreover, this coincided with the harvest of one of the largest wheat crops in the history of the Pacific Northwest. At the peak of harvest over 30 million bushels of wheat were on the ground due to a lack of transportation caused by the dock tieup. Some of this wheat suffered quality deterioration.

The 100-day strike and the threat of a continuation have created uncertainty in the wheat market. Based on purchases by the Japanese Food Agency, the U.S. farmer's share of this market for the March-December period fell from 55 percent to 40 percent. U.S. losses of sales are in the neighborhood of 25 million bushels valued at $40 million, and this loss continues to build. On January 19, the day after the West Coast dock strike resumed, the Japanese purchased 8.7 million bushels of wheat for March-April delivery; yet only 1.6 million bushels were purchased from the United States.

Other Far Eastern countries are looking to other sources of supply. A Korean tender for 110,000 tons of barley off the West Coast was recently cancelled due to the strike, and this barley has been purchased from Australia.

Korean imports of U.S. wheat in July–December 1971 were only 17 million bushels, compared with 28 million bushels in the same months the preceding year. The most affected varieties were hard red winter and soft white. The Koreans have purchased their needs from Australia.

Taiwan's imports of U.S. wheat in July–December 1971 were only 5.0 million bushels, compared with 12.4 million bushels the year before—a decline of almost 60 percent. In western soft wheat alone, the decline in U.S. sales to Taiwan was from 5.4 million bushels in July–December 1970 to only 1.6 million bushels the same months of 1971.

Thus wheat exports were the largest casualty of the 100-day strike, although other commodities were affected too, particularly fruits, vegetables, rice, cotton, and livestock products. Even those commodities that succeeded in reaching foreign markets did not represent a total plus.

Of those commodities which did move about one-half were fruits and vegetables and other non-bulk commodities. Lemons were flown to Japan, and fruits and vegetables were moved overland to Gulf and Canadian ports. Some Oregon seed producers were forced to ship overland to New York City to insure that their contracts would be met with foreign buyers.

The results of these costly diversions were less than encouraging. For example, two shipments of raisins and one shipment of prunes arrived in the United Kingdom contaminated by insects. The shipments have been investigated and the infestation was found to be directly attributable to the required diversionary hauls.

There is normally a constant flow of tallow from renderers to markets. The West Coast dock strike rapidly backed up exports and filled the limited storage available. Some tallow is being diverted to Canadian ports and some to the Midwest, at an increased marketing cost of over one cent per pound.

However, for most products the cost involved in diversion was too high, and consequently there were significant losses. In California ten alfalfa meal dehydration plants were forced to close during the West Coast strike. Since exports usually account for about two-thirds of the California output, the domestic market was quickly flooded with alfalfa that would normally be dehydrated for exporting. Furthermore, alfalfa cubes and pellets destined for export and held by the strike were exposed to the sun which reduced carotene content to no more than that of ordinary hay. As a result their value dropped to $30 per ton compared to the pre-strike price of $50 per ton.

The West Coast strike has had a serious impact on prices for acala cotton. This is a specialty cotton grown in the far West which normally sells for a premium of 4 cents per pound above regular cottons. Substantial quantities of acala cotton are exported, and the export market is necessary to maintain the price differential. During the strike and with the threat of a new strike, acala cotton lost its normal premium price and is now selling below the levels of other cottons which do not have acala's unique qualities.

The strike is also a serious problem to the American forest industry, which is a concern of my Department. The industry estimates that every day of a dock strike on the West Coast means the loss of $1 million in wood product exports. Further disruption of lumber exports, as well as imports, might well have serious repercussions upon home-building programs in 1972. Transportation problems in 1968–69 contributed to record high prices for forest products and a serious upset to the homebuilding industry. The present situation is very similar.

CHICAGO

The problems which arose on the West Coast last summer were repeated on the Gulf Coast, the East Coast and in Chicago on the Great Lakes last fall.

The Chicago strike of 9 elevators out of a total 11 in that port began September 1, 1971. These elevators were open from October 9 to November 11 under a temporary Taft-Hartley injunction. They have been closed since that time, and this will again be an acute problem once warm weather reopens the Great Lakes shipping route. Export capacity of the 9 closed elevators was estimated for September-December at 35 million bushels of corn and soybeans. The closing of this vital port during the height of harvest of a record corn and soybean crop was deeply felt in the corn belt. Cash farm prices for corn and soybeans were discounted well below the normal differential between the near term Chicago futures quotation and cash country prices in Indiana and Illinois.

EAST AND GULF COAST

The East and Gulf Coast strike started November 1, 1971 and ended November 27 when Taft-Hartley injunctions were issued. These injunctions expire on February 14, 1972. An evaluation of the impact of this strike is difficult because some ports were open during part of the October-November period. As an example, the West Gulf Ports which are important outlets for wheat, sorghum, rice, and cotton, continued to work until November 15. New Orleans, the major export point for soybeans and corn was opened from October 26 through November 15 due to an NLRB action. Mobile, Beaumont, and Baltimore were open for shorter periods. Philadelphia was open from October 26 to November 15 under a separate type of court action.

The East and Gulf Coasts normally account for about two-thirds of our total agricultural exports. During the October-November period in 1970 these ports exported $917 million of agricultural products compared to $400 million during the same period in 1971.

The strike impact was especially severe in October on exports of soybeans and corn from Gulf ports. Corn exports were down from $67 million to $9 million and soybeans were down from $95 million to about $16 million. By the time the Taft-Hartley injunction had been issued on the East and Gulf Coasts, 25 ocean-going vessels were idle at Gulf ports, the port elevators were filled, and an estimated 50 million bushels of corn and soybeans were backed up the Mississippi River Valley in barges and railroad cars.

Some of the soybean crushing mills along the Mississippi were forced to close temporarily while others operated at sharply reduced capacity. During this period tallow stocks on the East Coast increased and over 100 million pounds of tobacco were stalled at dockside.

THE COST TO AGRICULTURE

In total, the dock strikes on the East, Gulf, and West Coasts reduced U.S. farm exports during the shutdowns by over $700 million from year earlier levels. Diversionary movements to open ports during the strike, anticipatory shipments off the East and Gulf Coasts before the strike, and heavier than normal shipments following the strike will assist in reducing the losses. However, some losses are permanent, and the impact of these strikes will be felt in lost future sales.

The strike impact is not limited to lost export sales. It is felt in the form of reduced farm prices, increased marketing costs, and spoiled crops. This is especially true for those products for which the export market is substantial. We export over one-half of our rice, wheat, and soybean production; nearly two-fifths of the cattle hides; over one-third of the tallow, tobacco and cotton produced; and one-fifth of total feedgrain sales by U.S. farmers.

For example, if past performance is a guide, we expect that at the height of the strike during October and November, our farmers sold over 800 million bushels of corn and over 500 million bushels of soybeans. The price discounts received by farmers during this period were a direct result of the reduced foreign demand for these commodities caused by the dock strikes.

U.S. agricultural exports this fiscal year could very well be down $400–$500 million below last year. Part of this decline is due to lower unit values for some of our commodities but American agriculture is not getting the volume gains that could come from these lower prices. Without work stoppages Canada is experiencing a record year for barley exports. Some of our key customers are turning to Canada and Australia for more of their wheat supplies. The Russians were forced to purchase part of their corn requirements from Argentina because of the uncertainty of our port situation. Foreign customers are telling American agriculture that they are shifting their purchases elsewhere where they can get assured delivery. That is the real tragedy of these work stoppages—the loss of future sales to our competitors not only for this year but for years to come.

It is of utmost importance that these dock work stoppages be ended promptly, and that provision be made to prevent future tie-ups in our transportation system. Not to do this, promptly, will be to subject American farmers to an erosion of income which they cannot and should not be expected to endure.

They are growing weary of being bloodied, as innocent bystanders, by someone else's fight. They are justifiably incensed and frustrated at not being able to move to market at harvest time the product of a whole year's labor, because of unresolved arguments among small groups of people in transportation. Our farmers want protection from this kind of restrictive action—and they want it *now!*

PACIFIC COAST EXPORTS—JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1970 AND 1971

Commodity	In million dollars		Percent
	1970	1971	1971 of 1970
Grain and feed	141.8	13.8	10.0
Wheat and flour	88.7	1.4	2.0
Rice	25.7	5.6	22.0
Prepared feed/alfalfa meal	8.8	.7	8.0
Fats and oils	12.3	7.4	60.0
Tobacco	0	0	
Cotton	17.4	2.5	14.0
Dairy	7.0	1.5	21.0
Poultry	2.8	1.1	39.0
Livestock and meat	32.4	13.7	42.0
Tallow and greases	10.9	4.3	39.0
Hides and skins	12.0	5.3	44.0
Fruits and vegetables	69.3	30.9	45.0
Citrus fruits	11.0	8.5	77.0
Fruit cocktail	2.7	.3	11.0
Fruit juices	3.3	1.1	33.0
Other fruits and nuts	36.7	14.8	39.0
Vetetables	13.0	6.2	48.0
Sugar and tropical products	5.3	2.1	40.0
Total, all agricultural commodities	288.3	73.0	25.3

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton announced that the Department of Interior is considering a proposal which would permit coastal States to share in the revenues of mineral production on the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf.

A similar arrangement now exists between the Federal Government and the States with respect to Federal lands lying within their borders. Under present law, a State is entitled to 37.5 percent of the revenues of mineral production on lands lying within its borders to help pay the ancillary costs of providing education, health care, building roads, and other public services. A similar formula should be applied for States now providing services essential for offshore production.

Among the earliest and most effective voices for this proposal were the New Orleans Times Picayune and its distinguished executive editor, George W. Healy, Jr.

I am very pleased that the Department of Interior is giving this proposal the serious consideration it merits.

I am inserting a recent editorial and article from the New Orleans Times Picayune and calling them to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

SHOULD BE MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH

Dispatches from Washington Wednesday reported that the Department of the Interior is giving serious consideration to proposed sharing with coastal states of revenues produced from submerged federal lands off those states.

That is most welcome news.

Louisiana and other coastal states, we have urged repeatedly, should share in revenues received by the federal government from minerals production in adjacent waters. Such revenue sharing is earned and deserved.

The federal government could not realize this income from its lands off coastal states unless those states performed governmental services essential to men and women who work in offshore drilling and producing operations and to members of their families.

According to figures obtained from the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, the Outer Continental Shelf minerals production placed in the federal treasury in fiscal year 1970 more than $1.272 billion. By far the greatest contributor to this tremendous fund was federal land off Louisiana's coast.

During 1970 Louisiana provided education, health, police, recreation, library and other services to 67,644 persons employed to make offshore fields productive and to members of their families. The cost to the state and its subdivisions of providing these essential services is estimated conservatively at $79,718,702.

In addition, the state and its subdivisions have made capital expenditures to provide highways, marinas and other facilities without which the offshore oil fields could not be worked. These public works have cost many millions of dollars. As an example, Plaquemines Parish built a four-lane highway from Belle Chasse to Venice, at the head of the passes, whose major use is in transport of men and supplies needed in the offshore work. That construction alone cost $48,024,-008.

While interior states receive a substantial share of revenues produced by inshore federal lands, Congress has made no provision for sharing with coastal states of revenues produced from federal offshore lands.

To us, this is a serious injustice. It is an inequity which can be ended by prompt and simple action by the Congress. Let federal law provide for sharing of revenue produced by offshore federal lands in the same manner that revenue produced by inshore federal lands is shared with states like Wyoming, New Mexico, Alaska and other states where large areas still are held by the federal government.

Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton is quoted by The Washington Star as saying that he is "exploring the idea of giving coastal states a piece of the action on offshore oil."

It's a capital idea, Mr. Secretary, and one that we urge the national administration and the Congress to put in effect.

INTERIOR SECRETARY STUDYING SHARING OF MINERALS REVENUE

(By Edgar A. Poe)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration, already on record in favor of tax-revenue sharing with state and local governments, appears to be moving closer to a proposal that would cut the states in on yields from offshore oil, gas and other minerals.

Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton has under advisement a plan that would permit states with offshore wells to share in the revenues from this production.

A spokesman for the cabinet officer said Wednesday that the question of offshore sharing by the states actually came up during a closed conference with governors and official representatives of the Atlantic Coast States here on Jan. 11. It was not brought out at the subsequent open press conference.

Secretary Morton has not yet discussed a formula to be applied if and when such a proposal is approved by the administration, a spokesman said. He said the secretary realizes that off-shore production would be limited without services now provided free by the adjoining states. These include roads, schools, libraries, hospitals, police protection, and services of the courts, among other things.

Ironically, if the production was onshore on federal lands, the states automatically would receive 37½ per cent of the yields under present law. This includes yields from oil, gas and timber.

NO ENTHUSIASM

At the conference with state officials here earlier this month, neither Gov. Francis Sargent of Massachusetts, nor Gov. Marvin Mandell of Maryland, the only two governors in attendance, expressed any enthusiasm for a proposal by Secretary Morton to explore the possibility of conducting lease sales on the outer continental shelf lands along the Atlantic Coast. One reason, of course, is the dispute of how far state submerged lands extend seaward. Some of the New England states, including Maine and Massachusetts, claim ownership of 100-seaward miles.

Under a U.S. Supreme Court ruling, Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama can lease three miles from their coasts, while Texas and Florida may lease up to three leagues or about 10½ miles. Some critics of this unique decision of 1960 accused the High Court of legislating. With numerous nearby islands along the Gulf, the disputed question is where do you start measuring from the coast of a particular state.

Louisiana, with tremendous offshore production, currently would stand to share more in offshore yields than any state because offshore production of oil and gas from the federal leases is far greater than any other offshore area.

The Washington Star Wednesday, in a story asserting that Secretary Morton is considering a proposal to share offshore oil revenues with states, quoted an unnamed oil industry spokesman as saying he knows about the Morton plan. The industry spokesman went on to say the Secretary's proposal could provide the basis for an out-of-court settlement of the many-years-old boundary dispute with various coastal states.

"He also said he believes the oil money sharing would allow the federal government to follow President Nixon's order to accelerate drilling at sea," the newspaper said.

The story said that "sharing of profits from offshore oil could give states, now reluctant to start drilling in new areas, such as along the East Coast, an incentive to change their minds."

BIDS RETURNED

The Interior Department recently returned more than 250 sealed bids filed in December for lease on federal lands off Louisiana. There has been speculation in Washington that the sealed bids on the 78 tracts, totaling some 366,000 acres, possibly amounted to nearly $2 billion merely for the privilege of drilling. Any production from these lands, of course, would be shared by the federal government.

The bids were returned several days ago after a federal judge in the District of Columbia more than 1,000 miles away refused to dissolve an injunction he issued because a New York-based environmental organization contended that the Department of Interior had failed to comply with certain provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.

If and when the injunction is dissolved and the lease sale conducted it would add about 10 per cent to the 3,800,000 acres already under lease off the Louisiana coast. The tracts off eastern Louisiana are located in water depths up to 500 feet.

Secretary Morton promised Atlantic Coast governors and official state representatives at the Washington conference that he would not conduct any lease sales for drilling until

public hearings would be conducted, and the states would have a chance to present their respective stories, and the lawsuits of the various states against the federal government are settled.

BOGGS PRAISES SHARING PLAN

WASHINGTON.—United States Rep. Hale Boggs Wednesday praised a proposal to share offshore oil revenues with producing states similar to a bill he first introduced several years ago.

Boggs said: "I have sponsored legislation for a number of years to give coastal states a fair share of revenues derived from offshore mineral production beyond their so called historic boundaries.

"I have discussed this bill on several occasions with Secretary (Rogers C. B.) Morton, and he has indicated great interest. His support, and that of the other coastal states would be invaluable in its passage, and passage of the bill would be tremendously helpful to Louisiana.

Boggs had words of high praise for George W. Healy Jr., editor of The Times-Picayune who has been advocating such a sharing plan. He said:

"Mr. Healy through edtiorials and personal correspondence with the members of Congress and the executive branch has diligently and persistently pushed for this plan and the fact that it is being considered at the highest level of government is due in no small part to his efforts."

Under the Boggs proposal, the bulk of offshore revenues—62½ per cent—would be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury into a special fund in the treasury which would be known as the Marine Resources Conservation and Development Fund, and would be used in water pollution control, underwater agriculture, conservation of beaches, hurricane protection, aid to sea grant colleges, fisheries development, construction and maintenance of waterfront recreation facilities, oceanographic research, and in other sea-related activities.

The remaining 37½ per cent of the revenues would be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the state adjacent to the tidelands. The funds would be used for the benefit of the public schools or public roads of the state, as its legislature may direct.

GOVERNOR LUCEY'S CHALLENGE TO GRADUATING STUDENTS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin Governor Patrick J. Lucey recently had the honor of delivering the commencement address at the January 25, 1972, graduation ceremonies at the University of Wisconsin. Governor Lucey spoke directly to the most vital issue facing our Nation; that is, the continuing American participation in the war in Indochina, and he called for the immediate, complete, and total withdrawal of all American military personnel and equipment from Southeast Asia. Governor Lucey further challenged the graduating students to involve themselves in the political dialog of 1972 and to work for the cause of peace within the existing political framework.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with Governor Lucey's remarks, and I commend him for speaking frankly to the University of Wisconsin graduating students. It is my pleasure to enter Governor Lucey's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY GOVERNOR PATRICK J. LUCEY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON, COMMENCEMENT, JANUARY 25, 1972

I am honored to have the opportunity to address the graduating class at this distinguished University and to bring greetings from Wisconsin's citizens.

This occasion scarcely calls for a detailed review of the interrelationship between the University and its host state. The commitment to higher education that generation after generation of Wisconsin citizens have made since the almost simultaneous birth of this institution and this state, requires no elaboration. Were it not for financial assistance disproportionately large for our numbers and our resources, a state of average means could not support a world renowned institution. Nor could such an effort be so amply rewarded were it not for a superior faculty of extraordinary dedication.

The University has long provided our state with a fountainhead of learning, new knowledge and new techniques which have enriched our lives culturally, while also adding to our economic well-being.

But more than that, on numerous occasions in the past, the University has been the conscience of the state. The social reforms of John R. Commons and Selig Perlman, though controversial in their time, ultimately offered direction toward the attainment of a more decent society.

More recently, and to no less an extent, the faculty and the student body of this University have exercised a significant moral influence over the state and the entire nation.

I speak of the emphatically stated value judgment that American military involvement in the civil war in Vietnam was and is an immoral national policy.

At a time when there was less public understanding and more widespread support for the war throughout this country, the members of this faculty spoke against its legality and its necessity. When one Washington administration after another tied American intervention in Vietnam to American patriotism, students on this campus refused to accept so perverse and so simplistic a notion. When American corporations, profiteering from the war maintained a business-as-usual attitude, the University community dissented and called public attention to the misdirected expenditure of human and material resources.

In large part, these actions by the University community have stimulated a dramatic shift in American public opinion against the war. Yet in spite of the currently resounding national mandate for peace, the bombs are still falling, and the war persists—not only in North and South Vietnam, but in Laos and Cambodia and Thailand.

Two successive national administrations have betrayed the American people. In 1964 Lyndon Johnson was swept into office because of widespread fear that his opponent would act irresponsibly by expanding American military involvement in Southeast Asia. We elected Lyndon Johnson but then had imposed upon us the repudiated policies of Goldwater. In 1968—when many of you began your college careers—Richard Nixon was elected to the Presidency in large part because he claimed to have a secret plan to end the war.

Three years later we are still engaged in what has become the longest war in American history. The Nixon plan of Vietnamization has not brought an end to the killing but rather, it is instead responsible for untold additional Asian deaths, 19,400 more Americans killed in combat, 106,000 more Americans wounded and the squandering of countless billions of dollars. It is true that Mr. Nixon has reduced the number of American forces in Vietnam from 539,000 when he entered office to 140,000 at the end of this month. But it is also true that he has ordered the explosion of as many bombs in three years as Lyndon Johnson did in five.

In all, we have dropped 6,200,000 tons of bombs in Southeast Asia. Our bombings have caused an estimated one million Vietnamese casualties. A recent study by two American scientists reveals that these bombs have also produced a moon-like landscape in many areas of Vietnam, where approximately 20 million craters have been blasted out of the earth. These scientists point out that a quarter of a million bombs are unexploded—posing a hazard to all forms of life for years to come.

There are other facts of comparable horror which detail the many gruesome consequences of this war. But they are only too familiar to us all. Though their precise magnitude may be uncertain, their very existence evidences the tragedy of America's continued involvement in Southeast Asia. That some of these statistics are not increasing as rapidly as was the case at some time in the past, is of slight consolation.

The recent reduction of American battle-dead, for example, offered no comfort to the family of Sergeant Jerry N. Duffey of Charlotte, Michigan, the sole American battle casualty in Vietnam one week ago. Nor does the reduced American death toll diminish the anguish of Asian families, mourning the loss of a son or daughter. The continued American presence in Vietnam also leaves unresolved the fate of those held captive, whose return depends upon the termination of hostilities by this nation.

There are those who say the war is no longer an issue in our society or on our campuses. Some politicians of both parties argue that reduced American casualties and shrinking draft quotas have been sufficient to defuse the peace movement. Perhaps they are right. But if they are, what has happened to our righteous outrage? At what point did we lose the moral imperative? Is a war immoral only when it threatens our personal safety or makes career plans uncertain?

Is it immoral to kill and be killed on the ground but righteous to bomb indiscriminately from aircraft carriers and air bases in Thailand?

It has been said that in not one of the last twenty years would combat have existed in Southeast Asia without American financial support. Are we prepared to supply and finance carnage for an indefinite period, so long as we are not personally threatened or inconvenienced? The time has come for America to cease its role as the exchequer of Asian wars.

The time has come for us to demand an immediate, complete and total withdrawal of all American military personnel and equipment from all of Southeast Asia.

I am deeply disturbed by those who say the economy is the issue in the coming election. They say that the war is not important any more. I say . . . the war is *the* issue, and that everything we need to do or aspire to achieve is affected by it.

The war has contributed immeasurably to the disruption of the economy of this country.

The war has brought untold tragedy into the lives of hundreds of thousands of American families through the death, injury or capture of their sons and loved ones.

The war has diverted our attention and our resources from the decay of our cities, the destruction of our environment and the neglect of our children.

The war has materially contributed to the loss of faith in government by our citizens.

And most importantly, the war has become an immense and indelible stain on the moral integrity of this nation.

The question now unanswered is whether you are prepared to accept a responsibility to influence the political decision-making that will take place during the remaining months of this year.

Will you contribute to the political dialog of 1972 or will you stand mute as fateful decisions are made that will affect your lives and the lives of others?

This year presents you with the opportunity to work for peace not only in the national election but in the Wisconsin Presidential primary.

If this University has served you well, you go forth on this commencement day better able to direct society towards a more humane future. As members of this campus community you have recognized that a better future for this nation depends in large part upon the termination of the Vietnam war. As you influenced the community from the campus, so too, must you influence the community, as members and leaders in its ranks.

As champions of the cause of peace, may you be relentless in your efforts to secure the prompt conclusion of this war and of the processes by which Vietnams are made possible.

NEW TRANSIT TECHNOLOGIES

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues some recent developments which are extremely encouraging to those of us who have sought to encourage the development of new transit technologies.

I am particularly excited about President Nixon's decision to increase by 77 percent our spending to accelerate development of new transit technologies. Hopefully the House will act quickly to fully fund this urgently needed program.

I was also extremely pleased with a recent statement by Henry Ford II, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co., when he suggested that it is time for us to begin using a portion of our dedicated highway trust funds to develop new transit technologies. This somewhat heretical statement coming from an automobile executive is both responsible and refreshing in that it reflects a growing awareness of the urgent need to provide new transit alternatives in our urban areas.

In fact Ford has already begun to make sizable investments in the new transit technology field. They are one of four companies chosen by the Department of Transportation to demonstrate new transit systems at the International Air Exposition to be held at Dulles in May of this year. Hopefully these initiatives will lead the rest of the automobile industry to realize that encouragement of mass transit can be both good for the country and good business. It should be evident to all that more urban highway construction is at best only a partial solution to the growing auto congestion problem.

The January issue of Ward's Auto World carries an article by Tom Joyce which discusses the urban transportation crisis and the implications for the automobile industry. It is heartening to know that at least one automaker understands what Mr. Joyce is talking about and is doing something to meet the challenge.

At this point I would like to insert Mr. Ford's comments on highway trust funds and the article by Tom Joyce in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

NEXT TEST FOR DETROIT: ANTICAR CAMPAIGNS

(By Tom Joyce)

WASHINGTON.—After several turbulent years, it seems as if the auto industry is heading into some relatively quiet waters in its dispute with government and consumer groups over safety.

This isn't to say that there won't be some pretty choppy waves from time to time. But the way things are being sized up in the nation's capital, 1972 could well provide the embattled auto industry with a long-awaited respite.

The biggest single item still unsettled, of course, is that dealing with air bags or some satisfactory passive restraint system to protect car drivers and passengers. But the Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has pushed back the deadline on this requirement until 1976 models.

This was no easy task, especially since Douglas Toms, the safety administrator, had predicted that air bags could help cut auto fatalities in half by the beginning of the next decade. But the auto industry, with a hefty assist from the powerful American Automobile Association, won the delay on grounds that it would be technically impossible to install them safely by the earlier target date.

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader sees in this a deal between the White House and top officials of the big auto firms.

SAFETY DEMANDS REDUCED

But that really is no longer a major point. What is important is that demands on the auto industry—in terms of safety—have been whittled down and now 1972 appears to be shaping up as a year of relatively happy motoring for Detroit. The interlocking seat belt idea has to be worked out. And car makers are under orders to strengthen car roofs.

But even at Mr. Nader's Center for Auto Safety—a busy shop of 15 lawyers and students—officials concede that the new year is not going to be loaded with the kind of new demands like the industry has witnessed in the past.

"There really isn't very much coming down the line," one of Mr. Nader's auto experts told *Ward's Auto World*.

All this would seem to augur well for the industry; a period of calm that hopefully will give designers a chance to think more about designing cars around safety rather than adding feature after feature to cars already designed. At least this is the way Washington safety officials and even some of Mr. Nader's own people view it.

But there is a hitch. And while it involves automobile safety and the sister issue of clean air, it's something quite different.

Just as cars are being made safer, a new problem has developed—or is developing—for the car makers.

CUT CARS CAMPAIGN

Put simply, it is burgeoning campaign to reduce the number of automobiles on the road. And the idea is to vastly improve mass transit systems and train travel.

As might well be suspected, Mr. Nader's followers are among the avante garde. "It is," said an attorney at the Center for Auto Safety, "a different kind of approach. It deals with the whole picture, including improving the quality of life."

Spearheading the new crusade is the Highway Action Coalition, composed of leading ecological groups including the Sierra Club and the Audubon Society. The organization's concern is both death on the nation's streets and highways and pollution of the environment.

Leading the fight in Washington is John Kramer, a young activist of the Nader mold whose plan is to assault the National Highway Trust Fund which each year helps to build highways to the tune of more than $4 billion.

If Mr. Kramer and his fast-growing band of followers get their way—an iffy, down-the-road proposition at this time—the move would channel money now going into the highway kitty for the development of mass transit systems.

The idea is simple: The more people who use transit systems, the fewer who will be driving automobiles.

On the side of the coalition, its supporters argue, is a growing desire on the part of Americans to avoid driving and the traffic snarls and the parking problems that go with it.

The argument is not without its merits. In Washington last month the House finally released $72.5 million to keep work moving on Washington's under-construction subway system. The move is significant because it was a defeat for the highway lobby seeking more freeways and a victory for subway supporters cheered on by both District of Columbia and suburban residents.

The whole issue is likely to generate some fireworks early this year when both highway and mass transit programs are scheduled for airings in Congress.

QUESTIONS FOR DETROIT

For Detroit it poses a bag full of serious questions. Is there a growing disenchantment with the automobile, especially as a means of getting to and from the work place, that will erode sales? Is the move toward more transit systems and fewer highways a sign of this? What are the chances for the new movement?

There can be no doubt that the automobile is causing serious congestion in American cities. Parking is expensive. And even when motorists are willing to pay high fees, they often have to wait long periods to get their cars in and out of garages and lots.

In New York there are now plans for major changes in downtown traffic patterns—partly to eliminate traffic snarls and partly to conform to federal air quality standards.

Other cities are planning similar moves. And that could mean fewer automobiles.

What has made the auto industry so big and powerful is that ever since cars first started rolling off assembly lines Americans wanted more and more of them. But, like so many other things in American life, the blessing has not been without drawbacks. And today these problems are demanding attention.

General Motors Board Chairman James M. Roche, who retired Dec. 31, predicts the auto industry will sell up to 11 million cars this year. It well might turn out to be a good estimate.

But what about the years to come? No one, of course, is suggesting that the giant is going to fall into rapid decline and people are going to quit buying cars.

Nevertheless, there are some things to consider. The U.S. population growth rate has declined. Both because of safety and ecology, the automobile has more enemies than it has had since the days of carriage builders. And there are new pressures—like moves for fewer cars and more mass transit systems.

Thus, while 1972 should give Detroit a breather of sorts on the safety front, it might well be the beginning of different concerns.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESS CONFERENCE TRANSCRIPT, HENRY FORD II AND LEE A. IACOCCA

Question. Mr. Ford, how do you feel about diverting Federal highway funds to mass transit purposes? Studying mass transit ideas?

Mr. FORD. I don't know whether we're yet ready to suggest that mass transit get funds out of the Highway Trust Fund. However, we do think the Highway Trust Fund should use some of its money to study methods of mass transit and do some research and development on it.

Question. How much of that money? Ten per cent?

Mr. FORD. Well, 10 per cent adds up to an awful lot. I don't know how much research and development you can do over a period of time, so I don't want to give you any figures. But, we're talking about this to some people and I don't know whether we're going to be able to sell our ideas. We think to start with you can't switch this over all overnight and say "X" per cent of the Highway Trust Fund ought to go into mass transit. We're in favor of mass transit; we're not opposed to mass transit in any way. But, it's got to be a viable mass transit and it can't cost the general public a fortune. It's got to be a viable system. We have to start slowly, as I see it, and take some of the Highway Trust Fund money and use it for research and development and experimentation . . . maybe build one system, if it's a new type, and see whether it works. Do that kind of thing before you start to say you want to earmark "X" dollars out of the total Highway Trust Fund.

Question. Do you feel that eventually some of this trust fund money could be used to subsidize mass transit in the way it has been used to subsidize automobiles in the construction of highways?

Mr. FORD. That may come. I wouldn't say whether it would or whether it wouldn't. I think we have to crawl before we walk, and walk before we run. I think we have to find out how viable mass transit systems are. I am sure they are very necessary in some locations and not necessary at all in others. I think the types that are going to be used are going to be important. I think that there are all kinds of things that have to be researched and looked at and thought through including how they are going to be financed. All kinds of things have to be looked at.

NECESSITY OF AIRCRAFT CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, production of the Air Force's T–38 supersonic trainer jet by Northrop Corp. ended on this past Monday with the delivery of the 1,187th, and final, aircraft in a special ceremony at Palmdale, Calif. I would like to congratulate both Northrop and the Air Force for this effort that should serve as a model for military procurement programs. Since the first T–38 was turned over to the Air Force in 1961, every plane has been delivered on or ahead of schedule, the planes have surpassed their guaranteed performance standards, and all contract cost commitments have been met or bettered.

I have learned, to my dismay, that with the close of this project, the F–5B is the only combat crew trainer aircraft of this type now in production in the United States, and that this program will be closed in April 1973 unless further funds are made available immediately. The plan, at the outset of the F–5 program, was to include two F–5B aircraft for each F–5E squadron, in order to provide adequate training facilities for combat crews. There are now over 1,000 F–5 aircraft in 16 countries structured on this two trainers per squadron basis. The Air Force has been authorized by Congress to purchase 21 F–5E aircraft in fiscal year 1972, and they are requesting an additional authorization to procure 57 more F–5E aircraft in fiscal year 1973. I am concerned that at the same time, the Air Force has not requested authorization for the six F–5B combat trainers that were planned to support the three F–5E squadrons. It has come to my attention that the F–5B program can be continued with an appropriation of only $5 million. In light of the potential sales for the F–5B aircraft and the requirement for two of these F–5B's to support each of the 17 F–5E squadrons now planned in the 325 F–5E program, I submit that it does not make good sense for the F–5B line to be closed for lack of the $5 million. I hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the necessity of this program, and will work with me to assure its continuance.

WOMEN AT ANNAPOLIS? OLD HAT TO MRS. CURRY

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD an article by Hank Black and appearing in my hometown newspaper Graphic in its January 28, 1972, issue. Mrs. Curry is a friend of mine, and because of recent interest in women attending the service academies, this article seems particularly timely:

WOMEN AT ANNAPOLIS? OLD HAT TO MRS. CURRY

(By Hank Black)

Frank-Ragan King was given a presidential appointment to attend the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. . . . but her mother turned down the offer saying she didn't think her daughter could pass the physical."

That's right, her daughter, for Frank-Ragan King was a woman, a high school girl of 16 back in 1936. Amid the hubbub over a New York senator and a Michigan congressman nominating girls to the academy, few people remember the story of the girl who is now Mrs. Burton Curry of 14 Sherwood Drive.

Mrs. Curry says she was not as excited about the appointment as the newspapers were at the time.

"I was always receiving offers from boys' prep schools to attend, back in the days when they did soliciting," she said.

But a newspaper in Huntsville, where she was living at the time, carried a lengthy article on the subject, and then a national wire service picked up the story, using a photograph of young Miss King, a smiling brunette wearing a borrowed sailor's hat.

She was named for her father, who went down with the flagship he was commanding in the North Sea on a mine sweeping mission after World War I. He was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and later a destroyer was named for him.

"When I was 16, Secretary of the Navy Swanson wrote mother saying that he was sure Commander King's son wanted to follow in the footsteps 'of his illustrious father,'" Mrs. Curry remembered. "So he offered one of the 20 presidential appointments available."

"I probably would have gone, if I were a boy . . . I don't know," she said.

The resultant publicity about the girl with a boy's name even got to the eyes of Robert Ripley, originator of the famous "Believe It or Not" feature. He invited the teenager to appear on his New York radio program as well as including her in his newspaper strip.

"But my grandmother wouldn't let me go," Mrs. Curry shook her head.

After the newspaper stories, she received many letters from men who had served under her father.

A few days ago she saw the stories about Sen. Jacob Javits and others trying to get a female into the Academy, and she remembered her own story. Would she favor such a move?

"I'm not a woman's libber, although I think we should have equal pay for equal work in the same field, but I would not organize an effort to get women into Annapolis," she stated.

Her two sons, Frank Ragan Curry, 19, and Burton King Curry, 21, are students at the University and were not interested in attending the Naval Academy, she said.

DEVICE TO MEASURE AIR POLLUTION

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, two enterprising and community-minded students at Enfield High School recently put into operation an air-sampling device which was built by the students and will assist two already existing devices in measuring the air pollution content in town.

The air pollution test center, which is on the Enfield High School rooftop, was constructed by Stuart White and James Anderson. In coordination with the other two centers, the student project will be a great help to town officials in their efforts to determine the sources of pollution in Enfield.

This public spirited contribution by Stuart and Jim deserves high marks. For the interest of my colleagues, an article concerning this enterprising project which appeared in the Enfield Press follows:

EHS STUDENTS CONSTRUCT WORKING DEVICE TO MEASURE DENSITY OF AIR POLLUTION IN TOWN

(By T. Patrick Flanagan)

Last Sunday, a strange-looking contraption, located on the roof of Enfield High School, was turned on for the first time to sample Enfield's air and to aid pollution experts in finding the answers to these and other important questions about air pollution in the town.

The town of Enfield presently has two other air-sampling devices similar to the one at EHS that was built by students Stuart White and James Anderson. The apparatus, which resembles a large fiberglass vacuum cleaner, will be turned on every six days for a 24-hour intake of Enfield's air. By compiling the information gathered from all three of the monitoring stations officials hope to get a more complete picture of the town's pollution problem. The high school device will greatly aid the other two stations be-

cause of its ideal location. One of the other locations is hampered by the presence of fumes from a nearby bus station.

In cooperation with the Town Sanitarian Charles Agro and Thompsonville Fire Chief William Furey, the students of the three Environmental Study classes at the school will be monitoring the air-sampling station in accordance with state regulations regarding air-sampling. Of interest to the State Health Dept. will be the specially treated filter paper that is contained in the machine. The filter paper will be analyzed by the state to determine exactly what per cent of each particulate matter the air in Enfield contains. Hopefully, after further testing and comparisons with the other stations, they will be able to determine where the pollution in Enfield originates.

The Environmental Study classes, instructed by Valentine Kropiwnicki and Robert Kramer, will be supplementing their current study of the environment and its pollution problems with the findings of the weekly monitoring projects.

REASONABLE COMMUNICATION IN THE EASING OF DRUG ABUSE

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk on the national problem of drug abuse. This week the House will consider H.R. 12089 to establish the Special Action Office on Drug Abuse.

The following address by Dr. Frederic F. Flach before the American School Health Association convention should provide useful reading when considering this matter:

ADDRESS BY DR. FREDERIC F. FLACH

As we all realize, there has been an alarming growth in the abuse of drugs throughout this country during the last few years. Government and professional groups have, at last, acknowledged that drug abuse is a major public health problem.

This year alone, the Federal Government plans to spend nearly 400 million dollars on programs to stop the spread of drug abuse and rehabilitate drug users. Millions more are being assigned to this purpose by state and local governments.

Unless present and planned programs assume a new character and take on new directions, however, there is every reason for us to assume that everyone of them will fail. Worse yet, they may well serve to make the drug problem even more widespread.

There is nothing new about drug abuse. Alcoholism, opiate and cocaine addiction, and the misuse of other substances, have been with us for a long, long time. What is new, and startlingly so, is the extent to which the drug abuse problem has invaded our families and schools, has taken as its victims teenagers and preteen children. We may debate the right of an adult to slowly destroy himself, if he chooses, as long as he does not harm society in the process. But when it comes to marketing and distributing dangerous drugs to children, there can be no room for debate. Unchecked, this epidemic, and the factors which give rise to it, threaten the very basis of our society.

It is reliably estimated that nearly one teenager in three—perhaps in two—has used some form of illegitimate drug having an effect on emotions and behavior . . . primarily acid, speed, pot, barbiturates. More experiment with alcohol. Horrifying as they are, the box-car numbers don't count: what does matter is that these are children. And society's response is pitiful: it reveals many of the basic traumas which have helped create the drug abuse problem in the first place.

Most of the current programs to combat drug abuse, developed without professional wisdom, evidence serious errors of inexperience. One of the gravest is the establishment of new drug abuse control bureaucracies. Such bureaucracies sidestep the already existing channels for coping with this epidemic—the medical and related health professionals, the teachers, the family, the churches—and promise to train, by the thousands, experts in drug abuse education in a matter of a few weeks.

These pseudoexperts are drawn from a variety of backgrounds—former addicts, sensitivity trainers, physicians lacking in sufficient knowledge of psychiatry and the behavioral sciences. This large corps of well meaning people are being asked to form new kinds of organizations which depend for their economic and social justification on the perpetuation of the very problem they have been created to eliminate. Many are preoccupied with the application of their own pet methods: rap sessions, methadone maintenance, roundups of twelve-year-old pushers. To meet a highly complex social and medical challenge, they propose solutions which are at best simplistic and superficial, or so diffuse as to defy understanding. A true caricature of Parkinson's Law.

Conscious of the gravity of this social blight, the media lend an ear to the instant salvationists—adding to an already confused picture. Actors and actresses jam television panel shows deluging viewers with contradictory and ill-founded assertions, often reflecting only personal bias. Films are produced by creative, talented people . . . whose only authority may stem from their own trip on acid, and a hazy recollection of their adolescence. We have seen many; the majority are boring beyond belief. Some actually reflect the producer's bias, in favor of drug taking.

One such film, based on a television documentary shown nationally and sponsored by a major American corporation, can only be seen as a strong sell to youth in favor of using acid, regardless of the conscious intent of the film-maker. Physicians interviewed in film were dull stereotypes, pedantic and authoritarian. By contrast, Timothy Leary and his followers, were clearly exciting; notwithstanding sobering editorial comment, they offered hope and freedom through drugs from the aimlessness and absurdities of modern life. This particular film, I must add, is being recommended for classroom use to teach children about the dangers of taking drugs!

What about classroom teaching on the dangers of drugs? A great deal of emphasis is now being placed on formal instruction, even at grade school levels: Arms scarred with needle tracks . . . Children dead of heroin abuse . . . Descriptions of tablets and what they contain. Photos of marijuana leaves don't satisfy youth's demand for answers. Many of the youngsters we have talked with are turned off more often than on by such tactics. They see the adult population as basically hypocritical. They see the teaching itself as irrelevant, avoiding real issues under-lying drug abuse.

There is no evidence at all that teaching drugs, drugs, drugs, will have any influence in stemming their spread. In fact, repeated use of scare techniques is more likely to add to the credibility gap already existing between youngsters and adults. It may well induce more and more youngsters to experiment defiantly with drugs.

The issue is not to inform children about drugs, but rather how to do it in a professionally effective fashion. By this yardstick, it must be said that present approaches to the control and prevention of drug abuse all seem doomed to failure. The pseudoexpert and the drug bureaucracy . . . the denial of the problem by many segments of the adult population who have not yet been touched by it personally . . . bypassing the normal avenues of education . . . society's intense focus on drugs in themselves rather than on the human needs and communication deficiencies which have created an environment in which drug abuse can spread—all these conspire to waste not only millions of dollars and critical time but also human lives as well.

The society which has bred this problem must change itself to effect a cure; we cannot look to the causative factors for a solution. Oh, you might say there are glimmers of hope: One pharmaceutical firm, for example, has stopped sending amphetamines to medical students at examination time. This, of course, was in anticipation of a congressional investigation. Since these are not answers, what then can we, as health educators, recommend in this crisis?

First, let us end superficial programs, administered by amateurs, reflecting only political expediency. Let us end the accumulating bureaucratic structure which depends on the continuation of the drug problem for its existence. Instead, let us turn to the established professional groups in the country and offer them the opportunity, the training and the means to really do something about this situation . . . now.

Of all the professionals, perhaps the most neglected is the average American teacher. At the very time that funds are being lavished for drug-abuse control, teachers who could make a significant contribution are being dismissed. They are being asked to teach in horrendous environments, denied opportunity to update necessary skills and, in particular relation to the drug problem, no more than twenty percent are significantly involved or motivated. Instead, the majority are offered useless courses training teachers to spot the signs of drug abuse after the fact or group process discussions which are vaguely oriented, without goals, and often disruptive.

Yet the teachers of America are potentially our prime resource for an effective attack on the causes of drug abuse. It is the teacher who has the most continuing contact with our children and teenagers. It is the teacher who constitutes a potential adult model for youngsters in their critical years: His attitudes about life, and drugs, are inevitably albeit unconsciously communicated to the youngsters in school. It is the teacher who can continue to communicate reasonably with youth when the channels of communications break down at home or when the adolescent is trying—very normally—to break loose from the ties of home. It is the teacher who can encourage youngsters to feel competent and responsible, offering them a sense of identity in a society whose bureaucracies, technocracies and hypocricies threaten them with loss of individuality. It is the teacher who can win youth's trust in addressing himself dispassionately to the human problems which lie at root of the drug problem.

Let me emphasize further that without the teacher's cooperation, no other expert however qualified can make significant inroads into this drug problem. Whatever programs are set up in the schools to deal with drug abuse, they can only succeed if they have the understanding support of the teachers in the school. Without teacher acceptance—and I am talking of an attitude telegraphed in a thousand ways—without teacher acceptance, even a good program will fail.

This is by no means a recommendation that all teachers become directly involved in programs of drug abuse control. Quite the contrary. Some teachers are already involved. Some should never be involved. But the average teacher, genuinely concerned about his pupils, must be adequately informed so

that he can help create an overall school environment conducive to individual growth without drugs.

There in a nutshell is the key to my thesis. In precisely this sense, as a matter of fact, I would recommend that drug abuse, as such, not be taught to students at all. The visiting speakers from the police forces, the addiction centers, and emergency rooms of local hospitals, have all served their purpose in alerting us to the dangers and dimensions of drug abuse. Now it behooves us to shift the focus.

Let us start by upgrading the role of health educators in the schools: improving his training and experience, broadening his scope, making the study of health not just a study of the body, but of the emotional and mental health of the students in the context of society as a whole.

If futility and frustration, trouble in handling angry feelings, are part of the psychological matrix encouraging youngsters to enter the drug scene, where else are they going to learn how to handle such normal moods and feelings? If the imprint of a somewhat disturbed family structure is not to haunt them all of their years, where else are children going to learn how to correct for such traumatic influences? If the healthy channeling of aggression is a requirement of normal living, should it not be in school that they learn how to use it constructively rather than misdirecting it toward violence and crime?

Decentralizing the drug issue does not mean ignoring it. The psychiatrist treating a depressed patient certainly addresses himself to the patient's feeling of hopelessness. But he does not dwell on it, over and over again. This would drive his patient to suicide. When treating the alcoholic, the doctor cannot afford to overlook the pattern of drinking. But he also cannot afford to overlook the social and psychological factors which lie behind and contribute to the drinking problem. Drugs can and should be discussed . . . in school, but in the correct context and as part of a deeper and broader perspective.

We spend billions to train our children in science and mathematics. We are now willing to spend millions to alert them to the dangers of drugs. But how much effort are we willing to put out to prepare our children for the practical and personal aspects of living—without which their vulnerability to drug abuse will be heightened and their cultural academic subjects a total waste.

We are spending millions to rehabilitate a relative handful of youngsters who are the sad victims of the drug scene. Halfway houses. Drug detoxification centers. Rehab programs. All of which we need . . . though we are taking the money for this from other equally important medical needs—the schizophrenic in the state hospital the pupil in the classroom. In sadly familiar fashion—robbing Peter to pay Paul, and letting Joe walk off with the ransom—we are ready to devote our national energies to a small number in immediate trouble. Meanwhile, however, we ignore the philosophy of Chinese medicine which is to keep the well well and out of this unholy situation.

I am saying that we should direct our primary money and energies toward programs which decentralize the issue of drugs and which focus instead on those psychological and social factors which cause the drug problem in the first place. We should shift the aim of existing programs toward prevention of cause rather than effect. And, so doing, we must place in a position of leadership the teacher who, better than anyone else, can help to build bridges between sensible adults and sensible youngsters. This will destroy the secrecy and the lure of the forbidden without which the present market in drugs cannot survive.

The teacher may need a certain amount of reeducation, as does the typical physician. He may need fresh motivation, a shift in concept. He may well need new training in development of healthy personalities as well as informed minds. But the eventual benefits are beyond price—for the teacher as an individual and for society as a whole.

B. F. Skinner has contributed to our confusion by his recent suggestion that freedom is no longer relevant. He believes that we would all be better off in a controlled society using various forms of conditioning which, of course, would inevitably require the use of behavior-influencing drugs.

There is a real place in modern medicine for the sensible use of drugs to cure various forms of mental illness, to ward off depressions, and abnormal states of fear and tension. But this is not what Skinner and others have in mind.

To many of us, a philosophy is repugnant which limits individual freedom because of man's difficulties in coping with freedom—greed, competitiveness based on ego issues, envy and hatred, the need to dominate others, and still more. Rather than restrict freedom because it can erupt as license, surely we should concentrate our efforts on social, scientific, political and educational attempts to make freedom work. This, even if it means depriving man of his most precious neurotic need to do himself in, and others too, in the process.

Today's drug abuse problem reflects our difficulty in responding to the challenges of freedom. Its solution, I am convinced, lies not in further regimentation, but in increasing our capacity to live with freedom.

STILL NO ACTION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation cannot afford costly dock strikes and certainly it is up to Congress to draft some permanent legislation to deal with all domestic strikes. Already the west coast dock strike has cost a great fortune and hurt many people.

I would like to call attention at this point to an editorial statement in the January 26 Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel:

STILL NO ACTION

Mesmerized, perhaps, by momentous matters of politics, Congress is in no hurry to give President Nixon the power he needs to end the West Coast dock strike.

The best guess now is that no action will be taken until next week—and none will be taken at all if the longshoremen (backed by AFL–CIO President George Meany) have their way.

Meanwhile, the strike, which began last summer and resumed last week after an 80-day cooling-off period, is now in its 110th day. It is costing exporters—particularly farmers—millions of dollars in lost income, and raising serious questions about the nation's ability to protect its own economic interests.

Nobody, least of all Congress, likes to intrude in collective bargaining disputes. And it may well be that if the Government sat on its hands long enough (how long is that?) the strike would be settled.

But this strike has gone on far too long already. Too many innocent people are being hurt. And, at this point, the issues can be thrashed out while the ports are open just as easily as while the ports are closed.

INTERVIEW WITH JAMES H. BINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, HONEYWELL, INC.

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, our country is going through difficult times with a deficit balance of payment, deficit balance of trade and a loss of jobs to foreign competitors.

These conditions increase our temptations to retrench back into an isolationist trade policy. Mr. James H. Binger, the chief executive officer of Honeywell, Inc., a Minneapolis company, in an interview in U.S. News & World Report, recently cast some welcome light on a subject which is too often considered from an emotional standpoint.

The Binger article follows. I recommend it as useful information to all Members of Congress, whatever their views:

OUTLOOK FOR U.S. BUSINESSES ABROAD

(Interview with James H. Binger)

Q Mr. Binger, do you see a bright future for companies that have large foreign investments, now that the monetary crisis is over?

A I think the hazy picture we had been experiencing is clearing up. The new arrangement recognizes a change in currency values that were implicit before, but had not yet been made explicit by changes in official exchange rates. Because of the political rigidities in the system, it took a crisis like this and the exercise of considerable leverage by the U.S. to make the system work the way it was supposed to.

Q Exactly what does the change in values of foreign currencies versus the dollar mean to a company like Honeywell?

A It is a clear recognition now, in the official exchange figures, of factors that we have to pay attention to. Before, we were always inclined to say, "Well, the yen is really worth 300 to the dollar," even though the official rate was 360 yen to the dollar. But when we make an investment decision, or when we make a long-term import-export decision, we should use the right number instead of an artificial number that was created by the rigidity of the exchange rate.

Q You will have a better idea of what your real costs are, and what your real markets are likely to be—

A Yes. You could make a contract and benefit from the 360-yen-to-the-dollar ratio over a short term, but if you are going to make long-term arrangements, you really ought to use a more practical number, which has turned out to be about 308, so far.

Q The devaluation of the dollar, or revaluation of other currencies, is supposed to reduce U.S. imports and help U.S. exports. Looking at it from the standpoint of a company like Honeywell—which exports from this county and which also manufactures abroad—will it help your total sales around the world?

A I think it will help the entire trading world to operate with a little more certainty, closer to the real practical level of these currency values, and benefit U.S.-based companies most. In addition, I think it should help stimulate even further the sales of U.S. products abroad.

The revaluations are only a snap shot. I mean, it's corrected the situation until now, but we can't allow the trends that caused the 1971 crisis to continue without eventually

having another crisis. I suppose if you had to have another confrontation very soon, it would be quite clear that the dollar was losing its role as the major trading and investment currency of the world.

We've damaged the dollar to some extent by devaluation, and I don't think anybody would argue about that. A second strike on us, if that were to happen, would not be helpful. I think it is to the advantage of the American consumer, and the American economy and American business, that we do everything we can to maintain a very prominant role for the dollar in international trade and investment.

Q What does this involve? Controlling inflation at home?

A That certainly is involved. I think it's also exercising fiscal and monetary responsibility to a degree that compares favorably with our major trading competitors, as well as improving the level of productivity in our economy.

Q We can't do any worse than they do, in controlling inflation—

A If we are to maintain the effectiveness of the dollar as the leading trading and investment currency, we have to do better.

Q What about business abroad? Do you see a European recession as a possibility in the next year or so?

A In 1972, I think European business will be slow.

Q Do you mean a decline, or just slow growth?

A Slow growth. I've reached the point where I can't even contemplate a reduction in gross national product any more. Even in the United Kingdom, things look better. I tend to state the outlook in terms of Honeywell business, and it's better than the general picture. But it isn't wildly optimistic.

Q Why are you doing better than average?

A Computers are strong. Sales of residential and commercial control systems are also in pretty good shape. The same thing is true of our industrial-controls business. In Europe, we have only a limited aerospace and defense business.

Q Is the computer still a growing field in other countries as well as in the United States?

A Yes. We have tried to illustrate what we think about the future by saying we anticipate the markets for control systems will grow about 10 per cent a year on the average over the next five years, with a little stronger growth outside than inside the United States. Markets for information systems of computers we think will grow at a rate of about 15 per cent worldwide—not every year, but on the average over the next five years.

Q How do you assess the 1972 business picture in the United States?

A I'm a little more optimistic than some of my associates. I think we're going to have a good year, in terms of market opportunities. I don't want to make a forecast for what Honeywell is going to do.

Q What about Phase 2?

A I'm optimistic about the results of Phase 2. There is an awful lot of bickering and difficulty in interpreting the rulings. On the whole, it's going as well as could be expected, and it was the right way to go.

Q Are you hopeful of a smooth transition to a no-controls situation later?

A I expect it to come early, rather than later, and the transition problems won't offset the effects of restraint.

Q What are the chances of another world monetary crisis developing in 1972?

A It depends at least partly on domestic U.S. policies.

Q You are not convinced that the threat of a monetary or trade crisis is over—

A No. I think we've come through the resolution of the parity issue very well. We've given something in terms of changing the price of gold, and the relative changes in other currencies vis-à-vis the dollar have been reasonable. So we have a good current environment in which to go forward.

But actually going forward will require the success of Phase 2 controls and policies in the U.S. It also will require an improvement in the situation with respect to access to markets and freedom of investment in various parts of the world.

One of the things we might expect could go wrong is that some of these other countries might adopt restrictive practices with respect to investment, which could be very damaging to the U.S. economy.

Q Why is that so important? To the extent other countries restrict American investment, that cuts down on the outflow of funds from the United States. Why isn't that helpful rather than harmful?

A In the short term it might be helpful. In the longer term it is against our interests. We have already been restricting the flow of investment abroad for a long time, because we've had fixed involuntary investment controls imposed by our own Government for three years, since January '68—and prior to that, starting in the mid-'60s, we had voluntary controls.

We have already used up the short-term opportunity to improve our situation, and now we are in a marginal area where the effects are really reversing the balance. I feel the perpetuation of those controls can only damage the U.S. economy. It just can't help.

Q In what way do investment controls damage the U.S. economy over the long run?

A In the long run the American companies which have found the opportunity to make foreign investments—direct investments abroad—have been the same companies that have increased their American production far above average. They have increased their American employment far above average. And at the same time they have brought back from their foreign investments substantially more return on that investment than they were currently putting over there.

Q People find it hard to understand what investment controls are all about. Can you tell us briefly what sort of controls our Government has against the investment of dollars abroad?

A Basically, the rules say you can't invest more than you invested, on the average, during any two years in the 1965-to-1968 period. In fact, you are limited to a percentage of that base amount. Also, you must count as additional investment, against that limited base, most of the earnings on the assets you already had abroad. There are also restraints on bank lending and a special tax on financing here by foreigners.

It's complex, and really hard to make into a dramatic issue. The only way I can do it is to say again and again that to the extent American companies have invested abroad, they have increased their exports beyond the average of all U.S. industry. They have increased their employment. They've increased their sales. They've paid more taxes to the U.S. Government. And to cut off their investments at a time when you are trying to stimulate trade is just counter-productive.

The two programs—one to stimulate exports, the other seeking to restrict investment—are not at all consistent.

Q What is your answer to those people who say, "If you build a plant in a foreign country and produce things in that plant that you would otherwise produce in the United States and then sell abroad, you really are exporting American jobs"?

A That is a very easy argument to make but it just isn't true. Let me cite one example:

Honeywell has always been in the heating-controls business—oil-burner relays, thermostats and limit controls that make up a system to control an oil burner.

In 1952, we felt that the oil-burner business was about to burgeon in Europe. We also thought we would have difficulty selling our equipment there from the United States, because of growing strength of Swiss, German, Danish and British competitors on the local scene in Europe.

We put a plant in Holland, but we did not invest aggressively there. We said, for one thing, "We will design those oil-burner controls for the European market in Minneapolis." And we built something that wasn't right for that market.

As a result, our position was very badly damaged in Europe. We didn't lose employment in Minneapolis because of that, but we failed to gain additional employment because our position in that European market was very weak. It has taken us years to get it back.

As we expanded sales in Europe, with a properly designed relay, we also created a demand for more thermostats and limit controls and associated types of equipment that were made only in Minneapolis. Therefor, our employment increased in that area.

That's a specific example of how investment abroad seems to work in Honeywell's case.

Our employment in the United States went from 34,036 in 1960 to 58,000 in 1970. We had a 70 per cent increase.

Q Are you sure you wouldn't have had an even bigger increase if you had invested in more new plants in the United States?

A A lot of manufacturing industries which did not extensively develop their opportunities in foreign markets grew an average of only 15 per cent in that period.

I can point to a lot of things—which are good for our U.S. production—which never would have happened had our company been too timid about foreign investment.

As a matter of fact, our board of directors came very close to deciding not to manufacture those relays I mentioned in Europe, even though a very small investment was involved. Some had the fear of political problems over there, even expropriation of the investment. But while 1952 doesn't seem so long ago, it was the Dark Ages in terms of many Americans' view of the European commercial markets and political stability.

Q Do you see any signs that the climate for American investment in European countries is less favorable now?

A Yes, I do.

Q Can you explain?

A The local competition from companies based in Europe is much stronger than it was. In addition, the governments are much more conscious and concerned.

Q Less hospitable?

A Less hospitable. They think they don't need investment as much as they did before. I believe they are wrong.

Q Has the growth of the Common Market concept had something to do with this?

A The entry of the British into the Common Market is going to stimulate an even greater risk of restrictions against us, I believe.

Q Are there restrictions by European governments on American investment now?

A There are restrictions in several of the countries. Germany is relatively free. France is less so. Italy has some restrictions. U. K. has some restrictions, but they generally don't amount to much.

Q Are you suggesting that those restrictions may increase?

A I think they might, for several reasons. Suppose the U.S. makes progress at the negotiating table, in connection with trade restraints. It is entirely possible—because the Europeans recognized even before we did the increasing importance of investment as a means to make the world's economies grow—that they would say, "All right, we'll remove some of these restrictions on trade that you have complained about, but we will step up our restraints on investments."

If our negotiators do not have the investment issue high enough on their agenda, they may give back on investments as much or more than we get in modified trade restraints.

Q Does that prospect worry you?

A It does very much, particularly if our Government says to American companies trying to operate in this environment, "You may not make direct investments with U.S. funds; you've got to get the money over there."

That means those nations can then put restrictions on American investments and be absolutely certain they are going to be effective, because where else can the U.S. companies go? We will have been set up under those circumstances as a soft target.

Q Is a ban on direct investments abroad actually under consideration?

A It has been proposed.

Q Is the threat of such a ban part of the horse trading that's going on in the trade and monetary negotiations?

A I don't think it's had enough attention. In concentrating on trade restraints, our negotiators may overlook the investment side.

Even if they don't overlook the issue, unless our present direct-investment controls are eliminated we are going to be caught.

Q What chance is there that U.S. restraints on investment abroad will be eliminated?

A It just takes an executive action by the President. There is one issue that needs congressional action: the interest-equalization tax, or IET.

Q We hear increasingly often that this country is shifting from a trading nation to an exporter of capital and industrial know-how, and that sooner or later, if we keep exporting capital, we're going to start showing a huge surplus on the capital account. Can we then expect also a surplus on the trade account? How can our trading partners pay if we show a surplus on all accounts?

A They can't. You can't run a mercantile kind of world if everybody attempts to generate a surplus. We need methods by which balances are struck.

It may very well be that the income from U.S. investments abroad will grow to the point where we will have to balance it off with a trade deficit. But I don't think so. I think the better way to do it, and the more positive way, is to say, "Investment is a good thing; keep plowing it back."

Q Balance off the income flow with capital exports—

A Yes.

Q Where can you find places abroad that need capital and can employ it profitably for both investors and users?

A I don't know for sure. I suppose the most distressing thing has been the failure of our programs to stimulate investment in the developing countries. To what extent recent developments may have corrected that is a question. If anything, the situation is less promising today.

Q Why do you say that?

A Look at Chile [The Chilean Government recently took over much foreign-owned property there.] Without some new policies that aren't yet apparent, we aren't likely to achieve much success in stimulating investment in the less-developed countries.

Q. Have you developed any ideas about the possibilities in trade with Russia?

A. Yes, I think there are possibilities. I'm not sure that they're huge, but they're considerable and worth attention.

We've had trade with the Iron Curtain countries in connection with computers, industrial instruments and, to a certain extent, environmental controls for public buildings—air conditioning, heating. Eastern Europe isn't an advance market for air conditioning.

Q. Is the market there growing?

A. Yes. We thought at one time the British people would never want to be comfortable, but this has changed, too. There are certain thresholds in standards of living where things begin to become important for the first time. From the bicycle, a nation goes to the motorcycle and then the car, and then they begin to think about dishwashers and, eventually, air conditioning.

Q When do you think substantial markets are likely to open up in China and Russia for companies like Honeywell?

A Russia earlier than China. We have some business now in Russia, and we'll have more. I'm not sure about China in the near term—the next four or five years. I'd like to go over there, though, and learn a little more about it.

Q Are you optimistic that American business can compete successfully with other industrialized nations? A lot of dark talk has been heard in recent years about how we're losing out—

A I don't buy it. In the areas where we have some technology, where we've concentrated our attention, we're really doing quite well. Of course, we may not be making all the shoes that we wear. That really doesn't say very much about the over-all trend in the world-trade picture.

Q What about your operations in England? Are they conducted by a British subsidiary of Honeywell?

A Yes, a 100 per cent owned British subsidiary—Honeywell, Ltd. Normally we adhere to the same corporate identification in all other national markets as we use here in the United States.

Q How many different countries is Honeywell operating in?

A We operate to some extent in over 100 countries, and have manufacturing operations in a dozen.

Our employment outside the United States is about 40,000 out of 95,000 total employment.

Q About 40 per cent of Honeywell employment is in other countries?

A Yes—and I'd like to talk a minute about what a multi-national company is, and how this type of enterprise got started.

There seems to be a general feeling that American multi-national companies are the only kind there are. Actually, our information is that 40 to 45 per cent of total international investment is by companies whose home bases are not in the U.S.

Although American companies seem to be a little bit ahead in terms of funds invested in other nations, there's a very substantial segment of international investment and multinational operation conducted by companies with a parent foreign to the U.S.

Q The president of a radio-manufacturing company was testifying before a congressional committee not long ago, and he told how his company—a multinational operation—built a plant in Taiwan to make radios. The other day, it was announced that a typewriter factory employing 1,600 workers in New England is closing down, and the parent company will get typewriters from a British plant. This is the "export of jobs" issue associated with multinational operations—

A Well, I would suppose that all of us have more radios and more television sets because of the fact that we're finding out how to buy them for less.

HOW THE CONSUMER GAINS

Q Your point is that Americans benefit as consumers—

A As consumers. The consumer is generally not considered to the extent he should be in matters of foreign trade and investment.

In addition, I would be interested in knowing what happened to that radio company's employment during the period of time it was expanding abroad. If it's the company I am thinking of, I have the impression its employment in the U.S. went up modestly—even though, in order to satisfy the company's domestic markets at an appropriate price, it had to utilize some foreign labor.

Even where American jobs are wiped out, you have to remember those are jobs that were not economically viable in today's world. The people abroad who get jobs through expanding opportunities also deserve to eat, to enjoy life, and they are doing so more and more as time goes on. In fact, it's part of the interdependent world that is being built.

Q If you look down the road a little bit, do you see the U.S. no longer making some things, such as shoes and typewriters?

A Yes, we will probably cease to make some things, just as we will produce certain products in which we excel for ourselves and for many others. As we've been able to increase our productivity we made more products, and our consumers enjoyed more goods and more services, and we are getting many things for less cost.

Q You indicated that you think it's unwise for our Government to restrict investments by U.S. companies abroad. Do you see any likelihood those restrictions will be eased or removed in the near future?

A I think they will. That sought to be very high on the list of policy changes to be made in connection with the current trade and monetary negotiations. All our trading partners and the bankers in Zurich should be aware of the fact we consider this a counterproductive thing that we imposed on ourselves—just as bad as the trade restraints we're trying to negotiate away.

Q How does the return on U.S. investments abroad compare with the money we are putting out in new investments?

A During the 1960–69 period—10 years—private direct investment abroad was 26 billion dollars. The income was 38 billion, for a net balance of 12 billion. In addition, there were 11 billion in royalties and fees.

To a large degree in Honeywell's case it's an application of investment that gets us those royalties and fees.

But just consider the income versus the outgo of investment funds in recent years. In 1967, the plus balance was 1.4 billions; in '68, it went to 1.8 billions; in '69, to 2.6 billions.

Now, you're entitled to say, "Well, if the net income has been growing by that amount, why doesn't that prove that direct-investment controls are a good thing?" And I'm caught by my own numbers, except that it's quite apparent that, whether it happens in 1972 or whenever, we're going to dry up the pump if we do not continue to plow back into new investments some of the income we're taking in.

Q Do you have comparable figures on the long-term investments of foreign-based companies operating in the U.S.?

A In the United States, from '60 to '70, the investment by foreign-controlled multinational companies rose from 6.9 billions to 13.2. It didn't double, but almost. We don't have the information about the return flow of income to them from those investments.

Q What about the politics of the exported-jobs issue? If labor unions can cite cases like the radio–TV factory in Taiwan and the typewriter jobs going to England, doesn't that increase the pressure for inhibiting the flow of investment abroad?

A Yes. In my view, the workers who will be displaced deserve a far better method of adjustment than is provided for them under present laws.

Q What is provided for them?

A It was thought to be adequate, but it never has been, in practice. You have to go through the Tariff Commission and get a finding that people have been unemployed because of imports, and that the imports have increased because of a deal we made with one of our trading partners to lower tariff duties—there are about six different notches you have to get through in order to get the workers any help.

The unions have said, "It's burial insurance, that's about all." And can't disagree. We need a much more rapid, a much more broadly based kind of benefit-adjustment plan.

Q Do you see a prospect that in this election year there may be demands in Congress for more-direct measures, such as limiting imports, or—

A I think probably the monetary agreement has had a calming result. I hope it has. So there may not be the hysterical reaction that was evident at the end of the last Congress, when they almost passed that evil bill with a quota on practically everything imported from other countries.

I remember reading a listing of the products whose import would have been either prohibited or cut way back, and one was honey from Mexico—and $54,000 a year of honey was imported from Mexico. That's a threat to the economy of the United States. I guess, if you get into a certain mental state.

Q Do you think legislation restricting imports is likely to pass Congress in 1972?

A I think it's a real threat. There's another bill—the Hartke-Burke bill—coming up for hearings shortly. It gives the President discretion to restrict investment. It imposes involuntary quotas on a number of products without regard to market growth. We think much of the pressure behind the bill comes from the AFL–CIO.

Q Trade negotiations are going on right now following the currency-parity changes. I suppose those are of crucial importance to what Congress may do—

A If progress is made in those negotiations, I believe that the many very, very sound people in Congress can hold out against the pressure they're up against. If we fail to have progress, it might very well result in a legislative shambles.

One thing I forgot to mention about the Hartke-Burke bill is some very punitive income tax provisions which would change the whole setup as to taxation of foreign income. That would be extremely harmful.

Q How are you taxed now on earnings abroad?

A Currently, most industrial countries permit earnings by one of their corporations' subsidiaries in another country to receive a credit for any foreign taxes paid, when those earnings are brought back to the parent country.

If we earn a dollar in France and pay 50 cents in tax to the French Government, thereby having 50 cents of income to bring back, our tax laws have customarily allowed that 50 cents of French tax to be credited against our American tax payments.

What the Hartke-Burke bill says is that after you pay a 50-cent tax over there, and you bring 50 cents after taxes back here, it's to be handled just as if it were gross and not net income, and you must pay an additional 50 per cent American tax, with no credit given for taxes paid in France.

The entire tendency of the bill is to destroy very effectively any kind of incentive to make foreign investments. We think it's very shortsighted.

Q Mr. Binger, is the U.S. still the dominant nation in computer manufacturing?

A We estimate that over 80 per cent of all computers in the world are supplied by American-based companies.

AMERICA HOLDS ITS PLACE IN TRADE

Q Are we being challenged by foreign competitors?

A I think it's about the same as it was five years ago. We seem to be retaining our share of the market in general.

Computers are another case where it has been demonstrated that the business has a worldwide dimension. Without investment in manufacturing, marketing, support and development resources throughout the world, you haven't got the business size that can allow you to compete effectively. That would mean you wouldn't be as good at supplying the American market as you can be if you have got that worldwide dimension.

You certainly would be far weaker in the foreign areas, where marketing and other facilities close to the overseas market—which is very large and growing rapidly—are essential. You're either there, or you're forgotten.

COLLEGIATE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF AMERICA

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the Young Democratic Clubs of my congressional district and also the State and National Collegiate Young Democrats. Both organizations in Indiana have been very active in holding meetings and organizing in order to bring the true facts regarding important issues—National, State, and local—into the homes of our young voters, especially in the coming important presidential campaign.

The Indiana Young Democrats have been active for a number of years previous to our congressional enactment last year in giving the franchise to our 18- to 21-year-old youth. The Young Democrats of Indiana were among the first of the young political pioneers several years ago in organizing so that the voice of our young folks can be heard in the Washington executive and congressional circles, as well as State and local campaigns.

I was indeed happy to receive a letter this morning from one of your young Democratic leaders in Indiana, Ted A. Kane, Jr., who is now national treasurer of the Collegiate Young Democrats of America. He informs me that next week at the Collegiate Young Democrats convention he is a candidate for the office of president of this rapidly growing organization of American youth who will be a great help to the Democratic Party in the presidential, congressional, State, and local campaigns in 1972.

I include with my remarks the letter which I received this morning from Ted setting out his platform and qualifications as candidate for president of the Collegiate Young Democratic Clubs of America.

The letter follows:

THE FEDERATION OF INDIANA
COLLEGIATE YOUNG DEMOCRATS,
January 25, 1972.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Gary, Ind.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: I am a student at Indiana State University and have been active in the College Young Democrats for a number of years now. I am presently serving as National Treasurer of the College Young Democratic Clubs of America.

The CYDCA National Convention is going to be held February 10–13, 1972, in Youngstown, Ohio. The Indiana Federation of College Young Democrats have been very active in local and state politics in Indiana for quite some time. Now with the 18 year old vote the potential of the CYD's is enormous both statewide and nationally.

The National Organization of CYD's has been somewhat of a disappointment for those of us from Indiana who have worked with it up to this time. This year is the time for reform in the Democratic Party, and it is the time for reform in the CYDCA. Now, when the potential is so high for the CYDCA to prove itself an effective force in Democratic Politics, we in Indiana cannot stand by and watch the National Organization continue on in the ineffective manner of the past. The organization has for too long existed only to perpetuate its own structures rather than the purpose for which it was created.

It is now time for Indiana to surge to the forefront and to make the CYDCA the effective voice of students across the nation and an effective force in the Democratic Party. It is in this spirit that the Indiana College Young Democrats and myself personally seek your endorsement and support for my candidacy, for the highest office in the College Young Democratic Clubs of America, that of National President.

I have enclosed a copy of my background material and feel confident that I am qualified and capable of leading the CYDCA to a responsible position in the Democratic Party. The voice of the young voter must be heard and the CYDCA has the opportunity and responsibility of bringing this voice effectively to the Democratic Party.

Thank you for any support you may provide, and a reply would be best sent to my school address as soon as possible.

Sincerely in peace,

TED A. KANE, Jr.,
National Treasurer, College Young Democratic Clubs of America.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Ted A. Kane, Jr., National Treasurer, Youth Caucus '72. Board of Directors, Lake County Collegiate Young Democrats, 1969 to present. Executive Council, Indiana State University CYD's, 1969 to present. Vice President, Griffith Young Democrats, 1970 to present. Former Regional Director, Indiana Collegiate Young Democrats. Delegate to Indiana Democratic State Convention, 1970. Justice, Indiana State University, All-University Court of Appeals, February, 1971 to present. National Treasurer, Collegiate Young Democrats Clubs of America, February, 1971 to present. Employed by the U.S. Government, United States Office of Education, Washington, D.C. for eight months.

Age 22. Junior, Indiana State University, Political Science and Speech.

Home Address: 630 North Indiana Street, Griffith, Indiana 46319. Phone: XXXX

School Address: 36 South 11th Street, Terre Haute, Indiana, 47807. Phone: 812–235–7287.

NINE MORE COSPONSORS OF TAX SIMPLIFICATION BILL

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced the tax simplification bill yesterday with 69 other cosponsors, nine other members of the House have expressed a desire to cosponsor this legislation, which I am reintroducing today with their cosponsorship. This brings the total of cosponsors to 79. A list of the nine new cosponsors of the Tax Simplification bill follows:

COSPONSORS

George Collins, Ill.
Robert Drinan, Mass.
Ed Jones, Tenn.
Peter Kyros, Maine.
Otis Pike, N.Y.
Robert Roe, N.J.
William Roy, Kans.
Charles Wilson, Calif.
Fernand J. St Germain, R.I.

CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING PARIS PEACE TALKS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the undisputed fact that since taking office President Nixon has succeeded in bringing about an 87-percent reduction in U.S. troop strength in Vietnam emphatically demonstrates the President's deep desire for peace. The President's dramatic announcement, January 25, concerning his secret negotiations should dispel any reasonable doubts in this regard. At the same time, it should be equally apparent that it is the other side that has refused to negotiate meaningfully, either in public or in private. So long as the North Vietnamese continue to believe that they can, by influencing American public opinion, win at the negotiating table what they have failed to accomplish on the battlefield, there seems little chance that the enemy will genuinely seek peace. In an editorial broadcast on January 26, 1972, station WJIM–TV, Lansing, Mich., raised some important considerations concerning these negotiations and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

EDITORIAL

The President's newest Vietnam peace initiative is really not "new," it's been on the negotiating table for over 2 months, the world knows about it now only because Richard Nixon hopes the public revelation of private talks may prod Hanoi into action in Paris. 30 months ago the significant negotiations went underground for the same reason they have now been made public to hopefully break the deadlock. The secret missions of Dr. Kissinger have failed. About the only positive outcome is some restoration of faith in the government's ability to keep a secret, a faith badly shaken a few months ago by the New York Times publication of the Pentagon papers.

The President's reflections on the frustrations of his three year quest for peace have served a more serious purpose, however. His address to the nation last night isolated what might be the single most crucial issue standing in the way of negotiated settlement. Withdrawal of American troops has been only a propaganda controversy since May of 1971 when Dr. Kissinger gave the Vietcong specific guarantees on this point. The POW exchange is probably similarly superficial . . . realistically, pressures on the North Vietnam government for a return of prisoners is as great as the pressures our own government faces.

Now that the President's frank recounting of the secret negotiations has effectively exposed the "straw man" character of those two issues it becomes clear that the real stumbling block is agreement on the *political future* of Vietnam . . . that's what is really at stake. From Eisenhower through Nixon the consistent position of this nation has been that the proper resolution of this problem is free elections. It is now apparent that Hanoi rejects this solution . . . basically because the North Vietnamese simply do not believe a free election is possible in the South. Unfortunately, the antics of President Thieu which turned the recent South Vietnamese Presidential election into a farce, dangerously threatened the United States position. In our judgment the President is on the right track when he emphasizes international control of the proposed elections. It is likely, however, to achieve final agreement, the North will need realistic guarantees that international control will be both independent and completely capable of preventing intimidation and fraud.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION—THE ISSUE IS NOT SETTLED YET

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, too often, in discussing the United Nations and the question of the relationship to that body of the Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan, we tend to overlook what really happened in the recent United Nations vote.

It is widely believed that the Government of Communist China was admitted to the United Nations, while the Government of the Republic of China was expelled. According to the provisions of the United Nations Charter itself, such a transaction could not have been affected in the manner which was used.

In an article exploring the legal procedures used, Prof. Robert Morris points out that—

If it were a question of admission, the United States or the Republic of China could have exercised the veto and prevented it. Russia has thus acted 51 times that I know of and thwarted admission of a new state.

Dr. Morris notes that the Government of the Republic of China was not expelled. He writes:

If expulsion were the issue, the United States which professed to deplore this precise act, instead of shedding tears, could have cast a simple veto.

What really happened was that the Chinese question was discussed in terms of representation and credentials. Dr. Morris states that the State Department began to formulate the issue in these terms more than 20 years ago, and that this was "the only route by which the Chinese Communists could escape a veto."

In this sense, it was the action of the United States itself which laid the groundwork for the unfortunate events we have witnessed in recent days.

What is important now, Dr. Morris believes, is that the Government of the Republic of China remain strong and free. He writes:

Free China will remain strong, as West Germany or South Korea, even out of the United Nations, if a sense of hope prevails. It can go down only if the impression becomes fixed that it is a regime that is dying on the vine.

It is up to those in the United States who continue to believe in freedom and in resisting aggression to make certain that our own defense commitments to the Republic of China remain firm and strong.

I wish to share Dr. Morris' article, which appeared in Twin Circle, the Catholic weekly newspaper, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

THE ISSUE ISN'T SETTLED YET

(By Robert Morris)

Everyone is talking about "the admission of Red China" to the United Nations and the "expulsion of what they call 'Taiwan' " from that world body. Our top government leaders use those expressions. Our leading newspapers deplore or applaud the events at the U.N. with those precise phrases. Even good friends of Free China deplore, with anger and bitterness, these twin misadventures of "admission" and of "expulsion".

But that is not what happened. It could not have happened. Yet everyone—but everyone—says it did. I ask myself if this is some great hoax being perpetrated as I hear our Secretary of State and our Ambassador to the United Nations warn against the consequences to follow, and the precedent set, by the expulsion of a member state.

The People's Republic of China was not admitted to the U.N. If it were a question of admission, the United States or the Republic of China could have exercised the veto and prevented it. Russia has thus acted 51 times that I know of and thwarted admission of a new state. Nor was the Republic of China, whom foes and even some well meaning friends call "Taiwan", expelled. If expulsion were the issue, the United States which professed to deplore that precise act, instead of shedding tears, could have cast a simple veto.

The charter is clear on both points. Article 4 provides that admission "will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council".

Article 6 similarly provides that a member "may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council".

In both cases the recommendations of the Security Council could be vetoed.

Moreover, in both cases the decision of the General Assembly that would follow a not vetoed recommendation of the Security Council must be by a two-thirds vote.

What did happen then and why is everyone, including those who certainly must know, saying something else?

Twenty years ago or even more I began to read of the efforts of the State Department to frame the issue of Red China and the U.N. in terms of "representation" and "credentials". Whose credentials would be acceptable by the U.N.—President Chiang's or Chairman Mao's?

I thought it was purposeful because that is the only route by which the Chinese Communists could escape a veto.

This is the effort that succeeded. The ruling forces made "representation" the issue and in that way it was kept in the General Assembly. "Representation", unlike "admission" or "expulsion", does not carry a mandatory two-third vote in the Assembly but it must be expressly made so by a majority vote.

But this is my point. For some reason that underlying cause of the outcome is being concealed. It is certainly being overlooked when we assess the future.

The Communists and the others who won on this device do not want us to know it. Why? Because it could be used against them next year—and the year after.

Next year the Congo or Brazil or some other nation, not enamoured of Red China, could introduce an "Albanian" resolution asking that Chiang's credential be accepted and Mao's, or his successor's, rejected.

We know that the Communists will be truculent, ruthless and agggressive in the years to come. Their heroin traffic will begin to break into the news. An administration in Washington desiring a Free China in the U.N. might come into office. These acts influence members' votes. Thus the issue could still be won.

But the big advantage is this: Free China will remain strong, as West Germany or

South Korea, even out of the U.N., if a sense of hope prevails. It can go down only if the impression becomes fixed that it is a regime that is dying on the vine.

And that is what will happen unless we look at the issue in terms of what did happen, instead of what they want us to think happened.

So there is still hope for liberty in Asia.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC POLICIES AND THE MINORITIES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 28, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 20, 1972, Mr. Jack Ybarra, president of the Confederacion de la Raza Unida, appeared in front of Senator HART's Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to testify on the effects of President Nixon's economic policies on the minorities and the poor of our Nation.

The Confederacion de la Raza Unida is a coalition of 67 Mexican-American organizations in Santa Clara County in California.

Mr. Ybarra has been involved for a number of years working for the social, political, and economic rights of Mexican Americans and poor people residing in our communities.

Mr. Ybarra raises some important and cogent issues in his testimony, and I recommend its reading to you:

PHASE II OF THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Jack Ybarra)

GENTLEMEN: My name is Jack Ybarra, president of the Confederacion de la Raza Unida. My business address is 1656 E. Santa Clara Street, San Jose, California. The Confederacion de la Raza Unida is a coalition of sixty-seven (67) Mexican-American organizations in Santa Clara County. It has been organized since 1969 for the purpose of securing appropriate and necessary social, political, and economic rights on behalf of the Mexican-Americans and poor people residing in the county.

The question to which I would like to address myself is whether Phase II of the President's Economic Policy accurately addresses itself to the economic problems of Mexican-Americans and poor people. It is my opinion that the President's Economic Policy must be concerned with the problems which poor people and minority people face. If positive steps are not taken with regard to this very large segment of the American population, then certainly the poor will be caught in an economic cross-fire from which they cannot free themselves.

In order to give you a clear picture of the problems which have beset poor and minority people in Santa Clara County, I would like to briefly describe the area to you. Santa Clara County is located approximately fifty (50) miles south of San Francisco. The county-wide population, according to the 1970 Census is approximately 1,064,714. Of this total number, approximately 186,525 or eighteen percent (18%) of the population are Mexican-American and/or Spanish-speaking. We therefore compose the largest single minority group in the county.

There are fifteen (15) municipalities in the county. By far, the largest municipality is the City of San Jose, and much of the growth of Santa Clara County is attributed to the growth of the City of San Jose. Since 1950, when the expansion-minded city manager, A. P. Hamman, assumed the reins of the city, San Jose has grown from an agricultural community with a population of 95,000, contained in seventeen (17) square miles, to an urban community of one hundred thirty-five (135) square miles and a population of 445,779.

As an agricultural valley, Santa Clara County provided employment for Mexican-Americans in the fields and orchards as well as in the packing houses and canneries. With urban growth, however, came large corporate land developers. The farmers and ranchers who once employed thousands of Mexican-American families sold their vast holdings to these land developers or became land developers themselves. The orchards and fields of the fertile Santa Clara Valley, which once fed the nation, were now replaced with commercial, industrial, and residential development. As the fields and orchards disappeared, jobs for Mexican-Americans became increasingly scarce. There were fewer crops to be harvested and therefore no need for the farmworker. Major canneries and packing houses which processed the crops closed their doors and moved out of the county into other agricultural areas.

In short, the Mexican-American has been caught in the cross-fire of the rapid urban development and economic growth which has been taking place in the county. As development has progressed, the Mexican-American has been displaced, not only from his employment, but also from his home. Without exaggeration, the Mexican-American has literally become a refugee in his own community. Long lists of Spanish-surnamed families await placement by the housing authorities of the City of San Jose and the County of Santa Clara. Other families, in desperation, have found shelter for themselves. However, all too often their new homes have been inadequate and temporary, primarily because these homes are all too often in the way of a proposed freeway or urban development project.

It is from this vantage point and in this context that I address the members of this sub-committee regarding Phase II of President Nixon's Economic Policy. While big labor, management, and industry concern themselves with wages and prices, the Mexican-American and other poor and minority people are being discounted and ignored.

I would like to define what I mean by a poor person. Although poverty has been defined in various ways, it has been most often defined in terms of economics. However, poverty is not restricted to OEO guidelines; poor people are not necessarily those who have incomes of under $4,000.00 a year. Rather, one may be marginally secure but still unable to buy a home in the neighborhood of his choice because of his race or national origin. Again, one may be marginally secure but still unable to voice an opinion in the decision-making process which affects his life. These people are poor people. In a very real sense, Mexican-Americans and other minority people are poor, both socially and politically, and all too often economically.

Phase II must address itself to the concerns of poor people in this country and it must address itself to their needs both socially and politically, as well as economically in order to be meaningful. Poor people have essentially four major concerns which are:

(1) Housing
(2) Employment
(3) Food and the necessities of life
(4) Direct input into the decision-making process

Phase II of the President's Economic Policy must have a positive impact on these major concerns in order to be meaningful.

HOUSING

From 1960 to 1969, Santa Clara County was one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the country, increasing by some 45,000 people a year and generating an average of 15,000 new dwelling units a year. Highly skilled workers, attracted by expanding job opportunities, created an affluent population. However, there are many people who have not shared in the general prosperity. Mexican-Americans and other poor people have been caught in the severe housing shortage which has existed in the county. For minority and poor families, the national goal of a "decent home in a suitable living environment" has not been met. On the contrary, there has been an increasing inability of the housing market to respond to the needs of such disadvantaged households. The contrast in Santa Clara County between the poor and the affluent, and the Mexican-American and the white population is never more apparent. There is no question but that there is visible geographical segregation of the minority and poor from the white and the affluent. Lending policies of the banks, municipal zoning and land use policies, in addition to the policies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, all play a role in the shortage and placement of housing for poor people.

A. *Banks.*—Commercial banks play a central and critical role in the development of a community. Government, particularly the federal government, is instrumental in the interaction between banks and the community. The government plays a central role in the basic deposit gathering and lending operations of commercial banks and savings and loan associations. By law, these banks are given control over checking account deposits, which guarantees banks the interest-free use of these deposits. Further, government insurance creates public confidence in the banks and encourages the public to deposit money in banks.

In addition to the guarantees provided under federal law, the federal government deposits large and substantial sums of its money in banks, interest free. Deposits from government sources give banks sufficient liquidity to attract more deposits and lever them further with greater flexibility.

Although banks effectively operate under the protective umbrella of the federal government, the lending policies of banks, *vis-a-vis* the minority and poor community do not reflect social awareness of the problems of urban development and economic growth. The protection given to these banks by the federal government gives rise to a corresponding obligation on the part of banks to comply with the policy and goals of the federal government. Banks perform a "public trust", and they do so by government fiat. The decisions made by governing boards of the banks affect the entire community, including governmental structures. As a public trust, banks should be responsive to the needs of the community which they serve.

Nevertheless, the banks have not complied with the policy and goals of the federal government with regard to housing and placement of housing. The only question which banks are concerned with is whether its loan to a developer is secure and will make an anticipated return. Social concerns apparently do not enter into the consideration; the pattern of housing in Santa Clara County is visible evidence of this fact.

I recently had occasion to meet with the regional vice-president of the Bank of America. He prided his bank's socially responsive policies. Indeed, the Bank of America has awarded scholarships, instituted training programs, and established a special loan program for minority businesses. One of the programs instituted by the Bank of America was of particular interest to me. The president of the bank established a special loan fund of $100 million earmarked for a home owner-

ship program for poor and minority people. The standards for qualifying under this special program were more lenient than that under FHA standards. The program was so successful that the president earmarked an additional $100 million.

The problem with this special program was that it was earmarked for poor and minority people living in a certain geographical area. For instance, in the San Jose area, the East Side of San Jose was selected as the geographical lending area under this program. All minority and poor people living in the East Side of San Jose potentially could qualify under the bank's loan program. However, only minority and poor people living in that given geographical location qualified. It was apparent that there would be a tendency for minority and poor people to move into this designated area because of the availability of the loan. Further, there would be a tendency for minority and poor people already living in this area to continue to live there rather than attempt to move out of the neighborhood since it would be more difficult to obtain a loan outside the area. In short, the Bank of America, through its lending policies, has assisted in creating an ethnically and economically imbalanced neighborhood. This bank's lending policies, compounded with other decisions which have been made, and are being made, by governmental entities has insured the East Side of San Jose to be a Mexican *barrio*, where schools are ethnically imbalanced to such a degree that integration of the schools for quality education is presently a grave concern.

Phase II of the President's Economic Policy does not come to grips with the problems which face minority and poor people with regard to acquiring housing. The powerful lending institutions must be carefully examined and their lending policies must be made to comply with the national goals and objectives. In order to remedy this problem, I suggest:

(1) That the federal government establish appropriate regulations and guidelines whereby participation of the minority and poor community on the governing boards of lending institutions be required. In this way, lending institutions will be made to be responsive to the needs of the minority and poor community.

(2) That the federal government, through the Comptroller of the Currency and other appropriate regulatory bodies, establish a system whereby all banks and savings and loan associations report their lending patterns of home loans in terms of geographical location of the home, the racial or national origin of the borrower, and the economic status of the borrower.

(3) That interest-free deposits by the federal government be used as leverage on lending institutions and deposited in those banks that are willing to extend more lenient loans to minority and poor people.

B. *Municipal zoning and land use policies.*—Closely related to the lending policies of banks is the problem of municipal zoning and land use policies of the various jurisdictions. Earlier, in my introductory remarks, I stated that Santa Clara County, particularly the City of San Jose, has grown from a sleepy agricultural community to a large urban area. The urban growth which began in 1950 and which went unchecked for twenty (20) years has left visible marks on the county and the fifteen (15) cities within the county.

The very real problem of concentration of minority and poor people in one geographical location of the county did not occur by accident. The fifteen (15) cities in Santa Clara County have a variety of zoning restrictions and land use policies. Two municipalities, Los Altos Hills and Monte Sereno, have a minimum one (1) acre zoning restriction which effectively prohibits the construction of multiple housing units under any of the FHA low and moderate income housing programs designed to provide housing for the poor.

While other cities do not have prohibitive zoning restrictions, nevertheless, planning decisions have been made so that low-income housing is located in the *barrio*, and housing for the affluent is located in the suburban areas. The City of San Jose's planning policies are a case in point. Recently, the planning commission of the city approved a project to be located in an exclusive suburban area. The proposed project is to be located on one hundred one (101) acres and will be composed of single family and townhouse units. The single family homes will sell from $32,000 to $38,000. The three hundred (300) townhouses will sell from $26,000 to $36,000.

Developments such as this one raise two important problems. First, the 1970 Census indicates that there is a marked spatial segregation of income groups in the county. The poor are found in the older areas of the valley floor, the *barrio*, while the higher income groups, those earning more than $15,000 a year, tend to dominate the newer areas in the foothills. Additionally, there is a corresponding spatial segregation of racial groups. Mexican-Americans are found in the older areas, while there are relatively few Mexican-Americans in the higher income residential areas which are developing. Needless to say, the schools in the core city have a very high concentration of Mexican-Americans (80% or more) and poor people, while the schools in the suburban areas have very few Mexican-Americans (5% or less) and poor people.

Secondly, recent studies indicate that there are relatively few homes selling for less than $20,000 in Santa Clara County, while more than one-third (⅓) of the new homes are selling for over $30,000. In short, developers are building homes for the affluent. Escalating costs have precluded an increasingly larger share of Santa Clara County households from an opportunity for home ownership.

Many reasons may be attributed to the causes of segregated neighborhoods. However, in my opinion, municipalities have failed to impose meaningful restrictions and conditions upon developers when zoning and building permits are requested. One important condition which should be imposed upon private developers is that they should be required to provide funds to reloacte families who are displaced as a result of their development. More often than not, those who are displaced are minority and poor people.

Another important condition which should be imposed upon private developers is that they provide homes for all economic segments of the community, and that they provide a proportionate number of homes in a price range that is within the reach of those families who have been displaced as a result of their development.

C. *Rentals.*—Because of the cost of home ownership, the very large majority of Mexican-Americans and poor people must rent. Although both the County of Santa Clara and the City of San Jose have housing authorities under Section 23 of the federal leased housing program, the number of units of such subsidized housing fails to meet the needs of the poor.

Rental housing has also increasingly become more costly. Vacancy rates have fallen from fifteen percent (15%) in 1965 to less than three percent (3%) in 1969. Households earning less than $4,000 a year are those most adversely affected by the short supply of rental units. It has been estimated that ability to pay $120 per month in rent was necessary before the local rental market could supply an adequate number of units to balance supply and demand. Assuming a normal budget of twenty-five percent (25%) of monthly income for rent, it appears that a household in Santa Clara County had to earn $5,700 a year before the market could supply an adequate opportunity to rent. For nearly 34,000 renters with incomes below $5,700 there were only 14,400 units available at prices they could afford. In addition, the majority of unsound rentals in the county are in the rental range below $120 a month.

In my opinion, merely placing controls on the price of rentals is ineffective for it is apparent that according to the law of supply and demand, the price of rentals will skyrocket once the freeze has ended, particularly in the price range where there is the greatest demand, among the poor. I suggest that substantial federal assistance is needed to enlarge federal programs such as Section 23, Section 236, and Section 235. Only until the supply of housing meets the demand for housing will there be any stabilization in the price of rentals for poor people.

Thus, in the area of housing, Phase II of the President's Economic Policy fails to address itself to the pressing needs of the minority and poor people. Lending institutions, with all the advantages of government support, still remain unresponsive to the social needs of the poor. Although the cost of construction of new homes may be frozen through wage controls and price controls, nevertheless, for Mexican-Americans and poor people, the cost of occupying a home is still beyond their means. Although the price of rental units are frozen, for Mexican-Americans and poor people, the price at which they are frozen is still beyond their means.

EMPLOYMENT

The second major concern of poor people is employment. With the coming of the major electronic and aerospace industries in the early 1950's, Santa Clara County was transformed from an agricultural community to a major urban center. Lockheed, Fairchild Camera, Philco-Ford, and IBM, to name but a few companies, have located in Santa Clara County.

The influx of families tied to these industries created a demand for homes. Corporate land developers such as Foremost-McKesson and Kaufmann and Broad came to the valley to capitalize on this market. They purchased substantial acreage to build homes, and the orchards, ranches and farms disappeared from the scene and were replaced with tracts of residential developments. Agriculture as an industry declined in importance; and Mexican-American farm labor was no longer needed to tend the fields. Simultaneously with the decline in agriculture was a decline in the need for the canneries, packing houses, and other food processing plants. Again, Mexican-American cannery workers and food processors were displaced as these industries closed their doors and moved to other areas where agriculture was still a primary industry.

The conglomerates which located in Santa Clara County dictated the destiny of all people living in the valley, particularly Mexican-Americans and poor people. It was the decision of these major industries to locate in this county which placed the poor people in the economic political, and social cross-fire of urban development and economic growth. It was these conglomerates which influenced the economic life of the people. It was these conglomerates which directed the political decision-making process in the community.

And yet, these corporate giants have not assumed the responsibilities to the very community whose economic, political, and social life has been disrupted by their coming. It is naive to expect that these conglomerates will assume social responsibility. Indeed, Santa Clara County is an example of their corporate irresponsibility. Public officials, particularly at the federal level, must impose the most stringent restrictions on the actions of such corporations to minimize the disruption which these companies have set in motion.

It may be too late for Santa Clara County to turn the tide. However, it is not too late for the hundreds of communities which will be victimized by socially irresponsible corporate giants.

If Phase II of the President's Economic Policy does not address itself to the growing power of these conglomerates, it will merely mean that government will be forced to step in and spend millions of dollars for housing and other related social services for those who have been displaced as a result of private corporate action.

In spite of the corporate irresponsibility however, Mexican-Americans and other poor people have begun to take positive steps from agricultural employment to industrial employment. The transition has been a slow, painful one. Phase II of the President's Economic Policy comes at a time when the Mexican-American has taken his first step toward living and working in an urban society. Whether Phase II will help or hinder his transition remains to be seen. At the present time, the guidelines of Phase II are not responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans in several respect.

A. *Affirmative action.*—The major electronic and aerospace industries in Santa Clara County depend on government contracts to sustain them. The words, "affirmative action", gives the Mexican-American hope that there is a place for him in the industrial society which is growing up around him. For him, affirmative action means more than hiring minority people at entry level jobs. It means job-upgrading. All too often, it has been our experience that minority people are hired to be the janitor or maintenance man; and all too often, minority people stay at that entry level position.

Within Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, the largest private employer in the county, there has been formed the Chicano Workers of Lockheed. The organization is a member of the Confederacion. Their primary concern is to hire not only a proportionate share of the Spanish-speaking people into the company, but also to upgrade those Spanish-speaking people who are already there.

I am concerned that Phase II and the wage restrictions will tend to work at cross-purposes with our efforts in affirmative action and job upgrading. It has been established that salary and wage increases are to be held at 5.5% a year. Any greater increase requires a substantial change in job description. It would seem that under the guise of complying with the wage guidelines there will be a tendency to keep employees at their present level of employment. Thus, in complying with the Phase II guidelines relative to wage stabilization, there will be a corresponding lag on the part of the employer to carry on and implement an affirmative action program.

B. *The non-unionized wage earner.*—I am sure that I am not making a profound announcement when I say that minority people have traditionally had a difficult time joining unions and becoming a part of organized labor. For Mexican-Americans in this position, the wage freeze presents a very real problem. There is no one to represent the non-unionized employee *vis-a-vis* his employer. Further, because he is not a member of a union, the non-unionized employee has not had the advantages of collective bargaining agreements in the form of a decent hourly wage and other fringe benefits. In short, the wage earner who is not a member of the union is all too often a member of an ethnic minority who is at the bottom of the wage scale.

I am concerned that the wage stabilization effort will have a very adverse effect on this man's earning power since the wage freeze can easily be used as an excuse to keep him at a lower wage. Although it has been stated that the wage freeze will not apply to anyone who is earning less than $1.60 an hour, the minimum federal standard, nevertheless, this exclusion is meaningless to the great majority of working people. At $1.60 an hour, the wage earner brings home $12.80 a day or $64.00 a week. This is a gross income of $3,328.00 a year, an income which is well below any poverty guideline.

In fact, a family of five (5) would do better to receive $282.00 a month or $3,384.00 a year on Aid to Families with Dependent Children. It is my suggestion that anyone earning less than $2.25 an hour be exempted from the wage freeze. Furthermore, wage earners earning above that amount should be exempted from the wage freeze on a sliding scale, depending on his needs and the number of dependents he must support. After reviewing the problem, I am sure you will agree that the wage earner who earns $2.25 an hour is not the one who is responsible for the spiraling inflationary trend which has beset this nation. Rather, it is the person earning $9.00 an hour with generous fringe benefits who must be curbed.

FOOD AND THE NECESSITIES OF LIFE

The third major concern of poor people is to provide food and the necessities of life for their families. In this regard, Phase II of the President's Economic Policy is weak in that it fails to take active steps to halt the increase of prices.

Poor people ordinarily spend all of the money they earn on the necessities of life. Rarely are they able to save money on a regular basis. During Phase II, I can see little change in the purchasing patterns of poor people. Their income will be spent on food, clothing, shelter, transportation and medical services. The poor person has few options opened to him. Therefore, if he needs a new pair of shoes, he will go out and buy it and he will buy regardless of whether the price of the shoes has increased.

It has been stated that prices will be held constant and will not increase more than 2½% a year. Some economists have speculated that this ruling will have an inflationary effect in that all companies will tend to raise prices to 2½% regardless of whether they need an increase in prices. If this is so, then the poor person who purchases goods out of necessity will buy goods at the inflated price, while the affluent person can afford to wait.

In order to minimize the adverse effect the price freeze will have on poor people, I suggest that price distinctions be made between those products which are necessities, such as food, and those which are considered to be luxuries.

There is another problem with price controls which adversely affect the poor. The guidelines have permitted the 2½% increase in prices across the board. A flat 2½% increase taxes poor people more severely than the affluent. Thus, to the individual earning $20,000 a year, the 2½% increase will have less of an adverse effect than it will to the individual earning $4,000 a year. The 2½% price limitation would be regressive in nature, and would affect the poor person much like the sales tax on goods.

DIRECT IMPUT INTO THE DECISIONMAKING PROCESS

The fourth major concern of poor people has been to obtain direct imput into the political decisionmaking process. Historically, in Santa Clara County, municipalities never thought that the Mexican-American farmworker, packing house worker, and cannery worker had any contribution to make to the decisionmaking process. Indeed, there was a conscious effort to exclude and discourage imput from the Mexican-American community. It has been assumed that decisions were to be made *for* poor people and minority people since they, like children, were unable to make decisions for themselves.

This attitude has been reflected in the statements of public officials, bank executives, and other corporate magnates with whom I have come in contact. In short, there tends to be an insidious prevailing attitude among public officials and top level corporate executives that they know what is best for the poor, the minorities, and those who are in the lower economic and social class.

During the last few years poverty programs and model cities programs have been instituted throughout the nation. Purportedly, poor people and minority people are given a voice in the manner in which these programs are to be operated. Citizen participation, particularly participation of the poor and minority people, is encouraged. And yet, although these programs involve expenditures of substantial sums of money, they cannot compare with the millions of dollars which are being spent by government in other sectors. Thus, it has been my observation that while the poor and minority people involve themselves with the expenditure of a two million dollar model cities program, many more millions of dollars are being spent by the cities in expanding airports, building streets and expressways, and developing public transportation systems. In these latter areas there is virtually no participation from the poor and minority people although their lives will be substantially affected by the decisions which are made.

This same paternalistic attitude of local public officials is reflected in the formation of the structures that guide the Phase II program. It appears that there has been a conscious effort to exclude poor people, who more often than not, tend to be members of ethnic minorities.

For instance, the Pay Board is composed of five (5) representatives from big labor, whose salaries amount to thousands of dollars each year; there are five (5) representatives from the conglomerates or giant corporate structures, whose salaries rival those of big labor; and there are five (5) so-called public members, whose respective backgrounds are so interlocked with big business that it is very confusing to the general public as to who represents big business and who represents the public.

It appears to me that there was a conscious effort made to include among the fifteen members of the Pay Board, the highest paid, the most influential, and the most powerful people in the country. There is no one among the fifteen who knows the problems of the poor, who knows the problems of the Mexican-American community and the poverty and misery that this community must struggle with on a day-to-day basis.

The Price Commission is composed of ten people, headed by university scholars and corporate executive from various industries. Once again, there is no one with an intimate working knowledge of the agony that the poor Mexican-American farmworker or unemployed house worker must struggle with each day of his life.

Indeed, it is safe to say that all of the representatives on the Pay Board and Price Commission are protecting their respective economic, social, and political interests. And I do not quarrel with this political reality of life. My concern is that there is no one on these bodies to protect the interests of the poor and the minorities whose interests heretofore have been overlooked if not ignored.

I need not go into a discussion of the other committees which are adjuncts to the Price Commission for the same criticism applies to these bodies in that they are just as imbalanced as the parent body.

In order to remedy this imbalance and lack of representation from a very large segment of the community, I propose several changes. Perhaps these changes would have been appropriate to suggest had I testified before this committee in December, 1971, prior to the time that the Senate extended

the President's power. Nevertheless, these are the changes which I propose:

(1) That the Pay Board be increased by five (5) members. The five members would be representatives of the poor and ethnic minorities.

(2) That the Price Commission be increased by five (5) members. The five members would be representatives of the poor and ethnic minorities.

(3) That all adjunct commissions to the Price Commission be increased by five (5) members. The five members would be representatives of the poor and ethnic minorities.

(4) That a fifteen (15) member advisory board to the Cost of Living Council be established. The advisory board would be composed of representatives from the poor and ethnic minorities.

(5) That the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to be the *ex officio* member of the advisory commission. This would insure direct input to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the chairman of the Cost of Living Council and the individual who directly reports to the President.

CONCLUSION

I have only touched upon some of the concerns of poor and minority people. A more detailed analysis would certainly point up the inequities of the present freeze in the areas of education, health care services, etc., which also affect the poor and minority community. However, by this statement, it has been my intent to impress upon you the simple fact that Phase II of the President's Economic Policy fails to take into consideration the pressing needs of millions of poor people who are economically deprived. Further, the program fails to take into consideration the needs of the millions of Spanish-speaking Americans and the millions of Black Americans. In short, Phase II does not attempt to equalize the great inequities which presently exist in our country. Rather, it has attempted to stop the rising tide of inflation by mandating that all things be kept at the *status quo*. In an attempt to maintain the *status quo*, however, the powerful few, whether at the national level or at the local level, remain all powerful since no effective controls have been imposed upon them.

The substantial difference is that the powerful now have added sanctions from government so that in a very real sense government is aiding and abetting the powerful few, the power structure, to maintain its position of leadership and authority. By maintaining the *status quo*, Phase II simultaneously has had the effect of keeping those who are poor, both economically, socially and politically, in that state of poverty.

In my opinion, Phase II is a simplistic answer to a very grave problem. Until national policy begins to address itself to our present system which continues to create gross inequities, we have not begun to attack the problem. For so many of our people the American dream is living in sub-standard housing which is located in a segregated neighborhood. It is discrimination in employment, whether the employer is a public entity or a private corporation with substantial federal contracts. It is attending segregated schools located in decaying quarters of the city which has inadequate facilities. And this American dream of the poor exists amidst plenty where technology and rapid industrialization have made, and are continuing to make, the affluent and powerful more affluent and more powerful.

THE VALUE-ADDED TAX OR NATIONAL SALES TAX

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, the President stressed the importance of local control of public education. Now, he speaks of a value-added Federal tax for financing public education. The two statements regarding public education are contradictory.

We all recognize the truisms: "Money speaks;" and "He who pays the piper calls the tune." We know from experience that Federal controls inevitably follow Federal grants to the local people of their own tax money.

The value-added tax appears to be nothing more than a national sales tax. To call it by its right name would incur overwhelming opposition. It is called a value-added tax, because the tax is applied as value is added to the product at every stage of production from the raw material to the finished product. In the final analysis, it is the consumer who pays the tax.

The respected columnist, Don Bell, in his "Don Bell Reports—A Weekly Commentary" of January 28, 1972, has written a penetrating and enlightening account of the value-added tax entitled "The Upcoming Value-added Tax Bombshell." Since the proposal for such a tax may come before this body this session, I insert for the benefit of our colleagues the text of Don Bell's article in the RECORD at this point:

THE UPCOMING VALUE-ADDED TAX BOMBSHELL

THE RED INK DILEMMA

The apology was voiced in terms of the unacceptable alternative: If Nixon did the right thing he would be defeated in November; but if he did the wrong thing he would be elected. So, naturally, he did the wrong thing—wrong in the eyes of all who would like to see a balanced budget, that is. To quote one commentator who sought to justify the President's budget message:

"He could clamp down on spending, present a conservative budget, and probably be defeated next November because of high unemployment. Or he could open the spending gates, pour on the red ink, and shock his traditional Republican constituency with the highest series of peacetime deficits in history. Nixon chose the second course. In the old days it was known as 'spend and elect,' and it was normally associated with Democrats rather than Republican Presidents. With his new fiscal budget for 1973 (the year beginning next July 1), the government will have operated in the red for all four years of Nixon's term of office. Deficits of $3.8 billion in 1970, $23 billion in 1971, $38.8 billion in 1972, and $25.5 billion projected for 1973, add up to a total of $91.1 billion. That is almost as big as the entire federal budget when John F. Kennedy took office barely a decade ago. Even that figure understates the enormous size of the deficit because it includes healthy surpluses in trust funds for Social Security and the like, which don't really belong to the government.

"The shortage in the 'administrative' or the 'federal funds' budget, which measures how much more the government actually spends than it collects, is projected at $124 billion during Nixon's first term—smashing all records since World War II. All that red ink will push the federal debt up to the staggering $493.2 billion—nearly half a trillion dollars."

Ironically, the President asked Congress not to appropriate more than he had asked for in his budget because that might "cause inflation", and he also asked for that now seemingly perennial upping of the federal debt limit.

Also, somewhat in the nature of the parent who holds out a spoonful of sugar after administering a dose of castor oil, Mr. Nixon called for prime time to announce that Herr Kissinger had made a dozen or so secret trips to Paris over the past three months in attempts to arrange what can only be described in honesty as a conditional surrender, whereas the enemy, seeing themselves as victors, reserve the right to set their own terms of surrender, holding onto American prisoner-of-war like the legendary sword of Damocles, to hold over the heads of American officials and force them to come to terms set by the Reds.

However, dismissing other considerations for the purpose of spotlighting the budget problem: If and when the war in Southeast Asia has been concluded, President Nixon has pledged the American people to finance the astronomical cost of reconstructing that part of the world and paying all war damage costs. This is some huge amount of money that cannot even be estimated until the end of the shooting, but which will be added onto other red ink amounts beyond the budgeted expenses of government, *and also beyond the ability of the people to pay, unless some new, invisible form of taxation is devised and installed to bleed the taxpayer in a new and unseeing way.*

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION

How much of what we are going to write in the next few paragraphs was planned, how much came about as coincidence, how much was unavoidable development, we are not prepared to say; but bear with us:—

Public education has been called "the new secular church which uses force to impose its morality" (Thomas A. Lane in *Don Bell Reports*, Jan. 21, 1972). The religion that is being taught in this "secular church" is a Statist form of Humanism. As Mortimer Smith, a California educationist, wrote in *The Atlantic*, Sept. 1958: "The primary task of the school is not education, but social conditioning."

Thus, education is seen as "a function of the state" (W. W. Eshelman, NEA President, in an address at the 98th annual NEA convention held at Washington, D.C., from June 26 to July 1, 1960.)

Since education is for social conditioning and is a function of the state, it must, therefore, be removed from local control; and it must be federally controlled.

One of the greatest obstacles to federal control of schools has been the manner in which schools are financed. Despite the billions of dollars which have been poured into the public school system by the federal government, primary financing of the local schools has always been through property taxes; and property taxes are *local taxes;* taxes over which federal authorities have no direct control.

It follows then, as night follows day, that if the Feds were to obtain absolute control over the public school system, then it must be arranged so that property taxes cannot be used to finance education!

Perhaps the pattern is sheer coincidence: coercive race mixing in the public schools has proved such an expensive necessity that school districts all across the nation have

found themselves "going broke." The geographic location of some school buildings and facilities caused them to be totally abandoned and new facilities constructed at "more centrally situated sites" and at great and unnecessary expense. The need for purchasing thousands of school buses in order to transport children across cities, counties, and even State lines, along with the expense of drivers, maintenance, insurance, etc., imposed an impossible burden on many school districts.

The inevitable result of the rise in the cost of sending children to school and there supporting them in the manner decreed by the Federal judges and the bureaucrats of HEW: Property taxes began to go up and up.

When this "coincidental" jump in property taxes across the Land began to assume "emergency" proportions, it was easy to bring forth the argument that property taxes for the support of public schools is unconstitutional.

So, as most things of this nature do, the new trend began in California. Last summer the State Supreme Court ruled that it is discriminatory and therefore unconstitutional to base public school financing on "widely divergent local property values, since rich school districts can spend more money on each student than poor ones." Later, a similar ruling based on a similar argument, was handed down in Texas. Then, the day before President Nixon made his State of the Union address, a New Jersey court overturned that State's real-estate tax system.

And again we say, placing figurative tongue in metaphorical cheek, that it all may have been the purest coincidence; but in his State of the Union message President Nixon promised that he would develop some new and "revolutionary" recommendations for "relieving the burden of property taxes and providing both fair and adequate financing for our children's education."

Please don't misunderstand us; we are not condoning or defending the use of property taxes to finance schools. Personally, our property taxes have tripled in the past two years because of the high cost of public school maintenance and our grandchildren all go to a private Christian school. The point we wish to make is that, as FDR used to boast, *they planned it that way:*—

Create a situation whereby citizens will demand a relief from excessive property taxes and "two birds can be killed with one stone;" that is—

(1) Local property taxes can no longer be used to finance the schools; so the Feds can design a new support system which will put them in absolute control of the nation's public school system; and

(2) This new method of taxation can then be used to further milk the citizens of their hard-earned dollars, and the Federal excesses in other areas can be alleviated through extensive use of this new kind of taxation!

So, under the guise of "saving the schools" a whole new and "revolutionary" system of national taxation is to be imposed upon all of the people; a system of taxation that will involve, personally, all who buy or sell in the market place. This new tax is to be announced and imposed at the right time, politically and philosophically. Best guess as to the time of the official unveiling: A Presidential commission purportedly dealing with the problems of public education, has been meeting spasmodically over the past two years; is expected to make its report in March. The report will be studied and analyzed by a group of experts; probably such Presidential advisors as Kissinger, Burns, Schultz and Connally. Then, any time after June 1st, whenever the winds of political opinion seemed to be blowing in the right direction, this new and "revolutionary" tax could be announced.

Last December, through one of those leaks in security which usually work to the advantage of some well-known and widely-read columnist, Joseph Alsop received the word about the new tax. In the *Washington Post* of Dec. 10, 1971, weeks before anyone had heard of the new tax (other than those who were preparing it for American use), in a column headlined "Nixon's Tax Bombshell." Alsop wrote:

"A plea for a modest value-added tax is due to be the most surprising, most interesting and most generally gusty of President Nixon's bombshells for the election year. . . .

"Until the day for it comes, the fact of the coming bombshell may well be denied. . . . This will be a multi-purpose bombshell, in truth, calculated to bring down a perfect covey of birds in a single thunderclap. . . ."

Alsop then proceeded to give a favorable report on the "value-added tax," pointing out that it is being used successfully in the socialistic Scandanavian countries, in West Germany, and in France.

After Alsop's story was published, the news of the "possibility" of a new kind of tax at the federal level, began to be hinted at by other messengers for the media.

THE NATURE OF THE VA TAX

The value-added tax is a complicated kind of sales tax. It derives its name from the fact that the tax is applied at every stage of the production of any product, or each time value is added to the process of production. As a very elemental attempt at explanation of how this value-added tax works, let's take the example of a pair of shoes, and let's suppose that that the value-added tax is ten per cent. The tax begins with the raw product, in this case with the cow from which the leather is derived. The rancher must make a profit from tanner to whom he sells the cowhide. So, to the sales price there is added a ten percent sales tax. The leather processor has made the cowhide more valuable because of his work on it; so when he sells it to the shoemaker, he adds his value-added ten per cent sales tax (his original tax payment has been included in the sales price, so he isn't really paying any tax on the transaction, he simply makes a book entry). The shoemaker completes his product, and he also has added value to the original cowhide, so when he sells to the retail outlet, he adds to the sales price the ten per cent added value tax (all previous tax having been absorbed into his sale price). The retailer must cover his expenses (including that ten per cent sales tax he paid to the manufacturer), and he must make a profit if he is to stay in business. So, he computes his selling price (or in the case of a wage-price freeze, some government bureaucrat fixes it for him), and he adds the ten per cent value added tax to his sale price.

Result: nobody has paid any real tax but the ultimate consumer, but that sales tax he must pay has been computed, confounded and compounded at every step in the process of production.

The Feds figure that if this value added tax could be imposed at, say, three per cent, then they could squeeze out of the ultimate consumers—rich and poor, young and old, in sickness and in health, on welfare and on pension—an additional twenty billion dollars a year; this computed at the current gross national product and sales turnover. If the added value tax went up to 23 per cent, as it is said to be in France, think of the vast amount of tax money the federal bureaucrats would have to spend!

And there is this added advantage: Since the VA Tax is paid by the buyer at the point of purchase, there is little likelihood of tax evasion.

It should be understood that this value-added tax (shortened to VA Tax by those studying the system) is nothing more than a complicated kind of universal, national sales tax. Many States already have sales taxes on certain items, and the federal taxes on gasoline, luxuries, etc., is a form of the same kind of tax. But never before has there ever been suggested a federal tax on *everything:* products, services, food and medicine; everything.

Stanley S. Surrey served as Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy in the U.S. Treasury Department, from 1961 to 1969, when he left the Government to go back and teach taxation at the Harvard Law School. Despite this academic and administrative background, Professor Surrey is against the value-added tax. In a long article entitled "A Value Added Tax for the United States—a Negative View," Surrey made the following points:

"We all know what a retail sales tax is—44 of our states and some of our cities have this tax. We also know what a wholesale sales tax is and what a manufacturer's sales tax is. What, then, is a value-added tax? A VA tax is merely a different method of collecting a retail sales tax. Moreover, it is a more complicated method. . . . Certain virtues are claimed for it in the name of 'neutrality.' There is no such thing, however, as a really neutral tax; some transactions or people must in the end be taxed, and not others. The VA is said to be neutral because it applies in the same way to all types of business. Thus the tax is said to be a cost for every business—whether a business makes or losses money, whether efficient or inefficient, whether in corporate form or proprietorship form, whether labor-intensive or capital-intensive, whether debt-financed or equity-financed, and so on. We are left with the impression that here is a really neutral tax *imposed on business.* . . . But this just is not so. The value added tax is neutral as to business *because it does not apply to businesses;* rather, it is a retail sales tax on the consumers of the goods and services, and not a tax on the producers or sellers of goods and services. For the business sector, the neutrality of the VA tax simply means *the neutrality of the non-taxpayer,* because it casts the business firm in the role of a collector of taxes *for* the government and *from* the ultimate consumer.

"Nor should we view a VA tax as a neutral tax on consumers. A VA tax would be neutral only if it taxed all consumer goods and services at the same rate. But no such tax actually exists in Europe, and none would exist here. The French tax, for example, has four rates: a normal rate; an increased rate for luxury items; an intermediate rate for certain utilities, such as hospital care and certain foodstuffs; and a reduced rate for widely consumed foods, tourist hotels, and so forth. The German tax has two rates, and other countries generally also have at least two rates. Some systems exempt food, and many exempt a large variety of services, financial activities (banking and insurance), newspapers, nonprofit institutions (schools and governments themselves), and so on. Other systems avoid differential rates, but reduce the tax base for certain sectors of the economy (e.g., construction), by taxing only a percentage of the sales price. The list of separate rates, differentials, exclusions, and discriminations is endless. No mass tax can be a simple, neutral tax, as anyone acquainted with a state retail tax will agree, and a value-added tax is more complicated than a retail tax. . . .

"In varying degrees, our existing federal tax system provides equity, incentives, certainty, and familiarity. It is by no means perfect but any change should be in the direction of improvement, balancing the various goals the system seeks to achieve.

"Viewed from the standpoint of domestic

considerations, the addition of a national sales tax would clearly not improve our present federal tax system; rather, it would make it distinctly worse.

"On the international side, a national sales tax would not bring the United States any advantages which would alter a policy decision against the tax made for domestic reasons.

"Finally, if a national sales tax were ever deemed desirable in the United States, it should take the form of a retail sales tax and not a value-added tax.

"In this light, the case against a value-added tax for the United States is very strong." (End of quotation.)

The case against the VA tax is stronger yet if we consider *all* of the reasons for its desirability in the eyes of the Planners:

(1) Under the guise of "saving the public school system," it would ensure total Federal control of local schools;

(2) By depriving State, County and City Governments of local property and sales tax revenues, it would force States and localities to depend on Federal "revenue sharing" for survival;

(3) By concentrating all tax-gathering and tax-spending authority at the Federal level, totalitarian government will have been achieved and its continuation will have been assured.

The demand should be for value for the taxes we pay, not for value-added taxes. When Nixon proposes it, let's hope every citizen opposes it.

ANTIHUNTING BIAS WITHOUT FOUNDATION

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in response to a grass roots movement to protect environmental values, the Congress has passed legislation to protect wild horses and burros and to ban hunting from aircraft. The sentiments behind this legislation has had a salutory effect, but, as with any viewpoint, it can become counter-productive when applied absolutely.

Organizations have now arisen throughout the Nation which advocate the total preservation of wildlife, threatening to dismiss the game management principles developed over the past half century and to subject wildlife to the gravest challenge since the market hunters and poachers decimated their ranks at the turn of the century.

The key element in this protectionist philosophy is a strong bias against hunting, and, indeed a complete misunderstanding of the positive contributions hunters have made. Not suprisingly, the antihunting sentiment is strongest in metropolitan areas where guns are equated with crime and animals with zoos.

In a recent Los Angeles Time study, research biologists were asked if hunting has played a positive role in safeguarding wildlife. The conclusions were affirmative; and, in the view of Dr. Frank Hays, director of the Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Project:

If hunting were stopped in America, wildlife in this country would become a hopeless, pathetic situation. Without some manner of population control—now that we have eradicated the natural predators and by our own numbers shoved wildlife onto restricted areas—we would end up with two realities: starvation and disease.

Dr. Ralph A. MacMullan director of Michigan's Department of Natural Resources, adds:

If it were not for the hunters, the country would not have anything close to the wildlife it has today.

He also states that no species of wildlife in the Nation has ever been exterminated by the sportsman hunter.

In fact, the hunter has contributed the only money for conservation. Across the Nation, hunters spend more than $100 million a year on licenses and permits. Together with fishermen, they provide nearly $200 million a year to support State fish and game departments.

This money is used not only to provide recreation areas for hunters and non-hunters, but also to study and research wildlife.

Despite this record of service, some 10 States have considered legislation outlawing the killing of various game animals, and, for example, there is now a bill in Congress to eliminate the harvest of all marine mammals.

To aid in a balanced presentation of the complicated problem of wildlife preservation. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues the article "Saving of All Wildlife; Idea Good, But," by Jim Stingley which appeared in the January 16 Los Angeles Times:

SAVING OF ALL WILDLIFE: IDEA GOOD, BUT . . .

(By Jim Stingley)

Since a great environmental movement blossomed in America about two years ago, the idea that we must save all wildlife has become predominant with the general public.

Organizations dedicated to total preservation of wildlife, and, in effect, an end to hunting per se, have sprung up nationwide. Armed with animal posters, they say, "Let it be."

This surge, according to wildlife management experts, comes from a recently urbanized society, well-meaning but ignorant of nature's workings.

And it is exerting the greatest threat to the welfare of America's wildlife since the turn-of-the-century days of the market hunter and poacher.

"What's happening is that many people are equating environmental decay with the removal of any animals for any purpose," said Dr. Joseph Linduska, associate director, U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

PROTECTIONISTS REBUTTED

"And there's no question, we've got well over 100 endangered species that need all the protection they can get and all the habitat that can be acquired in order to preserve them.

"But at the same time, a lot of these people have parlayed this to mean all of wildlife. So now, suddenly, there's a growing total antihunting sentiment."

Linduska and his peers maintain all wildlife doesn't need total protection. In fact, they say, deer, elk and small game such as rabbits, squirrels and raccoons must be controlled.

They say that to stop hunting and to let nature take its course would result in overpopulation which soon would lead to massive deaths by disease and starvation.

But telling some people that one must kill something in order to protect it does not, or in the case of many Americans, has not registered well.

Game management men say they know why it hasn't registered:

Those seeking an end to all hunting are primarily urban bred and are so far removed from nature that they no longer accept killing as anything but a horrible, unnatural process.

NATIONAL REACTION

They explain that the only guns these people see are in the hands of policemen, criminals or soldiers. The only animals they see are in zoos or on films. They wonder if the urbanite even relates death to the prime rib roast being prepared for dinner.

Or, as Russell Cookingham, director of the New Jersey Division of Fish and Game, put it: "They think Col. Sanders' chicken is born already fried."

So, the wildlife experts say, these people, by virtue of their own protected environment, are quite naturally enraged or turned off by the killing of wild creatures.

"It's what we call the 'Bambi syndrome,'" said one wildlife director. "And," said another, "the underlying move is to get the hunter, the villain, completely out of the picture."

In the past two years the move, supported vigorously by the art and news media, has indeed been working toward such an end. If it hasn't been totally effective, it has, according to a Times survey of America's 50 state wildlife management directors, adversely affected their management programs.

In the past year legislation has been proposed or passed in 10 states outlawing the killing of various game animals.

In Colorado the legislature closed the season on buffalo indefinitely, outlawed doe deer hunting, prohibited the taking of spike elk, reduced the number of cow elk permits by 25% and split the deer-elk seasons.

Harry Woodward, director of Colorado's Division of Game, Fish and Parks, said all of the action followed the Denver premiere of Stanley Kramer's movie, "Bless the Beasts and Children."

(Kramer's film depicted men literally slaughtering a fenced-in herd of buffalo that six young boys were trying to save. It was based on Glendon Swarthout's book by the same title—which was in turn based on Arizona's buffalo hunting program—and carried a strong antihunting theme.

(The film, according to state officials in Arizona, falsely depicted the buffalo hunt to such a degree that "it was a total, emotional misrepresentation, calculated to make the hunter look bad.")

"Since that time we've been blasted with antihunting sentiment. I've even had anonymous letters threatening my life," Woodward said.

Woodward did not appear that concerned about the threats. But the changes in his hunting programs were another matter.

"We have the biggest elk herd we've ever had," he said. "And our deer herd is very healthy and in some areas seriously overpopulated. When winter comes, if it is a hard one, we're going to lose a lot of animals to starvation. We've just got too many animals for the amount of food available."

In New Mexico, according to Ladd Gordon, director of that state's department of fish and game, antihunting movements stopped a plan to reintroduce buffalo there for future public hunting.

In Connecticut, according to Ted Bampton, director, Board of Fisheries and Game, four bills were introduced into the legisla-

ture last year that would have resulted in "an outright prohibition of hunting and trapping."

"Had these passed, which thankfully they did not, it would have caused us all kinds of problems," he said.

"We are a densely populated state, but some of the species have learned to live with man and do it damned nicely, such as the racoon, beaver and squirrel. Well, as it is, we're kept busy as hell live-trapping and relocating these animals away from our cities."

(While Connecticut was the only state where open abolishment of hunting was legislatively advocated, and where the problems with an overpopulation of wildlife were most city-oriented, other reports of legislative cutbacks in hunting programs or threats to do the same were reported in Massachusetts, Utah, Arizona, Oregon, Wisconsin, Alaska and California.)

In all cases the biggest disagreement, beyond that of whether or not hunting should be allowed, is on the term "endangered species."

Alaska and California are two prime examples of this highly flammable topic.

In Alaska, according to Frank Jones, the state's director of the Division of Game, "right now there is quite a bit of pressure nationwide to cut off our harvest of polar bear. In addition to that, there is nationwide pressure and a bill in Congress now that would cut off harvest of all marine mammals.

"Well, in our opinion, based on information we have from our biologists who are working on the polar bear continuously, the polar bear is not endangered.

"But 'Say Goodbye' said they were, so the public believes it."

("Say Goodbye" was a David Wolper production which, according to NBC, "was an essay purposedly edited to dramatize preestablished and authentic facts concerning endangered species of wildlife the world around."

(The production had a key scene which depicted hunters in a helicopter chasing down and shooting a mother polar bear in front of her two cubs.

(It was later disclosed that (1) the scene was faked and (2) the polar bear is not an endangered species.)

In California, the disagreement over what is an endangered species took dizzying turns.

The animals involved were the tule elk, the sea otter and the mountain lion.

Ray Arnett, California's fish and game director, said his department observed the elk almost reach extinction, not because of hunting, "but because man came in and built cities, grew cotton and wheat and took away the animal's habitat in the San Joaquin Valley.

RANGE LIMITED

"The elk is a small marsh dweller," he explained. "His range is extremely limited.

"So we took this remaining handful and searched the state for a place to put them. This was 40 years ago. We found habitat for them in the Owens Valley. They thrived.

"They thrived so well that in a few years they were overrunning the area, tearing down fences and eating alfalfa the ranchers had planted for their cattle.

"Well, a conflict developed and pretty soon, to protect his feed, the ranchers started shooting the elk, which were on the protected list.

"Then the Tule Elk Society started.

"And then all hell broke loose."

The "hell" Arnett spoke of put so much heat on his department that a committee representing all sides was formed to study the matter.

Experts were called in, including a student of conservation who spent two years with the elk and wrote his doctoral thesis on the situation.

"As a result of his study, all finally agreed that the Owens Valley could support between 300 to 350 elk without damages to ranchers or competing wildlife. The excess would be cropped out."

That should have been the end of it, Arnett said, but it wasn't. Two years ago the Tule Elk Society "suddenly came back and said that 350 elk is not a safe number—that 2,000 elk would take them off the endangered list.

"Well," said Arnett, "we had already proved biologically that the Owens Valley can't support 2,000 tule elk. But because of the new outcry, we called the experts back to reexamine it.

"Except for finding one small area that might support 140 more elk, we were right back where we were before. The ranchers hadn't left the valley, the elk range had not increased.

"Well, thanks to people who can't accept biological fact and who arbitrarily decide 2,000 is a good safe number for a species, the bill went through this year making it law that before we can have another hunt on tule elk, the herds must reach 2,000 in the state with a 490 maximum in Owens Valley.

"Now we've got tule elk and no place to put them. We're trying everything we know how, begging zoos to take them. We've trying our damnedest to get Mexico to take some of them.

"The sea otter is another item. They were wiped out badly by commercial hunters, but back in the 1930s we found a small colony in the Big Sur area and put them under our protection.

"But the otter moved southward into prime commercial abalone beds, doing considerable damage to them.

"Well, we are charged with protecting and maintaining both the sea otter and the abalone because they are both resources that belong to the state of California.

"So we had a bill in 1970 to manage—and manage in some instances means kill—the sea otter numbers.

"SCREAM BUTCHER"

"Immediately the friends of the sea otters scream butcher at us. They scream 'Why don't you take the otters to other places along the coast? Why don't you protect them?'

"Well, we have been protecting them for years, and we have trapped and transported them to new areas.

"And they, for all practical purposes, beat the boat back. The prime abalone area is where they want to be. They're living high off the hog there. Why should they want to go anywhere?

"So, the public outcry killed our bill. Now we can't do anything, can't touch the otter. Instead we must make a five-year study of them. Well, we'll make the study. And you know what we'll find? That sea otters like prime abalone beds.

"Another item that's been forced on us by people who don't know what they're talking about is that of the mountain lion. We worked a long time to get the lion off the predator-bounty list and on the protected game list."

Arnett said that at first "we were criticized by people who said if we took it off the predator list, it would overrun California.

"And once this was finally accomplished, and the lion could no longer be indiscriminately killed as a predator," Arnett said, the antihunting forces hollered at him for making it a game animal.

"Last year they passed a bill in the Legislature declaring a moratorium on hunting the mountain lion and told us to make a four-year study of the cat."

Arnett maintains that one reason he fought so hard to get the cat off the predator list was so that his department could, by the use of mandatory listing and limitation of kills, study the cat and determine his number and range.

"The thing that bothers me about all three instances—the elk, sea otter and lion—is that all research we have done and have been ordered to do will be paid by the sportsman, out of his pocket."

Efforts to unload the hunter's gun have been active on the national level, as well.

DEER HUNTS

The Humane Society of the United States is in the courts seeking to stop the federal government from allowing deer hunts on public lands in New Jersey, Virginia and Maryland.

Bills are pending in Congress to outlaw the taking of furbearing marine animals.

(In California last year a bill was passed stipulating that no fur seal skins can be sold in or brought to California for commercial purposes.)

In each of the federal cases, the U.S. Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife says such pressure is not only unjustified but also presents a threat not only to the welfare of the animals involved, but their particular environment as well.

At both the state and federal levels, the wildlife experts say "You can't just 'Let it be.' If you do, you'll be protecting it to death . . ."

Protectionists dismiss wildlife management's arguments as being propaganda from vested interests. And it is essentially true that wildlife managers are largely gamekeepers for America's sportsman hunter.

Recognizing this, The Times asked research biologists across the nation if, indeed, hunting played a great role, as the wildlife managers contend, in the healthy safekeeping of this country's wildlife.

Dr. Frank Hays is director of the Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Project, a research project under way at the University of Georgia college for veterinary medicine.

Dr. Paul Saltman is a professor of biology and the provost of Revelle College, UC San Diego. He is internationally known for his research work in trace metal metabolism and photosynthesis. He is not a hunter.

"If hunting were stopped in America," said Hays, "wildlife in this country would become a hopeless, pathetic situation.

"Without some manner of population control—now that we have eradicated the natural predators and by our own numbers shoved wildlife onto restricted areas—we would end up with two realities:

"Starvation and disease."

Oddly enough, Hays maintains that the hunter himself has traditionally been the overprotectionist.

"In 1970 I studied specific examples of this in Mississippi, Florida and Arkansas. Overpopulated herds, made that way because the hunters refuse to pass a law legalizing the taking of does, were decimated by stomach worms.

COMPARISON MADE

"If you're going to compare the inhumanities of it—shooting versus nature," said Hays, "well, a deer that is literally bled to death by starvation or gradually wastes away to a rack of bones, to me that's not very humane."

The most severe example of wildlife starvation due to overprotection occurred during the 1920s in northern Arizona when a herd of about 3,000 Rocky Mountain mule deer, totally protected by the U.S. government—even to the extent of eradication of predators—grew to more than 100,000 on a million acre sanctuary.

Within six years the herd depleted its grazing range to the point where in most places 90% of the range was destroyed.

In the same six years 70,000 mule deer starved to death.

The deaths continued until 1930 when, with only about 15,000 deer left, annual

hunting seasons were finally opened under a new agreement between the government and the state of Arizona.

The damage, however, was not confined to the deer. The overgrazing had literally turned the sanctuary into a wasteland. Harsh erosion and its effects followed.

The incident was the turning point in game management philosophy, which, in the era directly following America's halting of the market hunter, had been one of total protection—let nature take its course.

Aldo Leopold, a federal forester destined to become one of this country's leaders in conservation, wrote in 1925 of the incident:

". . . We have learned that game, to be successfully conserved, must be positively produced rather than negatively protected . . . we have learned that game is a crop, which nature will grow and grow abundantly, provided only that we furnish the seed and a suitable environment."

In agreement with wildlife biologist Hays is Dr. Saltman.

"You have to have a balance of nature and that balance of nature relates to the whole pyramid of production of food stuffs beginning with photosynthesis.

"Now in any circumstances where you begin to change that by essentially putting a bounty on man's shooting the so-called predators, all of a sudden you change a very fundamental balance of nature, and you have the herbivores now growing out of control and as such ultimately destroying their food crop by overgrazing."

SUPPORTING FACTS

The case for the taking of wildlife by sport hunters is supported, according to Dr. Ralph A. MacMullan, director of Michigan's Department of Natural Resources, by two additional arguments.

"The first is," said MacMullan, "that if it were not for the hunters, the country would not have anything close to the wildlife it has today. The second is, despite what has been said to the contrary, that no species of wildlife in the country has ever been exterminated by the sportsman hunter."

MacMullan maintains "The hunter has contributed the only money to date into conservation. In Michigan we have a series of game and recreation areas taking up tens of thousands of acres. They were all bought by hunters' money.

"They are used three-to-one by people who are not hunters.

"Protectionists haven't put one cent into the care and upkeep of the very programs that provide them with wildlife to photograph and see.

"As to the extinction of species, you'll hear them say, what about the buffalo? Well, the buffalo was run out by man's use of the land. The professional market hunter, not the sportsman, was an accessory there."

MacMullan's remarks concerning who supports the wildlife of America with dollars were agreed upon by most game management men interviewed. Except for a handful of states, every cent spent on wildlife programs comes out of the hunter's pocket.

In California that is a tidy sum—about $21 million annually.

Across the nation, hunters spend more than $100 million a year on licenses and permits. Together with fishermen they provide nearly $200 million a year to support the 50 state fish and game departments.

This money is used not only to provide recreation areas for all of the public, hunters and non-hunters alike, but also in the study and research of wildlife inhabiting these areas.

Game management people have to know how much cropping certain species can stand in order to maintain a healthy balance. They have to know when the cropping or hunting should take place, where and how. The hunters' money provides the biologists for these studies.

The same money also goes for the study of nongame wildlife, for its control or re-establishment as the case may be. And, in the cases of many states, the money is used to conduct impact studies on areas where new housing or building projects are planned.

PRIVATE GROUPS

Coastal states spend some of the hunters' money in studying and maintaining shellfish life, such as the California abalone, as well as keeping an eye on pollution of the sea and shore creatures' habitat.

In addition, hunters founded private organizations, such as Ducks Unlimited, to provide protection to the wildlife they hunt.

Ducks Unlimited has poured more than $17 million into Canada to construct more than 1,000 "duck factories." Its funds have built or restored almost 2 million acres of prime waterfowl nesting habitat, with more than 1,500 miles of protective shoreline.

Still, these facts and figures, according to the game management experts, have done little to stem the flow of anti-hunting sentiment.

Programs to acquaint the public with the hunter's role and his contribution have been standard fare in all 50 states for many years, but of late, the states admit, they haven't been that well received by the people at large or the communications media.

"People who refuse to accept that animals have to die—well, you're not going to beat that kind of thinking," said California's Arnett.

"About the best thing we can hope for is for them to understand that if it wasn't for us, there wouldn't be any wildlife for them to worry about—and if they don't enjoy hunting it, fine, but let me and my sporting friends who do enjoy it alone.

"And let us manage this game so that 20 years from now the protectionists' children and our children will still have plenty of wildlife to enjoy. . . ."

DAVE SWIFT, GOOD SAMARITAN

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, a newcomer to Wyoming, Dave Swift is the manager of radio station KBBS in Buffalo. A few months after his arrival, Dave learned of a project to collect Betty Crocker coupons toward the purchase of a kidney machine for the new hospital in Rawlins, Wyo. The Buffalo Beta Sigma Phi sorority was joining in the statewide effort to collect 700,000 coupons, with a value of a half-cent apiece, before the December 31 deadline.

In late November, Dave Swift personally directed a radio appeal throughout the Rocky Mountain region, and the Nation. He began with the Intermountain Radio Network and later placed a news item with the American Broadcasting Co.'s daytime news. Listeners were asked to forward coupons to Dave and to contact friends in other States. Dave's mother in Florida heard the appeal. So did residents of nearly all the States, and several foreign countries. By mid-December, the goal was reached. In fact, Dave received an extra 100,000 coupons which are being saved for his next project, a new bus for the Wyoming State Training School in Lander.

I believe this remarkable example of public spirited service deserves recognition. It is not the sort of story which makes good news, from the sensational point of view, but at a time when apathy and alienation make us wonder if there are any more good Samaritans, it comes as very good news.

WILLIAM WALTON

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, William Walton, painter of note and one of President Kennedy's closest friends, recently completed a notable period of service as Chairman of the National Fine Arts Commission.

The great significance of Mr. Walton's work in preserving and enhancing the beauty of our Capital City is aptly described in the following column by Tom Braden, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post:

A LEGACY TO BE LONG REMEMBERED

(By Tom Braden)

There was not a line in the newspapers about the departure from government of my friend, William Walton. The atmosphere and appearance of the capital city of a great nation—Rome, London, Paris, Moscow—have a lot to do with setting the tone of national life. In this sense William Walton is an important political figure.

He has had more to do with preserving the atmosphere and appearance of Washington, D.C., than any man in this century with the possible exception of Theodore Roosevelt.

It was President John F. Kennedy who appointed Walton to his unpaid job and who marked the range for it. One afternoon, Walton waited outside the President's office for a scheduled appointment, and when he was ushered in, saw that he was breaking up a meeting between Kennedy and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. He apologized, pointing out that all he had to talk about was Lafayette Square.

"Never mind, Bill", said the President of the United States, "that may be the only thing this administration will be remembered for."

It is a beautiful square—that area across from the White House. Walton and his Fine Arts Commission saved it from the wrecking crews. The small houses, including the Dolley Madison House, which were occupied by private citizens in the Republic's early days have been repaired and painted and stand as pleasing reminders both of history and of good taste. But it was a close call. They might have been torn down for office buildings.

Walton insisted on red brick for the old houses, not only because that is the way they once were, but because the bright color sets the White House apart, makes it look more spacious and whiter. For the same reason, the path through the park is laid with red brick, and the larger buildings on either side. They set the White House off, as the White House should be.

Walton is a paratrooper turned writer and artist and President Kennedy liked him, a fact which gave him more power than chairmen of fine arts commissions usually command. Under Walton, the commission enlarged "the federal area" over which it exercises authority to "advise" about what can be built and what can be destroyed and under Walton the power to "advise" carried the unmentioned suggestion of real power.

So the temporary buildings which had

marred the park behind the White House since World War I were at last destroyed and the land once again slopes undisturbed toward the river, as it did in the days when John Adams looked out the back door.

L'Enfant Plaza was added to the capital city's list of gracious places to see. Street lighting became gracious too; the Renwick gallery was restored, and the Federal Triangle, the greatest concentration of government in the world became an object of design rather than neglect.

During the Walton years, the world's leading architects were brought to Washington: Mies van de Rohe to build the public library, I. N. Pei to design the new national gallery, Marcel Breueur to do the Department of Transportation. They designed pleasing and interesting new buildings which fitted harmoniously with the old.

Along the way, Walton lost some battles. If he had had his way, the Kennedy Center, that enormous pile of post office architecture which blocks everybody's view of the Potomac would have been three theatres on Pennsylvania Avenue, helping to preserve life, brightness and perhaps safety, too, in the old federal city.

But the battles Walton won—the design of the new subway system and of the Hirshhorn Museum will be additional evidence of his country's taste and capacity to care about beauty.

Bill Walton could stand some day in Lafayette Park and repeat the proud boast of the old Romans: "Si monumentun requiris circum spice." ("If you wish to see my monuments, look around you.")

A TAX BREAK FOR COMMUTERS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the commuting public have been severe. Poor service and rising prices have made commuting less and less attractive.

Recently, to add insult to injury, the Long Island Railroad raised its fares, in gross violation of the price guidelines, and the raise was approved by the Price Commission within a few days, without benefit of hearings or any justification.

I believe the needs of the commuter must be recognized and relief from the burdens of the cost of commutation should be assured. For that reason I have introduced a bill in Congress (H.R. 12630) to allow an income tax deduction for expenses for transportation to and from work. This work be a reasonable consideration, consistent with present policy which allows traveling businessmen to write off part of the costs of their travel as business expense. It would seem that the costs of commutation are likewise part of the costs of a person's holding a job.

I would hope this legislation would receive early consideration by the Congress as its need has been made more severe by the recent raises in commutation fares.

The substance of my bill follows:

H.R. 12630

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. EXPENSES OF TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM WORK.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a deduction the reasonable and necessary expenses paid or incurred by an individual during the taxable year for transportation between his residence and place of business or employment.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—The amount of the deduction allowed an individual under this section shall not exceed $500 for any taxable year. In the case of a husband and wife making a joint return under section 6013, the amount of the deduction allowed under this section for each spouse shall not exceed $500 in any taxable year.

"(2) EXPENSES OTHERWISE ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS.—No amount which is allowable as a deduction under part VI of this subchapter, or under any other provision of this part, shall be allowed as a deduction under this section."

(b) The table of sections for part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 218. Expenses of transportation to and from work.

"Sec. 219. Cross references."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) EXPENSES OF TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM WORK.—The deduction allowed by section 218."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

DRUG PROGRAM COORDINATION NEEDED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse is one of the most frightening terrors of our times and that is a principal reason why, as the ranking Republican on the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, I want today to urge this House to pass as rapidly as possible H.R. 12089, our bill to coordinate drug abuse prevention programs through a Special Action Office under the White House.

We must have a strong tool to coordinate the drug control and cure programs presently scattered over at least nine departments and agencies. This Special Action Office gives us that strong coordinating tool so that all programs now existing can be used most effectively. At present, no clear-cut responsibility exists at any Government level to provide overall leadership, sense of direction and strategy in conquering the drug problem.

The need for an office to respond to the emergency situation in which we find ourserves has been defined by President Nixon as follows:

This Office would provide strengthened Federal leadership in finding solutions to drug abuse problems. It would establish priorities and instill a sense of urgency in Federal and federally supported drug abuse programs, and it would increase coordination between Federal, State, and local rehabilitation efforts.

In most cases, the Special Action Office is not intended to implement programs with its own staff. Instead, its purpose is to arrange for carefully defined working agreements with other agencies. Where necessary, however, the director may develop and introduce new programs and be responsible for their proper administration and direction.

The problems of drug abuse and drug addiction are human problems. We do not have total insight into the cases of drug addiction, particularly among young people, but we do know Americans in ever-increasing numbers are experimenting with an ever-increasing variety of drugs. The cost to society is tremendous through the diversion of energy, talent, social usefulness, crime, and the anguish of thousands of families who are affected by drug abuse.

As you may have noted in House Report 92–775, which accompanies this legislation to the floor:

Drug abuse in America has reached epidemic proportions;

There are now between 200,000 and 250,000 heroin addicts in the Nation and the number is growing;

Addiction in at least one U.S. city now kills more than 1,000 persons annually—including many teenagers—and afflicts 50 percent of the inmates in its jails;

Between 1,200 and 1,400 tons of opium are being produced for illicit markets and between 50 and 60 tons are sufficient to supply the heroin addicts in the United States.

These are stark reasons why the overwhelming need is to see that the full range of training, treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research programs are used fully and effectively, and that close coordination exists with law enforcement authorities as well. I think this measure can help.

There is one provision of this legislation which should be singled out for particular praise. It may make possible the development of a nonaddictive drug much better than methadone to block the addict's craving for heroin. Due to developments resulting from our hearings, a special scientific task force made up of research directors of 30 pharmaceutical companies has been formed to work

closely with the Government in finding such a nontoxic, nonaddictive blocking drug. This measure would require the Special Action Office to encourage this unique private-public cooperative research effort.

Certainly, I am proud to have had a part in developing this legislation. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for his guidance and untiring efforts as subcommittee chairman, as well as to my other colleagues on our subcommittee for their good work in developing this worthwhile bill.

THE SICKLE CELL AND THE PILL

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, an article in this month's issue of Ramparts magazine suggests that women who have sickle cell disorders may develop blood clots if they take oral contraceptives and that pregnancy is dangerous to them also.

According to the article some physicians have recently reported cases in which patients with the sickle cell disease or the sickle cell trait have developed blood clots or have suffered strokes after taking oral contraceptives.

In one case a black woman with sickle cell disease suffered no blood clotting episodes or thromboses until she had been taking an oral contraceptive for 8 months, at which time she developed a blood clot in one lung. She stopped taking birth control pills for a while and then 1 month after she resumed, developed another blood clot. Finally, she stopped taking the pill altogether and the blood clotting ceased.

In this country alone, 10 percent of the black population has the sickle cell trait and 90 percent of them have never been tested for it. Yet, the U.S. Government and private agencies have decided to concentrate funds for family planning efforts among poor people, as this is the section of the population that needs birth control most. But the Food and Drug Administration requires no mention in the labeling of oral contraceptives that preexisting blood abnormalities may make them dangerous. Family planning clinics often do not administer the cheap, easy test for sickle cell; black people are not advised to receive the test elsewhere before taking oral contraceptives.

Family planning programs, with oral contraceptives being used as the prime means of birth control, have been instituted in black communities at the risk of black health and without a proper diagnosis of the effect that oral contraceptives could have on this segment of the population.

This article also suggests that pregnancy is a dangerous condition for women with sickle cell disease, because it slows down the flow of blood. While the incidence of thrombosis actually declines during pregnancy for most women, it increases in women who suffer from sickle cell disease.

These disturbing facts point out all the more clearly the desperate need for more research into this dreadful disease.

I call your attention to the article, "The Sickle Cell and the Pill," by Frances Lang of Ramparts magazine. And I urge my colleagues to become more aware of the need for more medical research in both sickle cell anemia and into the effects of oral contraceptives.

The article follows:

THE SICKLE CELL AND THE PILL

Birth control pills may be dangerous to large numbers of black women. Recent articles in medical journals suggest that women with sickle cell anemia or the sickle cell trait may be likely to develop blood clots if they take oral contraceptives. Ninety-eight percent of those who have the sickle cell disorder are black.

Ten percent of black people in the United States alone have the sickle cell trait, and ninety percent of these remain undiagnosed. Yet neither domestic family planning clinics nor the Agency for International Development which administers birth control programs overseas give black women the simple, inexpensive test for sickle cell trait before prescribing oral contraceptives. Nor do they warn blacks that sickle cell trait in combination with oral contraceptives may make them more susceptible to stroke or heart attack or other blood clots.

Three physicians recently reported cases in which patients with sickle cell disease or the sickle cell trait developed blood clots after taking oral contraceptives. In a 1967 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Drs. Roy Haynes and James Dunn discuss two patients with sickle cell disease who developed blood clots in their lungs after the use of oral contraceptives. In the April 1971 issue of *Connecticut Medicine*, Dr. Jonathan Greenwald describes the case of a patient with the sickle cell trait who suffered stroke after taking birth control pills.

In the case reported in JAMA, a black woman with sickle cell disease suffered no blood clotting episodes—or thromboses—until she had been taking an oral contraceptive for eight months, at which time she developed a blood clot in one lung. She stopped taking birth control pills for a time, then one month after she resumed taking them developed another lung clot. Finally, she stopped taking the pill and had an intrauterine device inserted. The thrombotic episodes ceased. Drs. Haynes and Dunn have treated at least one other black woman with sickle cell disease who developed lung clots after using oral contraceptives.

In 1969, Dr. Greenwald treated a black woman who was suffering from stroke. She had been taking oral contraceptives. In the hospital, she was tested for every condition her physician knew of which might have predisposed her to stroke. In every respect she was discovered to be normal except that she was a previously undiagnosed carrier of the sickle cell trait. In this case as in the others the evidence led her physician to conjecture that a sickling tendency of the red blood cells might predispose women to have adverse reactions to birth control pills. All three doctors felt that oral contraceptives had acted as agents precipitating red blood cell sickling, which in turn produced blood clotting in their patients.

Sickle cell anemia is caused by abnormal hemoglobin, the essential element in red blood cells. Individuals will have sickle cell anemia if they have two genes for Hemoglobin S. They will then suffer from unpredictable periodic stretching of the red blood cells to an abnormal, elongated shape. When this occurs, blood circulation and the flow of oxygen throughout the body are obstructed. Since decreased oxygen concentration in the body is one condition under which sickling inevitably occurs in people with sickle cell disease, the sickling process induces further sickling until the bunched sickled cells cause blood clots. People with sickle cell anemia suffer these painful thromboses regularly until the time they die. Few individuals with sickle cell disease live past the age of 30. Those individuals with only one gene for Hemoglobin S have the sickle cell trait, not the disease. People who carry the trait usually bear no symptoms of the disease. Under conditions of low oxygen pressure, however—notably in unpressurized airplanes or after heavy exertion or during a high fever—those with the trait may experience sickling of the red blood cells and thromobotic crises. [See RAMPARTS, October 1971]

Doctors who have reported coincident cases of oral contraceptive use and thrombotic episodes are exploring this theory: that oral contraceptives may also lower the oxygen pressure in the blood and thus induce sickling and thrombosis. Oral contraceptives, they assert, thicken and slow blood circulation. The more slowly blood circulates through a tissue, the more oxygen the tissue extracts from it. Birth control pills in this way may lower the oxygen level in the blood, bringing on the sickling crises which lead to blood clots. Pregnancy is a dangerous condition for women with sickle cell disease partially because it slows blood flow. Drs. Haynes and Dunn write that while the incidence of thrombosis actually declines during pregnancy for most women, in patients with sickle cell disease it increases. Oral contraceptives merely replicate many of the hormonal changes the body undergoes during pregnancy. Most relevantly, they slow blood flow thereby reproducing the precise condition which makes pregnancy dangerous for women with sickle cell anemia.

"Whenever a physician contemplates prescribing an oral contraceptive for a patient of Negro ancestry, he should first order a sickle cell preparation and ideally a hemoglobin [test]. If sickling and/or Hemoglobin S is found, alternate contraceptive methods must be given strong consideration," Dr. Greenwald writes. Drs. Haynes and Dunn conclude, "[There is] strong evidence for a cause and effect relationship between the oral contraceptive, sickle cell hemoglobinopathy, and thrombosis. Perhaps oral contraceptives should be withheld from women with Hemoglobin S."

Sickle cell specialists agree that birth control pills should not be administered to those with the actual disease. The British government has already issued a report documenting increased incidence of thrombosis among all women who have taken birth control pills. Sickle cell disease specialists feel it senseless to give patients already prone to thrombotic seizures a drug which compounds the risk. The Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York City is currently planning a study concerning the effect of oral contraceptives on sickle cell anemia. Doctors at that hospital no longer administer oral contraceptives to patients with the disease despite the imperative need to protect them from the dangers of pregnancy. Dr. Robert Scott, a specialist in sickle cell disease at the Medical College of Virginia Health Sciences Center, does not give his patients who have sickle cell anemia birth control pills for the same reasons. Dr. Lemuel Diggs, in the Department of Medicine at the Universty of Tennessee, who has had extensive experience with sickle cell disorders, reports adverse reactions to oral contraceptives in patients of his who have sickle cell disease.

Sickle cell trait may leave those who bear it entirely free of symptoms and become significant only if two people with the trait

marry and have children. Physicians who interdict use of the pill in conjunction with sickle cell disease are generally uncertain about whether the sickle cell trait as well renders the pill particularly dangerous. Yet, if birth control pills do deplete the body's oxygen supply, as the articles have suggested, oral contraceptives may be almost as dangerous for women with the trait as for those suffering from the disease.

During this period of uncertainty, the US government and private agencies in this country have decided to concentrate funds for family planning efforts among poor people, as this population is most "in need" of birth control assistance. However, the Food and Drug Administration requires no mention in the labelling of oral contraceptives that pre-existing blood abnormalities may make them dangerous. Family planning clinics often do not administer the cheap, easy test for the trait; black people are not advised to receive the test elsewhere before taking oral contraceptives. Another prime target of birth control pills are countries with exclusively black populations who receive no information about the specific dangers the pill may bear for them.

The potential danger of birth control pills to black women is only one of the hazards they pose. The pill is increasingly coming under attack by physicians who feel it is dangerous for all women. In 1967 two British neurologists reported a sharply increased incidence of stroke among previously healthy women who had been using birth control pills. Three neurologists at Western Reserve University School of Medicine have reported on at least nine women who suffered strokes connected with oral contraceptive use. Besides stroke, many women have suffered lung clots, phlebitis, and other blood clotting as a result of the pill. The British Minister of Health in 1967 stated that evidence showed women taking oral contraceptives ran "a slightly increased risk" of developing blood clots. A recent study of oral contraceptives in the *Journal of Chronic Disease* concludes, "clinical . . . data indicate that the oral contraceptives are thrombogenic. . . . Tentatively we conclude that the thrombogenic potential of the oral contraceptives appears to reside in the estrogenic components. . . . Further study of the effect of these hormones as it pertains to . . . clotting is . . . necessary."

Synthetic estrogen—a principal component of birth control pills—may cause cancer as well. Recently hearings on the hormone Diethylstilbestrol (DES), used by pregnant women to prevent miscarriage, have revealed that this hormone may be carcinogenic. The daughters of many women who have used DES during pregnancy have developed vaginal cancer, and physicians testified before the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee that the estrogen content of DES may have been the cause. One doctor was asked "To your knowledge, have any of the contraceptives on the market today been shown to be carcinogenic?" He replied, "Yes . . . because they have synthetic estrogen and . . . any estrogen of these strains will be carcinogenic."

Another great danger of birth control pills is that women taking them may forget to take the pill for a day or so, then resume taking them, having unknowingly become pregnant in the meantime. What this means for the fetus, as Morton Mintz has written in his book *By Prescription Only*, is that, if it is female it will be exposed to a tremendous hazard of being masculinized; many birth control pills contain norethindrone, which has a masculinizing effect on the female fetus. As early as 1964 The Council on Drugs of the American Medical Association reported that ". . . instances of masculinizing of the female fetus have been associated with its [norethindron's] use during pregnancy."

NOTEWORTHY CAREER

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Miss Cora Glasnapp, the assistant town clerk and interim town clerk in Southington, has recently completed a career of public service which has been both distinguished and invaluable.

As a former secretary of the State of Connecticut for 12 years, I know full well the high caliber of service rendered by the office of the town clerk and the dedication and commitment of the staff in fulfilling the important duties of the office. For nearly a half century Cora Glasnapp has served town clerks of each party with efficiency that has earned the well-deserved admiration and respect of her associates, as well as Southington residents generally, for her ability, sincerity, and concern during an outstanding career of service to the people of her town.

For the interest of my colleagues, an article concerning Miss Glasnapp's noteworthy career which appeared in the Southington News follows:

FUTURE ACTIVITY UNPLANNED, RETIRING TOWN EMPLOYEE SAYS

(By Edna Wood)

Cora. Anyone around Town Hall or associated with the center knows right off to whom that name belongs. She is Miss Glasnapp, assistant town clerk and interim town clerk for the past 45 years.

Last week Cora "retired." Behind her now lay the years of dedicated service—and dedicated ones they were as she saw elected town clerks come and go, and the work of the town's most important office growing more and more in volume.

As Cora and I talked about those years, she always included in her reminiscences those with whom she has been associated.

She went to work in the Town Clerk's office in 1926 when Harry H. Merrell was clerk. There were just the two of them then and in addition, Cora kept a record of expenditures made in the Selectmen's office.

"Mr. J. B. Lewis signed the checks. He had a very good handwriting," she recalled. This is only a small observance, but indicative of her thoroughness for details.

There were times when she found she needed advice and help when she first started work. But she says she always had good friends to turn to such as the late Judge Thomas Welch. "Anyone who didn't know the answers always went to Judge Welch," she said. "Judge Lambert Degnan was always good to discuss things with. Of course, Mr. Merrell taught me a good deal. But I was on my own a lot of the time," she added.

After six months on the job, she was named assistant town clerk. There was also Town Clerk Hermann Muus. The six months lapse between the time he took office in January 1936 and Mr. Merrell resigned in June, Cora served as acting town clerk.

By this time Cora had acquired a broad knowledge of the Town Clerk's office and it has been she who has trained many of those who have worked there over the years.

Cora was appointed Town Clerk in the interim period from January 1961 to May after Robert Foley resigned after serving some 13 served as acting town clerk.

Cora was endorsed as a candidate for Town Clerk by the Republican Party but immediately withdrew her name after she learned about the move when she came back from vacation.

She has always been an assistant town clerk because that is the way she wanted it. She humorously remarked the other day that being in the top job gave her ulcers—but truly.

To this she added, "It is amazing the work that is accomplished in the town clerk's office—and it takes patience, tact and knowledge. There's never a dull moment," she explained as she told of the various records which must be carefully kept for permanency such as changing state laws, election and voting rulings and others.

Cora has been a part of the town's growth. She has seen land records grow volume by volume, as well as the exacting and statistical community business which passes through this local government office.

Cora's family also has been a part of Southington, dating back to the son David, of the first white settler here—Samuel Woodruff. Actually, she was born in Cheshire and when a little girl came here with her family who occupied the "Martin Frisbie" house on Queen St.

They later moved into her grandparents' house built in 1799 on Queen St. The large, old home has since been torn down to make room for modern apartments. Her great aunt was a sister of Seth Peck, of the Peck, Stow and Wilcox Co.

Albert Glasnapp, Cora's brother, and his wife live on Loper St. Cora now lives on Woodruff St., and is looking forward to devoting more time to her home. She is also interested in photography and hopes to pursue that hobby in the future. She may spend some time in Florida and take some trips—leisurely. Before she retired, it seemed no matter what she did, she was meeting some kind of deadline.

Her thoughts, however, are still about the Town Clerk's office as she predicted the reapportionment of the state and the presidential election will pose some problems. She feels the town clerk position should not be elective but an appointment for an indefinite time.

No matter what party was "in" at the Town Clerk's office Cora continued to serve as assistant town clerk—re-appointed every two years.

She served when the late Joseph DePaolo was town clerk from May 1961 to May 1965, and later, under his wife, the present Town Clerk Juanine DePaolo. I asked her how it was to work in an office with all women personnel.

"We have worked hard to get caught up—nights and all. Juanine DePaolo is a very good friend, and hard worker," she observed. "Everybody didn't always agree in the office, but we worked together to share the responsibility," she noted.

She spoke of Dorothy Kelley, Ruth Welch recently retired, and those of former years—Leora Degnan, Ada Larkin, Antoinette Chaffee Giles, Marilyn Miller, Priscilla Nyren Hubeny, Mrs. Charles Griffin and some others.

She recalled, too, the typing of all deeds until 1954 when they were microfilmed by Ruth Welch, and moving into the new town hall in 1941—the present one which has grown smaller by the year.

Cora, just graduated from Lewis High School as a commercial course student, was employed almost immediately by Peck, Stow and Wilcox where she stayed a year. Later, she worked about a month at the Commercial Trust Co. in New Britain and then for Trumbull Electric Co. (later to become General Electric in Plainville), for about a year. But it was in the town clerk's office that she found her place in a work-a-day world. She liked it even though there were trying times. In all her years of work, she has been "unemployed" for about five weeks—up to now, she recalled humorously.

Cora Glasnapp has been a devoted member of the Grace Methodist Church. She has served as a Sunday School teacher and later as Sunday School superintendent. She has sung in the choir for 50 years—"Yes, Gertrude Francis and I," she said. She also serves on the church's official boards.

On Saturday Cora will be honored at a dinner at Phil's Restaurant by her friends—not only as an employee who has spent years of dedicated service to the town but as an individual who has given her honest and sincere best. Cora impresses me that she is a good friend—a substantial person to know, one who many times sees the humorous side of life.

REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, we are a policy-oriented nation. We have a policy to stabilize our economy, a policy to save our environment, a policy to provide housing to every American, and a policy to govern our foreign affairs and trade. Such policies are implemented with broad-based and far-reaching programs.

Unfortunately, there now exists a crying need in this country to establish a policy to save millions of our people from the disgrace of economic decay. There is a need to save much of our land, and to utilize the potential of communities and natural and human resources being turned aside and wasted by an ironic sense of progress.

The people are rural Americans. The communities are those small, farm-oriented towns losing their people to metropolitan centers. In the past, rural Americans supported our Nation and pushed it into prosperity. Today, they need and deserve our help. Tomorrow, they could and should play a vital part in easing the pressures of crowding in cities and of uneven geographic and economic distribution.

Because we have ignored the need for an effective rural policy, we have permitted rural America to deteriorate. We have allowed those people and those communities upon which our Nation was founded to become economically despondent.

The farm industry, which was at one time the mainstay of rural economies, has dwindled to the point where only 800,000 farms produce 90 percent of all our food and fiber. Production costs rising at a faster rate than farm prices are forcing many small farmers to abandon their farms, their way of life, their heritage. In short, technological progress has backfired on many of our family farms. In 1920, our farm population was nearly 32 million. It represented 30 percent of our total population. By 1970, less than ten million people remained on farms; less than 5 percent of the total U.S. population. In my own congressional district, 800 farms folded between 1964 and 1969.

Another fact becomes evident. Agriculture has always been the economic base of rural America. Small communities built up in the outlying areas served and were supported primarily by farmers. These communities provided goods and services to farm people and thus thrived. However, with farm people moving out of rural America, these communities are economically stranded.

They have also begun to experience population depletion as economic opportunities faded. Many in the rural areas have moved during their prime working years. They leave behind them a disproportionately high number of less-skilled and aged. These are the men, women, and children described several years ago by the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty as "the people left behind."

What we viewed 40 years ago as an amusing day dream of the country boy leaving for the big city has now become a nightmare. Over the years we have carelessly crowded more than 70 percent of our Nation's people onto about 2 percent of our land. If this trend is permitted to continue, by the turn of the century 175 million Americans will be huddled into cities concentrated in five small geographic areas. The bright lights of the city which have lured so many millions of rural people now illuminate crime, pollution, and job shortages.

For those who stay behind the standard of living is at a low point. Substandard housing is prevalent. Our rural children do not have the educational opportunities they should because expenditures per pupil in the outlying areas are often far below what they are in more populated sections. The hospitals are small and are not adequately staffed or equipped to provide the quantity or quality of medical care needed. There are inadequate water and sewer facilities. Cultural and civic structures lack the population base to function at maximum potential.

In a nation where every man's birthright is the chance to make a good living for himself and his family, many are not breaking even. The men and women who have farmed our land to give us an abundance of agricultural products are now being repaid with unemployment and a bleak future. The promise of a good life has eluded them in spite of laudable industriousness and sobriety.

Many existing programs funnel modest amounts of money and technical assistance into rural areas. These programs have performed great services. But even the most casual observer can see that they are not enough. Some programs overlap confusingly while between others there are terrible gaps.

Today the urgent matter of rebuilding our rural areas is facing us with an ultimatum—act now or else. We are approaching the point of no return on depopulating the countryside.

Of some encouragement is the fact that last week, the Senate Committee on Government Operations held public hearings in Carbondale, Ill., to investigate firsthand rural revitalization. Senator CHARLES PERCY, who chaired the hearings said:

It is imperative that Congress act to promote renewal and economic growth in rural areas.

He also summarized the major constructive suggestions made at the hearings, which the committee, State, and Federal governments should consider further, as follows:

There is overwhelming support for the adoption of a national rural development policy to assist in the revitalization of the rural areas of our country.

Establish residential vocational centers to develop marketable skills on an area-wide basis.

Institute area-wide planning for professional and vocational training.

Overcome the bias against blue-collar work.

Inventory all educational facilities—physical plant, equipment and personnel—available for rapid implementation of new regional educational programs.

Improve the delivery system of existing health-care programs; increase health-care education courses available at junior colleges in order to increase the availability of basic health-care services.

Redirect Federal Government manpower training programs to train rural residents for jobs that actually exist in the area, and to support new businesses locating in the region.

Increase the amount of funds available for multi-county regional planning groups, and make the use of these funds more flexible.

Compile a state-maintained catalog of federal programs that are available to mayors and other local government officials.

Consider establishing federal instructional system for state and local government officers in use of federal programs.

Consider more carefully the environmental impact of strip-mining operations, and accelerate federal and state experimental efforts to reclaim strip-mined areas.

Make special efforts to reconcile public works projects that are needed by towns for economic growth, with national environmental objectives.

Investigate the possibility of a tax credit for citizens who contribute to their community's industrial development efforts.

Inaugurate a system to provide quick technical advice to cities to aid in implementing their development projects.

Enact President Nixon's rural community development special revenue sharing bill.

Enact the President's executive reorganization proposals, particularly the bill creating a Department of Community Development, which should contain a new section directed at rural community development.

Consolidate grant administration; simplify paper work procedure; and speed notification processes.

Decentralize administration of federal programs to regional councils, in order to accelerate decision-making by officials more knowledgeable in local problems.

Give serious consideration to creation of a Federal Rural Community Development Bank.

Study proposals for state-issued rural development bonds.

Enact a comprehensive rural development tax incentive program.

I commend the committee, and Senator PERCY particularly, for their efforts.

Also, of encouragement, is the work being done on the House side by the Agriculture Committee. Following hearings during which various Members of Congress and spokesman for farm organizations and other groups testified, the chairman introduced a bill authorizing loans to residents of communities for the establishment of small business operations, and loans to public, quasi-public, and nonprofit corporations for community facilities essential for development

including community centers and fire and rescue facilities.

The Rural Development Act incorporates many outstanding features which most Members of Congress can support without reservation. It provides balance between Government assistance and self-help. It utilizes the structures of existing programs. It provides for a land development program, and it truly takes into consideration the problems of our farm economy. However, it could be strengthened.

The Republican task force on which I serve has been working with the administration to develop needed amendments to the Agriculture Committee bill. President Nixon's statement on rural development contains many fine provisions which, hopefully, will be incorporated in the committee bill.

Briefly stated, the President called for $1.3 billion guaranteed credit for rural industries and communities and $1.1 billion rural revenue sharing funds for the States. Such a program would not only help the farmers, but would also help businesses revitalize rural areas. Mr. Nixon explained:

To help improve the quality of life in the American countryside, I am today presenting a series of proposals designed to marshal more effectively the energies of the private sector and of government at all levels in a cooperative program of rural development. We have seen the folly of pouring money into projects which were ill-considered and lacking in local support. What is needed now is a fundamental change in the way the government approaches the entire developmental challenge.

Hopefully, the House Agriculture Committee will take the President's message into consideration, and will soon report rural development legislation that will be acceptable to all Members of Congress. We owe it to rural America.

EMERGENCY LANDS NEED RESEARCH

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of January 31 contains an article by Thomas R. Odhiambo on the topic of the role of research in emerging countries. As director of the International Center of Insect Psychology and Ecology in Nairobi, Kenya, he is a leading expert in the field of insect physiology. One of Africa's foremost scientists, he is also professor of entomology at University College, Nairobi.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics had the great privilege of Professor Odhiambo's participation in the annual meeting with its panel on science and technology in January 1971. He made a valuable contribution to the committee's inquiry on international science policy.

The article by Professor Odhiambo points out the need for adequate funding for research and development activities in emerging lands. He states that—

Scientific research must become a vital part of national development plans of the developing countries.

I heartily agree with this assessment of the importance of research in economic and cultural activities across the world.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this time Professor Odhiambo's article, entitled "Emerging Lands Need Research":

EMERGING LANDS NEED RESEARCH

(By Thomas R. Odhiambo)

NAIROBI, KENYA.—The modern story of the "green revolution," which has swept through Asia and Mexico over the last six years, has galvanized the attention of the whole world. From being the second largest customer in the United States of America's food-aid program in 1967, Pakistan has now just about been transformed to self-sufficiency in cereal production. From being concerned largely with stepping up massive production of maize, Mexico is now turning her attention to the breeding of a more nutritious and high-yielding variety of maize.

Pakistan, India, Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran among the developing countries have made spectacular increases in their wheat production per unit area; Mexico and Kenya have made equally dramatic increases in the productivity of maize. Similar advances, not so explosive, are being made with rice in the Philippines and Taiwan.

This vast progress in cereal production has been made as a result of significant innovation being made in technology. This in itself would not have been enough to demolish the barriers to increased productivity. The establishment of an effective infrastructure (for instance, irrigation systems, fertilizer manufacture and distribution, and and efficient transport network), the acceptance of far-reaching socio-economic changes (for example, in regard to land tenure practices), the removal of social and cultural inertia to change, and, above all, the provision of first-class management have helped.

Three ingredients are absolutely necessary for a successful science-based breakthrough in development: firstly, the acquisition of new and relevant knowledge, specific discovery, or innovation; secondly, the availability of first-class managerial skills, and finally, the existence of a well-defined and critical market. The demands of the market—whether of a product or a social service (in this case the acute and recurring hunger in the developing world)—give direction to the efforts of scientists, technologists, policy makers, and managerial personnel.

Scientific research must become a vital part of national development plans of the developing countries.

The centers of excellence that have largely been financed by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines, the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center in Mexico, the International Center for Tropical Agriculture in Colombia, and the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture in Nigeria all indicate a fruitful model on how to define development-oriented problems, how to organize a research program to focus on these problems and how to coordinate the efforts of the scientists working on these sharply delineated problems.

The newly established International Center of Insect Physiology and Ecology in Nairobi has similar objectives in an area of crucial importance in the whole area of agricultural and livestock productivity in the tropics.

Development-oriented scientific research has for long stagnated in Africa and other developing countries for the major reason that most scientists in those countries (whether nationals or non-nationals) found it personally more satisfying to do fundamental research.

There are signs that some developing countries in Africa are making a serious reappraisal of how best to utilize their scale research resources in a strictly development-oriented direction. For instance, the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie I, has set up a foundation, one of whose main functions is to make a prestigious annual award to the scientist in Africa who has made the greatest advance in making Africa's science-based progress possible. We need more of these morale-lifters, both at the national and international levels.

It has sometimes been said that Africa does not need to devote more than a modicum of its resources on scientific research since it can purchase know-how (in the form of patents, licenses, etc.) from industrialized nations.

This does not mean that Africa must for all time be dependent solely on foreign know-how. In certain areas, it may be suicidal to do so. In agriculture and all other biological resource areas, which depend very largely on ecological and local phenomena, the only feasible way to maximize production is to base it on a deep scientific insight at a local level.

The purchase of know-how has serious repercussions in the planning for high-level manpower. The efficient utilization of this specialized knowledge presupposes the existence of highly trained scientists and technologists to copy, adapt, and modify the procedures to correspond with the specifications of the product they wish to sell to their identified market. Africa is alive to this problem.

In Kenya, for instance, over the last year, a series of plans have been hatched to establish a series of technological institutes where future technicians are to be trained. On the shores of Lake Victoria, an ambitious Ramogi Institute of Advanced Technology is being established on engineering, applied sciences, and business management. Its sponsors wish it to rival the best of such training institutions in the United States.

IN DEFENSE OF LARGE FAMILIES

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, those ecologists, family planners, and abortion advocates who criticize large families often ignore the fact that many parents consider their children a blessing rather than a burden. For these parents, large families are a labor of love. The Gilbreths, a well-known Providence family, practiced this principle with efficiency, as described in the best-seller "Cheaper by the Dozen."

I feel Columnist Jack Anderson and his wife Olivia expressed it best. Their feeling toward children are simple:

We don't have children because of religion. We have them because we love them.

They have nine children.

Two Rhode Island families recently explained this maxim in practical terms. Mrs. Samuel H. Ramsey, wife of the mayor of East Providence, and the parents of five children, questioned

critics of large families in a thoughtful and timely essay. Mr. and Mrs. Michael A. Hession III, of Woonsocket, are the parents of nine girls, and now finally a boy. I believe the following articles have merit and, therefore, include them in the RECORD:

[From the Providence Sunday Journal Magazine, Jan. 16, 1972]

IN DEFENSE OF LARGE FAMILIES

(By Doris Ramsay)

Okay, ecologists, family planners, abortion advocates and all those others who rationalize away their consciences, I've had it! I would like to speak out for parents of large families who honestly want all their children and who have begun to skulk around corners and hesitate before taking the entire troupe to a parade or restaurant because of stares.

Would you like to hear the ignorant remarks I have compiled from "friends" concerning my sixth pregnancy? "Was it an accident?" (I have to admit that one left me speechless.) "Better you than me." (In retrospect I thought of a reply I should have given—"Yes, it certainly is!") "God *bless* you," in pitying tones (I threaten someday to say, "Yes, He really has!") Or how about this one—"I heard about it and couldn't believe it but now that I see you I have to." (Such good taste—and from a casual acquaintance, too!)

When people talk of the quality of life being endangered by large numbers of people, I wonder what they mean. Perhaps the traffic will be heavier and our tolerance and patience will be tried, but if true moral values are our criteria for a full and rewarding life, then we've lost the battle before it's begun. When crass, insensitive remarks can be made by so-called intelligent people about the miracle of life, then we're already slipping.

The popular theme of today is comfort and convenience. Many women who would not have considered an abortion 10 or 15 years ago are tempted because of the availability and ease with which it can be done. The mental health of the mother is the reason most often given. This is, in most instances, a cop-out and the mother knows it.

While I do not feel I have to justify my existence as a mother of a large family, I would like to state for the record that we are teaching our children to respect their environment. The inside of our car suffers because nothing is ever tossed out of a window. On walks we often fill bags with other people's litter. We save glass for recycling and would not consider burning leaves or trash. Our family contributes to society in many ways. My husband volunteers many hours to improve our community, which is more than the vast majority of citizens can say—even those with the correct "quota" of children. Surely we get some Good Do-Bee points for these things!

My husband and I (at present) have five healthy, bright children ranging in age from 14 to 2, who are a joy to us. Our life is full and never boring. For the Feminists who feel my college education is wasted I would like to state that my major was "Child Development and Family Relations" and if that isn't using my education to good advantage, I don't know what is!

[From the Woonsocket (R.I.) Call, Jan. 3, 1972]

HESSIONS, AFTER NINE DAUGHTERS, HAVE A SON

(By Tim Manigan)

Michael Augustine Hession IV?

We don't believe it.

Come on, daddy, you've been telling us you're going to be the father of a boy for 18 years now.

You told us you'd have a son to pass your athletic talents along to after Mary Jane was born 17 years ago. Then you told us you'd have a son after Kathleen was born.

And you never lost your faith even after Sheilah, Helen Mary and Erin came along. We didn't believe you anymore after we heard about Eileen, Margaret, Patricia, and Kara.

Now, 18 years and nine daughters later, you tell us it's a boy? Come on, now.

At any rate, Mr. and Mrs. Michael A. Hession III of 59 Woodland Road made their 10th trip to the maternity ward at Woonsocket Hospital at 10:30 p.m. New Year's Eve. Mrs. Hession is the former Helen McNamara.

Two things were on their minds. Would it be the first baby of the new year? And, most of all, would it finally be a boy?

Well, it wasn't the first baby of '72, but it was a boy.

As Mike, the president and treasurer of Mack Buick and president of the Greater Woonsocket Chamber of Commerce, puts it, "the roof came down at the hospital and at home."

Baby Mike—a dream come true for his proud parents—took his first breath at 9:30 p.m. New Year's, weighing in at a chubby eight pounds, five ounces.

"After all, he's an athlete," daddy bubbled.

Daddy says he had his reservations. "I didn't believe the doctor when he told me . . . I really didn't."

But Mike isn't fooling us. Last baby, he and Mrs. Hession had the room decorated in blue and lost on that bet. They can't tell us that they gave up hope this time.

"Maybe it was the change in doctors," the proud father said today in a daze. He explained that his nine daughters were delivered by Dr. Richard H. Dowling who is not delivering children anymore. The son was delivered by Dr. Arthur C. Gaudreau.

During the waiting period, daddy took his favorite seat in the "daddy" room and watched four "bowl" football games and two parades. Dr. Gaudreau watched some television along with him.

When the joyful news was learned, Mike reports that the hospital was in an uproar. When dad called home, nine young girls went into hysterical laughter.

"The kids went crazy," Hession said, "I mean utter hysteria . . . and everyone went wild at the hospital, too.

"But after nine," he said, "I didn't believe it until I saw him."

It has been a long wait for the Hession clan, who, along with the well-known McNamara family of Millville have been waiting for a grandson.

After all, the oldest Hession daughter is 17 and president of her senior class at St. Clare. She is scheduled to enter college in the fall.

With a twinkle in his eye, the father of 10 related a promise made by his family of women "Little Mike won't do any dishes or housework . . . They said they don't want him to be a sissy . . . he'll cut the lawn and take out the trash, though."

The baby's grandparents are just as proud. Granddaddy Timothy A. McNamara of 21 Summit Ave., North Smithfield, a former professional baseball player, had his Boston Braves uniform cut down to kiddie size many years ago. It's been in mothballs just waiting for this day.

Mr. and Mrs. Michael A. Hession II of Chestnut St., Millville, are 81 and 76, respectively, and have 28 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren—and they were all girls until two days ago.

Athletics is something that is second nature to the Hessions and McNamaras. The well-known long line of athletes runs right down to daddy who was a star in sports at St. Anselm's College, Manchester, N.H., and played professional baseball for a time.

Daddy was a teacher and coach of baseball and basketball at Uxbridge High School and still keeps fit at the Woonsocket YMCA where he jogs and plays sports daily. Mrs. Hession, too, has been known to swing a good baseball bat when she had the opportunity.

In short, baby Mike is bound to receive some tutoring. Maybe someday he can coach an all girl softball team? He has just enough sisters, after all.

Anyway, the proud father was last seen carrying a baseball glove into Woonsocket Hospital.

CONGRESSMAN HAROLD R. COLLIER REPORTS TO ILLINOIS CONSTITUENCY ON FIRST SESSION OF 92D CONGRESS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit herewith my annual report to the residents of my congressional district as has been my policy in the past. This report will present a summary of major legislation, the bills I have personally introduced or cosponsored and my observations on the first session of the 92d Congress.

The actions of this Congress to date leave me with mixed emotions since several bills of a priority nature failed to get full consideration while others slipped into a state of limbo in the Senate. My personal criticism is not directed as much to the differences of opinion with regard to these bills but more to the failure of the legislative bodies to move them to a vote so that they could either be voted up or voted down. Should the latter be the case in some instances, then we could at least act upon other alternative measures. But the uncertainty of permitting them to remain in a state of limbo merely defers finding a solution to some of the most pressing national problems.

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS

The broad scope of national concerns was reflected in the more than 50 messages which the President has sent to the Congress covering such subjects as welfare reform, income tax revisions, revenue sharing, law enforcement, education, selective service, drugs and narcotics, labor disputes which ignore the public interest, mass transportation, space research, environmental programs, and social security amendments.

The President has outlined his answers to some of the country's most pressing problems. He has made certain recommendations and has invited the Congress to deal with them on a basis which would place our national interest above partisan politics. In fact, in his state of the Union address in January he pointed out that there are great national problems so vital that they transcend partisanship. He invited debate on honest differences of opinion but urged the Congress not to permit legislation a nation needs to become hostage to any political interest of any party of any person.

Action by the President on two vital issues captured the spotlight of national attention during 1971. Expediting the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia from a figure which escalated to 543,000 troops in early 1969, the 1972 reductions will leave 69,000 by May, bringing us to the threshold of total Vietnamization.

The annual cost of the Southeast Asian conflict which reached $20 billion has now been reduced to slightly more than $6.5 billion, although it has resulted in compounding to some extent the dogged unemployment problem. Early reductions in defense spending urged by many Members of Congress did take place during the past 2 years and resulted in the loss of jobs which were involved in these Government contracts. Thus the unemployment figure remained at about 6 percent as the year closed which is the highest since 1961 when it soared to 6.7 percent. Congress has sought to move in the direction of stimulating the economy and providing public service employment to soften the impact of the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

The second major Presidential action came in mid-August when a wage and price freeze was ordered as a last resort to cope with a dangerous inflationary spiral. It was ironical to me that many of those who voted to give the President the authority to impose wage and price controls even though he did not ask for it, then criticized the President for using this authority at a time when all other efforts to curtail inflation had failed.

TAX LAW CHANGES

The President submitted a tax package as part of the anti-inflationary program which the House of Representatives promptly enacted with few changes. As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee I worked on this legislation which we submitted to the Congress within 3 weeks after the August recess. The Senate delayed action for approximately 6 weeks so that it did not actually pass until after conference negotiations just before the Christmas recess.

One of the provisions of the tax bill calls for reestablishing the 7-percent investment tax credit to stimulate plant expansion and purchase of new machinery as a means of creating more jobs. The temporary surcharge on imports was subsequently removed to accompany the devaluation of the dollar and other international currencies. These actions are certain to have a favorable impact upon American industry in its competitive situation in the world market.

For many years the United States possessed superior technology and a greater productivity which gave us a favorable balance of trade and resulted in American workers being the highest paid in the world. But a trend in recent years saw a new situation develop in which other nations improved their technological know-how and vastly expended their productivity in a manner which resulted in greater imports of goods. As the first session of the 92d Congress adjourned, we were faced with finding new approaches and new solutions to recognizing the difficult competitive situation we face in the world market. Tremendous increases in the purchase of foreign cars, appliances of every variety and other goods has resulted in a loss of American jobs primarily because wages continued to increase faster at home than abroad. Nontariff barriers imposed by a host of foreign industrial nations persist in the face of public clamor for free trade rather than a neoisolationism.

The committee upon which I serve held hearings on three major pieces of legislation which are of a priority nature. In fact, we did pass a welfare reform bill after executive session hearings which fell into a state of impasse in the Senate. It seems to me that legislation in this area is vital because the present national welfare system is nothing short of a disgrace with the inequities and abuses inherent to the system. When the Congress adjourned the bill was pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

Hearings were held on a national health program but definite action was again deferred until 1972 because of the complexities and the wide variation in the provisions of the several bills introduced in the health field.

RECORD VOTES AT ALL-TIME HIGH

The first session of the 92d Congress established an all-time record for the number of recorded votes cast in any single session. In fact, there were a total of 320 recorded votes which surpassed by 54 the previous high of 266 recorded votes. This fact should not be construed as a measure of the legislation Congress considered, but was instead due to the fact that under the Legislative Reorganization Act the "teller" votes recorded the position of Members on numerous amendments which heretofore were decided on a procedural basis.

Among the major items of legislation which did pass the House prior to the pre-Christmas adjournment were measures dealing with election laws, education, national defense, consumer protection, campaign reform, public health, law enforcement, conservation, and the environment. There is little doubt in my mind that some of this legislation was passed in a manner which will require amendments in the future because of administrative problems which are certain to develop once enforcement is attempted. Congress continues to establish committees and commissions which seek to remove duplication of activities but has rarely done so in the past. Nevertheless it continues to provide the palliative in lieu of specific action. The result of this trend in legislation seems to have had the effect of giving bureaucracy authority to issue orders or establish programs of one kind or another which are often either contrary to the intent of Congress or go beyond what should properly be the power of those agencies.

I am listing forthwith some of the legislation with a brief explanation which did pass during this session:

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

Title I—Office of Consumer Affairs. To establish within the Executive Office of the President an Office of Consumer Affairs, with a director and deputy director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. To require the director to report annually to the President and Congress of the office's activities. To specify that the office must aid the President in coordinating Federal programs affecting consumers, assure that consumers' interests were observed in setting policy and operating programs, and for other purposes.

Title II—Consumer Protection Agency. To establish a Consumer Protection Agency with an administrator and a deputy administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. To require the agency to make annual reports on its activities to the President and to Congress, to make recommendations to the President and Congress and to conduct research on consumer affairs. To authorize the agency to represent consumers in formal proceedings conducted by other Federal agencies and in certain court suits, and for other purposes.

Title III—Miscellaneous. To establish a Consumer Advisory Council, composed of 15 members appointed by President for staggered 5-year terms, to work with both the consumer agency and the White House office. Passed House.

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1971

To authorize $19 billion in Federal aid to postsecondary education in fiscal years 1972–75. To extend existing programs of Federal aid to colleges and college students and vocational education programs through fiscal 1975. To establish a primary tenet of Federal policy that every qualified and needy student had a right to Federal aid in meeting the expenses of a postsecondary education. In conference.

WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

To require the President to submit a written explanation to Congress if he acted without prior Congressional consent in committing U.S. troops to combat, sending combat-equipped forces to foreign countries or significantly enlarging military forces already stationed abroad. Passed House.

EXPORT EXPANSION FINANCE ACT OF 1971

To amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to exclude Bank receipts and expenditures from the totals of the budget and to exempt it from any budget outlay limitations; to raise the ceiling on all loans, credit guarantees, and insurance issued by the Bank to $20 billion from $13.5 billion; and to extend the Bank's life by 1 year, to June 30, 1974, and make clear that the Bank has authority to sell obligations with maturities beyond its statutory life. Public Law 92–126.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS DEALING WITH OIL POLLUTION

The Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties. To establish the right of a coastal nation to take action against the threat of oil pollution after a maritime accident such as a collision at sea. Amendment to the 1954 Convention on the Pollution of the Sea by Oil. To alter the international law governing the intentional discharge of oil and to specify a rate-of-discharge formula to limit the amount of oil a ship was legally permitted to discharge into the sea. Senate approved resolution.

MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS

To extend the President's authority to induct men into the armed forces for 2 years, to June 30, 1973. To provide the President with discretionary authority over student deferments and to provide that a divinity student would have a statutory deferment from the draft, rather than an exemption. To require that a conscientious objector serve a 2-

year term of alternate service subject to recall for an additional year of service during a national emergency declared by the President. To provide a $2.38 billion increase in pay and allowances for military personnel. To impose an average manpower ceiling on active duty strength of 2,553,409 men in fiscal 1972 and 1973. To provide that it is the sense of Congress that the United States terminate "at the earliest practicable date" all U.S. military operations in Indochina and that the withdrawal of U.S. troops be completed by a certain date, not specified, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war and an accounting of those missing in action. To provide for the identification and treatment of drug and alcohol dependent persons in the Armed Forces. Public Law 92–129.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1971

To authorize $2.7 billion in fiscal 1972—$1.2 billion for foreign economic and humanitarian aid and $1.5 billion for security assistance. In addition, the legislation carries $984 million in economic aid authorizations for fiscal 1973. Passed House and Senate; unsigned as of date this report was printed.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—RATES OF PAY

To provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government. Passed House.

OBSCENE MAIL

To prohibit the sending of obscene material through the mail. Defined obscene matter that no longer could be mailed to minors under 17 years of age; defined obscene with respect to other material that was mailed, imported, broadcast or transported in interstate commerce, and provided mail patrons with a procedure to prevent delivery of "potentially offensive sexual materials." Passed House.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

To repeal the "equal time" requirement of the Communications Act of 1934 for all Federal elective offices. To limit the overall amount that could be spent by candidates or committees for broadcast and newspaper advertising to 10 cents per eligible voters, as determined by the Census Bureau. Of the total, up to 6 cents per voter could be spent either on radio and television or on newspaper, magazine and billboard advertising. To require broadcasters and newspapers to sell candidates advertising time and space at the lowest unit rate in effect for the time and space used. The requirement would be in effect during the last 45 days preceding a primary election and the last 60 days preceding a general election. To strengthen the requirements in existing law for reporting to the public how much a candidate spent on his campaign and his sources of contributions and other income. To establish a bipartisan, six-member Federal Elections Commission to administer the reporting and disclosure requirements and to monitor election campaign practices. To limit the amount a candidate or his family could contribute to his own campaign to $50,000 for President or Vice President, $35,000 for Senator and $25,000 for Representative. Passed House and Senate; unsigned as of date this report was printed.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE TO 18

To amend the Constitution of the United States to extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older in all elections. Passed Senate. Passed House. Ratified June 30, 1971.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

To add to the U.S. Constitution an amendment stating: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abriged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." To specify that the amendment would become effective if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date approved by Congress. Passed House.

CONQUEST OF CANCER ACT

To amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to establish an independent cancer research agency within the National Institutes of Health. To establish a National Cancer Advisory Board composed of the Director of the National Institutes of Health and 18 members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. Public Law 92–218.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1971

To provide construction assistance grants for schools in the health professions, student grants to encourage schools to expand their enrollments and student loan and scholarship funds. To provide a program of financial incentives for medical schools to train doctors who would go into family and general practice. Authorizations for the programs provided in the bill totaled $2.9 billion for fiscal 1972–74. Public Law 92–157.

COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970 AMENDMENT

To amend the 1970 act to provide an increase from $1 million to $4 million in the authorization for the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse. Public Law 92–13.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOANS AND SCHOLARSHIPS EXTENSION

To amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944 to extend through fiscal 1972 the student loan and scholarship provisions. To authorize $111.4 million for the various programs. Public Law 92–52.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1971

To make numerous changes in medicare and medicaid in order to improve the operating effectiveness of these programs. To provide social security beneficiaries with a 5-percent increase in benefits effective June 1, 1972. To establish an Opportunities for Families Program for needy families with one employable adult and a Family Assistance Plan for families with incapacitated or unemployable adults. To set a federally guaranteed $2,400 income floor for a family of four without any income. Froze State welfare costs at their 1971 levels and provided a partial Federal takeover of the welfare program. Passed House.

NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1971

To extend through fiscal 1974 Federal programs to train nurses. To provide funds for construction grants to nursing schools plus loan guarantees and interest subsidies to encourage nursing schools to expand their facilities. To provide a new program to give nursing schools student grants to encourage them to expand enrollments. Authorizations for the programs provided in the bill totaled $855.5 million for fiscal 1972–1974. Public Law 92–158.

DRUG LISTING ACT OF 1971

To require manufacturers and processors of drugs to submit to the Secretary of HEW a list of all drugs manufactured or processed for commercial distribution. To require manufacturers to submit all new information on drugs previously listed as well as on new and discontinued drugs every 6 months. To provide for prosecution of violators under the existing penalties of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1962. Passed House.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT EXTENSION

To extend for 1 year the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. To authorize $75 million to carry out the Act and to establish an Interdepartmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency to coordinate all federal delinquency programs. Public Law 92–31.

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS

To amend the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to permit treatment methods such as the use of the synthetic drug methadone, that would control the dependence of narcotics addicts on addicting drugs as well as eliminate the dependence. Passed House.

NARCOTIC TREATMENT PROGRAMS IN CORRECTIONS INSTITUTIONS

To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the drug treatment programs at State jails and prisons. To provide that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration correctional facilities grants be contingent upon State plans for operating narcotics treatment programs for drug addicts or drug abusers in prisons or jails, or on probation or parole. Passed House.

WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS AND EXTENSION OF INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS

To extend the President's stand-by authority to implement wage, price and rent controls to June 1, 1971. To extend to June 1, 1971, authority to regulate the rate of interest paid by lending institutions on savings deposits. Public Law 92–8.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

To increase the temporary ceiling, through June 30, 1972, on the national debt to $430 billion from $395 billion. To provide that the debt ceiling would be reduced to a permanent level of $400 billion on July 1, 1972. Public Law 92–5.

WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS AND EXTENSION OF INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS

To extend the President's authority to impose controls on wages, prices, salaries and rents through April 30, 1972. To prohibit the President from applying wage and price controls to a single industry unless he determines that wages or prices in that industry had increased in a grossly disproportionate rate compared to the economy as a whole. Public Law 92–15.

REVENUE ACT OF 1971

To reinstate the investment tax credit at 7 percent effective April 1, 1971. To in-

crease the personal income tax exemption by $50, to $700 from $650, as of July 1, in effect making the exemption $675 for 1971, and to reduce taxes paid by lower-income persons by making the existing low-income allowance of $1,050 available in 1971 without reduction where income exceeded nontaxable levels. To make effective January 1, 1972, an increase in the personal exemption by an additional $50, to $750, and the standard deduction is increased to 15 percent of income with a ceiling of $2,000. To raise the low-income allowance in 1972 to $1,300 in order to grant tax relief to low-income people who have been particularly hard hit by inflation. Provides a special deduction up to $400 a month for single individuals and working couples who support a child under the age of 15, or disabled dependents or disabled spouses in the household. This also covers child care expenses outside of the home up to $200 a month in the case of one child, $300 a month for the care of two children and $400 a month for the care of three or more children. To repeal the 7 percent excise tax on automobiles effective August 15 and the 10 percent excise tax on small trucks. To provide for public financing of Presidential election campaigns through a $1 voluntary check-off on the individual income tax return effective after the 1972 election. Allows a tax credit of $25—$50 for a married couple, or a deduction against income of $50—$100 for a married couple, for political contributions to candidates for local, State or Federal office. Public Law 92–178.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1971

To provide a 2-year extension, through March 31, 1973, of the interest equalization tax. To authorize the President to apply the tax, at his discretion, to bank loans and other debt obligations with a maturity of less than 1 year. Public Law 92–9.

SMALL BUSINESS LOAN CEILING INCREASE

To amend the Small Business Act to increase from $2.2 billion to $3.1 billion the amount of certain loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments outstanding in any one time from the business loan and investment funds of the Small Business Administration, thus permitting a continuation of five SBA programs through fiscal year 1972. Public Law 92–16.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

To establish a Joint Committee on the Environment with six majority and five minority Members from each chamber, with the Senate Members appointed by the President of the Senate and the House Members appointed by the Speaker. The chairmanship of the committee would rotate between House and Senate delegations every 2 years. Passed House. Similar resolution passed Senate.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT

To increase to $1.5 million the ceiling on annual authorizations for water resources planning activities; to authorize increased appropriations not to exceed $6 million for river basin commissions under the Water Resources Planning Act. Public Law 92–27.

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PESTICIDE CONTROL ACT OF 1971

To amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to provide for more comprehensive regulation and control over the manufacture, distribution and use of pesticides. To provide for all pesticides to be registered with the Environmental Protection Agency and to be classified into two categories of use—general and restricted, with products in the restricted use category subject to additional terms and conditions surrounding their use. To provide civil and criminal penalties for violations. To authorize the Environmental Protection Agency to administer the program and to enforce the regulations. Passed House.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

To authorize a 3-year, $11.8 million extension of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. To extend through August 12, 1972, the time during which states could revise their laws to enforce Federal gas pipeline safety standards established under the 1968 Act. To require the Secretary of Transportation to pay up to 50 percent of the costs of State programs to bring pipeline safety up to Federal standards. Passed House.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL EXTENSION

To extend for 3 months, through September 30, 1971, authorizations for administration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Public Law 92–50.

To extend authorizations for Federal water pollution control programs for one month, through October 31, 1971. The bill increased authorizations by $150 million for grants to local governments for constructing water treatment facilities. Public Law 92–137.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ACT OF 1971

To authorize $14 billion for the Federal share of constructing waste treatment plants through fiscal 1975, plus an additional $2 billion for various other water pollution abatement programs. To establish as Federal policy the goals of making the Nation's water suitable for fish propagation and swimming by 1981 and of ending all discharges of pollution into navigable waters by 1985. Passed Senate.

MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH AND SANCTUARIES ACT OF 1971

To prohibit the unregulated dumping of waste materials into the oceans, coastal waters or the Great Lakes, and to bank the transportation or dumping of chemical or biological warfare agents or radioactive wastes. To require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue permits for the transportation or dumping of waste materials only after he determined such action would not violate water quality standards. In conference.

PROTECTION OF WILD HORSES AND BURROS

To require the protection, management, and control of wild-free-roaming horses and burros on public lands. Public Law 92–195.

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

To provide the Alaskan natives with $425 million in grants from the U.S. Treasury paid over 10 years and 40 million acres of land to settle land claims. To set up a system of 12 regional corporations to administer assets and to provide welfare services to natives. Public Law 92–203.

WILDLIFE HUNTING FROM AIRCRAFT

To provide a criminal penalty for harassing or shooting at certain birds, fish, and other animals from an aircraft. Public Law 92–159.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASE

To provide a 10 percent across-the-board increase in old age, survivors and disability insurance benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1971. To raise the minimum monthly payment to $70.40 from $64.00. To increase the taxable wage base to $9,000 from $7,800 effective January 1, 1972. Public Law 92–5.

LIBERALIZED PAYMENTS FOR DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION

Provides a cost-of-living increase in dependency and indemnity compensation benefits payable to survivors of veterans who died as a result of service-incurred disabilities. Public Law 92–197.

LIBERALIZED NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION RATES AND INCOME LIMITATIONS

Provides for an average increase of 6.5 percent in nonservice connected disability pensions for about 1.1 million veterans and veterans' dependents. Provides for an increase in outside income limitations for these pensioners so they will not suffer a pension reduction as a result of the social security increase. Public Law 92–198.

VETERANS MEDICAL ACT OF 1971

To extend hospital and medical care benefits to wives, widows and children of veterans who were either totally and permanently disabled from service-connected causes or who had died as a result of a service-connected disability. To provide for outpatient hospital treatment for veterans and to liberalize VA employee pay. Passed House.

VA MEDICAL SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the establishment of new state medical schools; the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration; and to develop cooperative arrangements between institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other public or nonprofit health service institutions, and the Veterans' Administration to develop and conduct educational and training programs for health care personnel. Public Law 92–69.

ARMED SERVICES SURVIVOR PLAN

To provide that a military retiree could leave his survivors an annuity up to 55 percent of his retired pay. To establish a program to guarantee a minimum annual income of at least $2,000 for current military widows for whom the program came too late. Passed House.

DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1971

To make areas suffering from severe unemployment or other economic hardship eligible for emergency Federal aid. To define major disaster as the existence of an unemployment rate 50 percent above the national average for 6 of the

preceding 12 months or a 10 percent increase over 12 months to a rate higher than 6 percent. To include areas of unemployment attributable to the loss or curtailment of major sources of unemployment or employment opportunity. To authorize the Office of Emergency Preparedness to administer aid in affected areas. Passed Senate.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND BREAKFAST PROGRAMS FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds to insure that every needy school child received a free or reduced-price lunch as required by section 9 of the National School Lunch Act. To specify that use of section 32 funds would be authorized in fiscal 1972 only until a supplemental appropriation could be enacted reimbursing the Agriculture Department for section 32 funds expended for school lunches. To authorize a reimbursement to States of 6 cents for every meal served whether full price, free, or reduced price, and for other purposes. Public Law 92–153.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

To provide for increased enforcement for the Flammable Fabrics Act by requiring a manufacturer to certify that a product, fabric, or related material offered for sale meets the requirement of any applicable standard or any other regulation. To provide that such certification is to be based on a testing program conducted by the manufacturer or importer which has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the procedures established in this bill. To authorize $4 million for fiscal 1972 to carry out the provisions of the Act. Passed House.

INDIAN EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

To add a new section to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize grants for planning, pilot and demonstration projects and programs to improve the educational opportunity afforded Indian children and to upgrade the quality of educational personnel dealing with Indian children. To amend the law to authorize Federal aid to impacted areas to provide new funds for special Indian education programs. To establish an Office of Indian Education with bureau status within the Office of Education and to authorize the setting up of a National Advisory Council on Indian Education. Passed Senate.

PRISONERS OF WAR RESOLUTION

To call for humane treatment of American servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and its allies and endorsing efforts to win their release. Passed House.

PEACE CORPS AUTHORIZATION

To authorize $77.2 million in fiscal 1972 for the Peace Corps. Public Law 92–135.

Following is a rundown of the bills which I introduced or cosponsored in the first session of the 92d Congress and their status:

A bill to prohibit the dumping of ecologically harmful material into the oceans, Great Lakes or coastal waters of the United States. Passes House and Senate; in conference.

Conquest of Cancer Act. Passed; signed into law.

A bill to suspend foreign aid to any country which fails to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed in such country, from entering the United States unlawfully. Included in foreign aid bill; signed into law.

Revenue Sharing Act of 1971. Hearings have been held.

A bill to provide that the first $3,000 of Federal retirement income shall be tax free. Pending.

A bill to provide that annuities shall not be taken into account for inheritance tax purposes. Pending.

A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals. Pending.

A bill to prohibit the discharge into any navigable waters of the United States, or international waters, of any military material. Passed House and Senate; in conference.

A bill to provide that amounts equal to the minimum amounts authorized in the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 for airport development and airway facilities must remain in the trust fund until appropriated for such purposes. Passed; signed into law.

A bill to ban sports from closed circuit television, thus forcing promoters to use home TV and radio for broadcast of sports events. Pending.

A bill to exclude obscene material from mails for sale to minors. Passed House.

A bill to provide that the United States should maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone. Hearings have been held.

A bill to readjust on an equitable population basis the U.S. contribution to the United Nations. Hearings have been held.

A bill to provide more efficient and reasonable procedures to settle national emergency transportation disputes. Hearings have been held.

A resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second Sunday in September of each year as Bataan Day. Pending.

A bill to provide for the boycott of French-made products until France has taken successful steps to halt the processing of heroin and its exportation to the United States. Pending.

A bill providing for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam under certain conditions. Pending.

A bill to establish a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and men missing in action. Passed; signed into law.

Bills providing for the relief of River Forest for complying with civil defense regulations. Favorable report from the Defense Department. On the agenda for hearings.

A bill to correct unforeseen inequities in the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act which resulted in the drastic decline in immigration from Ireland. Reported by Committee.

A bill to make it a federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer when the offender travels in interstate commerce. Pending.

Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. Passed House.

A bill to provide for election reform, including campaign expenditures limitations and disclosures. Passed; signed into law.

A bill to permit importation of chrome from Rhodesia in spite of United Nations sanctions. Included in the military procurement bill; signed into law.

A bill to require that packages of detergents list the ingredients on labels. Pending.

The Law Enforcement Officers Bill of Rights. Pending.

A bill to establish a National Research Data Bank. Pending.

A bill to eliminate railway-highway grade crossings in Illinois. Pending.

A bill to provide for the regulation of strip coal mining. Hearings have been held.

A bill to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in Illinois. Passed; signed into law.

A bill to establish a standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. Pending.

A resolution urging a review of the United Nations Charter. Pending.

A bill to protect wild horses and burros on public lands. Passed; signed into law.

A bill to provide benefits to survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty. Pending.

The Health Care Insurance Act. Hearings have been held.

A bill to name the FBI Building for J. Edgar Hoover. Pending.

A resolution calling for the sale of F–4 jet aircraft to Israel. Pending.

A Constitutional Amendment providing for the ratification of treaties by the House of Representatives. Pending.

A Constitutional Amendment relating to prayer in public buildings. Failed of passage.

A Constitutional Amendment providing equal rights for men and women. Passed House.

A bill providing for the recognition of the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago as hosts in 1992 of the official quincentennial celebration of the discovery of America. Pending.

A bill to restore Memorial Day to May 30. Pending.

A bill to restore Veterans Day to November 11. Pending.

A bill providing a tax deduction for education of a dependent. Pending.

A bill to increase the amount of outside income permitted without loss of social security benefits. Pending.

A bill to restore the investment tax credit. Passed; signed into law.

The Foreign Trade Act of 1971. Pending.

A resolution calling for the humane treatment of prisoners of war. Passed House.

A bill to exempt prisoners of war and men missing in action from payment of income tax. Reported from Committee.

A bill to provide tax credits for employers who hire unemployed Vietnam veterans. Pending.

A bill to prohibit derogatory films and broadcasts on ethnic, racial and religious groups. Hearings have been held.

A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I. Hearings have been held.

A bill to authorize additional funds for Cooperative Forest Fire Protection. Passed House.

A bill expressing the sense of Congress

that the Holy Crown of St. Stephen should remain in the United States until Hungary once again functions as a constitutional government established by the Hungarian people through free choice. Pending.

REAPPORTIONMENT AND DISTRICT OFFICE OPERATIONS

As is required by law following each decennial census, Illinois congressional districts underwent a sweeping change which will find approximately 1 million Illinois residents voting in different congressional districts in November of 1972. Incumbent Representatives will still represent their present districts until the end of this year, thus there has already been some confusion on the part of many residents with regard to who presently represents them and in which district they will actually vote this year. Each one of Illinois' 24 districts has been changed and some have been renumbered even though the majority of the residents will remain in the same district. Our own 10th District is no exception because it will become the Sixth District for voting purposes this year while remaining the 10th District from the standpoint of current representation until December 31, 1972.

The area which was basically the 10th District will become the new Sixth District, although Maine Township and part of Proviso will go into the new Tenth and Fourth Districts respectively. Berwyn, Cicero, Norwood Park and Addison Township in DuPage County will be part of the new Sixth along with the area I have previously represented in the Congress.

I will maintain my present district office operation at 8909 West Cermak Road, North Riverside, Ill. This office is maintained on a full-time basis for the convenience of my constituents who prefer to handle any problems with which they need assistance locally rather than through writing or visiting my Washington office. I wish to report that I recently moved my family from the south end of Proviso Township to Riverside which has been part of the Tenth District ever since it was created. In addition, I have moved from the Rayburn House Office Building into larger quarters at 1436 Longworth House Office Building. My district office telephone number is 447–2746 and the Washington office is area code 202 225–4561.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I was not privileged to be a Member of this House when Public Law 89–761, creating the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore was approved in November of 1966. However, as a lifetime resident of Porter County, Ind., the site of this park, I was certainly aware of the history surrounding this legislation and its probable impact on the lives of the citizens who live and work in this area.

The main problem surrounding the original bill, which was eventually ironed out and appears as a compromise in Public Law 89–761, was one of land-use priorities. As introduced, the bill called for the indiscriminate acquisition of thousands of acres of land for inclusion in this national park. Fortunately, however, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at that time recognized the inequities inherent in such a proposal and argued that there should be a reasonable balance between the amount of land set aside for recreation and the amount of land left for industrial expansion and residential development in the area.

Appropriate action was taken in the best tradition of the congressional bargaining process, resulting in an agreement being hammered out that designated approximately 7,000 acres for use as a national park—and approximately an equal number of acres for much-needed industrial expansion in northern Indiana. The result was a bill people could "live with," for it recognized the fact that while people must recreate, they must have employment as well.

Of course, there were sacrifices to be made and accepted by private citizens and businessmen alike, such as the destruction of hundreds of homes and a number of diversified businesses, a substantial loss of tax base and numerous other inconveniences. By and large, this situation was accepted in good faith and sincere efforts were made toward a side-by-side development of the recreational and industrial facilities as set forth in the compromise.

However, the recreational development has been painfully slow in coming. Land acquisition drags on and after the passage of several years and the expenditure of nearly $30 million at the cost of tax base, the whole park project is far from operational in any respect.

With the above facts in mind, it should not be difficult for any normal person to imagine the shock and dismay felt by many citizens of Porter County, any myself as their Representative, when Congressman ROUSH and Senator HARTKE introduced legislation at the end of July which would violate the compromise in the most blatant manner. Their identical bills call for the acquisition of another 7,000 acres to be added to the national park, thus doubling it in size. Total acreage would then be more than that advocated by the original bill which Congress felt had to be pared down in the first place. In addition, these 7,000 acres would not be contained in one contiguous unit. The total figure is arrived at by adding up a hodge-podge of sectionalized "miniunits," 200 acres in one place, 1,200 in another, 100 in another and so on. This hop, skip, and jump effect would take place all up and down the northern Indiana lakeshore coast and inland area.

Should these bills somehow manage to make their way through committee and pass the House and Senate, what can the citizens of northern Indiana expect as a result? They can expect the confiscation of more homes and busineses and they can expect still more loss of property tax base so essential to education and other governmental services at the local level. The future development of approximately 200 acres owned by Midwest Steel, 100 acres of Northern Indiana Public Service Co., 1,200 acres owned by Bethlehem Steel and a portion of the area reserved for future public harbor development would be confiscated. Unknown thousands of jobs would be sacrificed.

Is this how we repay those industries, small businesses and individual homeowners for their trust and acceptance of the 1966 covenant? Do we tell them that this additional land grab must be tolerated and that all they can is pray that another 7,000 acres will not be taken at some future date at the whim of Members of Congress from far-away districts, aided and abetted by powerful Chicago industrial interests? Certainly not. I tell you this must not be allowed to happen.

What about the cost? Well, the designers of this legislation have neatly taken care of that problem in section 10 of the bill which states—

> There are hereby appropriated such sums *as may be necessary* to carry out the purposes of this Act.

In other words, there is just no limit to the amount of money that could be taken, straight from the taxpayers pocket, and wasted on this project. If anyone needs an example of the kind of spending that would ensue, all we have to do is examine the amount that has been spent so far on the present undeveloped park. The original estimates of 8 or 9 million grew to 27.9 million by 1966. Now we have already passed the $25 million mark, yet at least 25 percent of the proposed land area still remains in private ownership. I would estimate that the purchase of the additional 7,000 acres would require an expenditure of at least $50 million.

With 10 miles of lakeshore and close to 10,000 acres in the existing and proposed State and Federal parks in Porter County, plus the many smaller city and county parks located in Lake and LaPorte Counties, northern Indiana has an abundance of recreational facilities in operation, under development, or authorized for purchase and development.

Industry, organized labor, small businessmen, homeowners, plus local, county, and State officials all oppose the violation of the 1966 compromise. Among the organizations who have indicated their strong objection to this park expansion are: The Gary-Hobart Water Corp., the LaPorte, Starke and Pulaski County Board of Commissioners, the Beverly Shores People's Association, the Porter County Farm Bureau, Inc., the Bethlehem Steel Corp., the Great Lakes Commission of Indiana, the Indiana Port Commission, the State of Indiana as represented by the Governor, the Organized Labor Committee AFL–CIO, the National Park Limits Committee, which represents over 300 families, the Northern Indiana Bank & Trust Co., the Portage, Valparaiso, and Westchester Chambers of Commerce, the Valparaiso Jaycees, the city of Portage, the Chesterton Town Board, the Porter Beach Property Owners Association, the Town Board and Chamber of Commerce of Kouts, the

Greater Chicago and Vicinity Port Council, the Valparaiso Board of Realtors, the Northern Indiana Sheet Metal, Warm Air Heating and Air Conditioning Contractors Association, the Sheet Metal Workers International Association—Local Union No. 303—Gary, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local No. 531—LaPorte. As you can plainly see, Mr. Speaker, I do not stand alone on this most important matter.

I call upon the Members of the House and Senate, the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs to join in objecting to H.R. 10209 and S. 2380 which do violence to the trust the people of Indiana have placed in the Congress of the United States.

THE REVEREND MR. DANIEL HAMILTON SPEAKS ON PEACE AND JUSTICE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, friends of mine who attended the St. Thomas More Roman Catholic Church in Arlington, Va., on January 16, came away with open praise for the young man, the Reverend Mr. Daniel Hamilton, who preached the sermon. His message was on peace and the rightness of our moral commitment in Southeast Asia, and it moved the congregation to remain sometime afterward to individually congratulate this straight speaking young man.

The full text of his message follows:

PEACE AND JUSTICE

I have become appalled by the attitudes and ideas concerning peace and justice that are being spread by supposedly men of high intellectual ability. Apparently these prophets of peace (at all costs) lose their intellectualism in a rush of emotional fervor. Any Catholic or Christian who does not truly desire peace cannot call himself a follower of Jesus Christ. However, peace and appeasement are not synonymous but many of the advocates of peace seem to think they are. The world tried their brand of peace in 1938. Chamberlain brought back a piece of paper from Hitler that proclaimed peace for our time. One year later mankind was plunged into a worldwide conflict.

The prophets of peace in this country direct their attack on the war in Southeast Asia, and never do they fault North Vietnam, but only their own country. They cite the destruction and killing as done totally by the United States of America. They cry illegal, immoral! But I stand and say that the United States is neither illegal nor immoral in its actions in Vietnam. The United States entered the war only after it became apparent that North Vietnam had broken the treaty of 1955, by pouring troops and supplies into the South. *They are the aggressors, not the United States!* The critics wonder about the dignity of the person and I do too. The United States is trying to preserve and foster an idea of human dignity in the people of South Vietnam. The United States is trying to give the people of South Vietnam the most important tool necessary for fostering human dignity—that is freedom—the freedom to live, work and determine one's own future. Is this illegal? I think not. But the critics still cry immoral. The United States is and remains in Southeast Asia because it is a moral thing to do. We are committed not to territorial expansion, but merely to help the people of South Vietnam preserve their independence. We have remained in Vietnam this long only because our conduct of the war has been highly ethical and moral. We have not bombed or killed indiscriminately, but carefully, limiting ourselves to purely military targets.

Finally, we are waging a war against Communism. When Vietnam was partitioned in 1954, thousands of Christian people fled the North. They realized they could not practice their religion freely in the North. We have a moral obligation to help these people. The United States is involved in a war to limit or halt the spread of Communism. Our critics say this is wrong, they say we must learn to live and work side by side with them. Fine, but are they content to do the same? *The answer is evident.* Communism still seeks to dominate the world. Unless Communism is stopped our way of life will perish. All that America has worked for and all that America stands for will disappear. Not only our freedom, our way of life, but also our religion, our right to worship God as we choose will perish. Communism proposes a godless, atheistic society, one that is completely materialistic. I stand today and publicly praise our military and our government for its stand on Vietnam. I think these men truly have the key to a lasting peace. I truly pray for peace, but peace at the expense of justice is folly.

THE DES MOINES ROCKET

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, many communities throughout our Nation have been faced with the loss of rail passenger service, but few States have the problem facing Iowa and her cities. At present, Des Moines, the State capital, and Iowa City, home of the University of Iowa and 20,000 students, are without railroad passenger service of any type. That a States' capital is without such service is a condition that cannot be allowed to exist. Des Moines, besides being the State capital, is an important connecting point with Chicago, Minneapolis, Omaha, and St. Louis. Iowa City, which serves a vast student population, has no airport and is only accessible by car or bus.

Recently the University of Iowa Student Association Senate, through its committee on student rights and freedoms, took the initiative to return rail passenger service to Iowa. After considerable study, Mr. Stephen Wylder, rail passenger service coordinator for the committee on student rights and freedoms, submitted a proposal for restoration of railroad passenger service to Des Moines and Iowa City to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation on January 7, 1972. Entitled "The Des Moines Rocket," the proposal recommends establishment of an experimental train between Chicago and Des Moines.

The proposal is carefully and skillfully done. It urges community involvement through purchase of station facilities and their operation, while also requesting Railpax and railroad help. Through this mutual participation it is felt a successful run can be established. I concur with its intent and urge its consideration by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation. It is heartening to find citizens, and especially students, taking an interest in this important issue and proposing valuable and viable solutions. I lend my support to the effort to return railroad passenger service to Iowa. I would like to share with you the proposal for the accomplishment of this goal.

The proposal follows:

THE DES MOINES ROCKET

INTRODUCTION

Passenger train service on the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad has been unavailable west of Rock Island, Illinois since May 31, 1970. Des Moines, the capital and largest city of Iowa and Iowa City, the home of the University of Iowa, have been without rail passenger service since then. The 20,000 students of the University of Iowa are particularly dependent on public transportation. On November 17, 1971, the University of Iowa Student Association Senate unanimously endorsed efforts to restore passenger train service to Iowa City.

On October 31, 1971 I proposed to Amtrak President Roger Lewis that Amtrak operate an experimental train between Chicago and Omaha via Iowa City and Des Moines on a tri-weekly basis. Greg Herrick of the Student Senate Committee for Student Rights and Freedoms on November 22 wrote to Mr. Lewis supporting my proposal. In his reply to my letter Mr. Gerald D. Morgan, vice president for government affairs of Amtrak, said the corporation is "ready to cooperatively explore ways by which service might be added." He felt that a train wholly supported by Amtrak would be unlikely as funds for such services are limited.[1]

Amtrak has so far placed in operation two experimental trains on routes outside the national system designated by the Secretary of Transportation and the directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation. The first of these services to be put into operation was a tri-weekly train between Minneapolis, Minnesota and Spokane, Washington via Bismarck, North Dakota and Billings, Montana providing through service between Chicago and Seattle.

The second experimental service to be instituted by Amtrak was a daily train between Washington, D.C. and Parkersburg, West Virginia via Cumberland, Maryland. Amtrak came under fire from many quarters as a result of this experimental service due to the fact that Representative Harley Staggers, powerful chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is from West Virginia. *Passenger Train Journal* urged Amtrak to operate the service between Washington and Cumberland only.[2] Don Phillips, writing in the January, 1972 issue of *Trains*, says Amtrak has "kissed off the potential of the western end of its Washington-Parkersburg service by rescheduling the weekday trains to arrive in Parkersburg at 1:59 a.m. and to leave eastbound at 3:30 a.m. The idea is to increase patronage on the eastern end."[3]

Amtrak has also placed in operation several additional trains on routes within the national system including a second Chicago-Minneapolis service.

Trains may also be added to the Amtrak system if a state or region agrees to pay two-thirds of the losses incured by the train's operation. It is very unlikely that Iowa would be able or willing to subsidize a Chicago-Des Moines service. Such a train would not serve the whole of Iowa and might require Iowa's subsidy of service within Illinois.

Footnotes at end of article.

Furthermore the variability of losses prevents the allocation of a specific amount.

The plan I am suggesting would be neither a two-thirds subsidy by the State nor a wholly-Amtrak-supported service. Instead the communities to be served by the train would be required to pay for station expenses incurred by the operation of the train.

The train I propose would be "experimental" in a number of ways. A new possibility for local support of service would be tried. The railroad would be encouraged to increase revenues instead of costs. Incentive fares would be used to boost patronage. And a great deal of the train's promotion would be carried out by citizen groups.

DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE

The train proposed is a daily service between Chicago, Illinois and Des Moines, Iowa via Rock Island, Illinois; Iowa City, Iowa and other points designated by Amtrak to be served by the train which fulfill the conditions of service. It is suggested that the additional stops be made at La Salle-Peru, Illinois; Ottawa, Illinois; Grinnell, Iowa; and Newton, Iowa. Stops also will be made at Joliet, Illinois for passengers for or from points west.

The train's schedule is similar to that of the Des Moines Rocket which operated eastbound until August, 1960 and westbound until April, 1967. Neither discontinuance was effected under the provisions of Section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, but through a loophole in Iowa law. No hearings were held on the discontinuances and no regulatory body ever approved the discontinuances. The Des Moines Rocket was an extremely popular train up to the discontinuance of the eastbound segment in 1960. The Rock Island's train No. 5–9 is actually the successor to No. 5, the old Des Moines Rocket.

The train will initially consist of reclining-seat coaches and a dinner-lounge. Only one trainset shall be used to provide the service. Additional equipment may be added at the discretion of Amtrak.

The proposed schedule provides for connections with all Amtrak routes radiating from Chicago. Bus connections at Iowa City for Cedar Rapids and at Des Moines for Ames are possible under the proposed schedule.

RATIONALE FOR CHANGE IN PROPOSAL

In my letter of October 31 to Mr. Lewis I proposed that Amtrack operate a tri-weekly service between Chicago and Omaha. The rationale for the proposal's change is as follows:

Although the tri-weekly service between Chicago and Omaha generates fewer train-miles than the daily Chicago-Des Moines service, its potential for ridership west of Des Moines is very low. Rock Island's Trains 7 & 10, while offering relatively poor service in their last years of operation, had very poor patronage west of Des Moines after the discontinuance of connecting Trains 17 & 18 between Minneapolis, Des Moines and Kansas City. In connection with 17 & 18, 7 & 10 provided a Minneapolis-Omaha service. In the last months of the operation of Trains 7 & 10, the Des Moines-Council Bluffs (train service was discontinued between Omaha and Council Bluffs January 6, 1970) segment accounted for over one-fourth the trains' route-miles, but generated less than one-tenth of the trains' patronage.[4] The 1970 discontinuance of service to Omaha was of course instrumental in reducing patronage west of Des Moines, but the trains consisted of only one coach west of Des Moines even before the connecting trains from the Twin Cities were discontinued.

The addition of a Chicago-Des Moines-Omaha service would not provide significantly better train service to Omaha owing to the need to provide connections at both termini. The latest possible departure time from Omaha would be 5:00 a.m. if connections for such points as New York and Detroit are to be made. A passenger boarding at Omaha would have to rise by 3:30 at the latest to catch the train. The lack of a convenient Chicago-Omaha service may indicate the need for a daytime train on the Burlington Northern route.

Passengers traveling from Cedar Rapids, Iowa City and the Quad-Cities to points west of Omaha are currently able to use Continental Trailways bus service to Burlington in connection with Amtrak Trains 5 & 6. Continental Trailways Bus No. 1312 leaves Cedar Rapids at 3:00 p.m.; Iowa City at 3:45, arriving at the combined rail-bus depot in Burlington at 6:05. Connecting with this schedule is a Rock Island-Muscatine (Iowa) bus which leaves Rock Island at 3:30. Continental Trailways Bus No. 1305 leaves Burlington at 8:05 a.m., arriving at Iowa City at 10:45 and at Cedar Rapids at 11:30. The Quad-Cities connection arrives at Rock Island at 10:35.[5]

Limousine or minibus service between Des Moines and Osceola could be established in order to provide western connections for Des Moines. Feeder bus or limosine service for long-distance passengers, if effectively promoted, can become a significant revenue source for Amtrak. Amtrak should immediately move to establish through ticketing arrangements between itself and Continental Trailways.

Another significant problem associated with an Omaha train is that of the Council Bluffs situation. Rock Island's trains often took a half-hour to cover the four miles between Omaha and Council Bluffs. East of the Council Bluffs station there are numerous stops and clearance requirements due to the numerous junctions. The bottleneck of Council Bluffs is avoided by trains traveling on the Burlington Northern Route.

The daily operation of the proposed Chicago-Des Moines service is much more convenient than a tri-weekly operation. Tri-weekly services are hard to remember—the public is accustomed to daily service on its public transportation routes. A daily train would also allow one-day business travel between Des Moines and the Quad-Cities.

CONDITIONS OF TRAIN OPERATION

The train itself will be operated as an Amtrak experimental service. Amtrak shall pay the Rock Island the solely related cost of operating the service plus a reasonable profit based on train revenues. The profit margin shall not be tied to costs. Profits may be cancelled by Amtrak if it deems the railroad's operation of the service to be unsatisfactory.

The train crew shall consist of an engineer, a conductor and a brakeman, plus necessary food service employees. As the proposed train is a new service, no employee will lose his job because of the lack of a fireman. Engineers will be changed at Rock Island; conductors, brakemen and food service employees will not change. Precedent for such an arrangement is set by Trains 7 & 10, on which conductors and brakemen worked from Rock Island to Council Bluffs while engineers changed at Des Moines.[6]

Amtrack will designate the stops which the train is to make. Municipalities so designated will then be required to pay the cost of station facilities excluding agency service. Cities which are currently without rail passenger service in any form will be required to rent from the railroad a suitable waiting room on the condition that any improvements made by the city do not have the effect of either increasing the rent charged by the railroad or of increasing the property tax on the facility. Cities which are served by Rock Island passenger trains only will be required to pay one-third the cost of the operation of the station by the Rock Island excluding agency service. The same conditions regarding municipal improvement of facilities would apply.

Chicago and Joliet, which are already serviced by Amtrak, would not be required to pay for station facilities. The train would not go into operation until Des Moines, Iowa City and the Quad-Cities have arranged to pay for station facilities.

FARES

Fares shall be established at a rate no higher than four cents per passenger-mile for passengers over the age of twelve and two cents per passenger-mile for passenger of ages five to eleven. Passengers under five traveling with parent or guardian shall travel free of charge. Fares at rates higher than these would be uncompetitive with Greyhound bus fares. Such special fares which applied to Trains 7 & 10 shall also be applicable to the experimental train. It is additionally urged that a four-day return fare with a 25 percent discount be instituted to encourage short trips. Such fares were introduced on the Illinois Central's Illinois services in 1968. In 1969 Mr. H. F. Davenport, vice president for passenger services of the I.C., termed the fare program "successful."[7] There is no reason why such incentive fares would not be beneficial to many of Amtrak's short and medium-distance routes.

PROMOTION

Amtrak shall carry out a reasonable advertising program. It shall be assisted in its campaign by rail passenger groups along the line. The first of these, the Coalition for Rail Passenger Service, is already being organized in Iowa City. The Coalition is a tentatively approved campus organization although its membership is open to anyone.

If passenger train service is restored to Iowa City, the Coalition will do its utmost to promote it. It can promote the train by printing local timetables and flyers and organizing group movements. It can also provide suggestions for better service and act as a watchdog against practices which increase operating costs.

The possibility of a student travel agency is not remote. The University Travel Service already arranges for charter flights to Europe. A similar service could be set up for domestic travel.

CONCLUSION

An experimental service similar to the one I have proposed would help to fill a serious transportation vacuum which now exists in all but the southern portion of Iowa. Restoration of passenger train service to Des Moines and Iowa City would be valuable to Amtrak's public relations in addition to providing a valuable service.

The proposed train would be much less likely to incur large losses because of the conditions of service. Stations would be maintained by the municipalities they serve. The diesel fireman would be removed and all crew changes but those of engineers would be eliminated. The railroad would not be so much encouraged to inflate costs to reap higher profits but would be encouraged to increase revenues.

Fares would be competitive with those of bus service and an experimental four-day return fare would be established.

Promotion would be carried out by Amtrak and by local passenger groups of which one is being organized in Iowa City.

It is the obligation of Amtrak to provide a national system of passenger service. If that obligation is to be fulfilled there must be services to all the nation's regions and major cities. The proposed train between Chicago and Des Moines, if put into operation, would bring Amtrak one great step closer to providing a national system.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Gerald D. Morgan, letter to Stephen Wylder, December 10, 1971.

[2] "Experimental Service, Who Deserves It?" *Passenger Train Journal*, Washington, Summer, 1971, p. 4.

[3] Don Phillips, "Tale of a Timetable," *Trains Magazine*, Milwaukee, January 1972, p. 15.

[4] "Statement in Relation to Proposed Discontinuance of Train Service, Finance Docket 26175, Train Numbers 7 and 10 between Chicago, Illinois and Council Bluffs, Iowa," Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company, Chicago, Appendix K.

[5] Continental Trailways Bus Timetable No. 3, Schedule 8387, December 15, 1971.

[6] "Statement . . . ," pp. 2–3.

[7] H. F. Davenport, letter to Stephen Wylder, October 13, 1969.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Westbound: 4:00p, Chicago, 2:00p, eastbound.

Westbound: 4:50p, Joliet, 1:01p, eastbound.

Westbound: 5:35p, Ottawa, 12:25p, eastbound.

Westbound: 6:00p, La Salle-Peru, 12:00p, eastbound.

Westbound 7:30p, Quad-Cities (Rock Island), 10:30a, eastbound.

Westbound: 8:45p, Iowa City, 9:15a, eastbound.

Westbound: 9:55p, Grinnell, 8:05a, eastbound.

Westbound: 10:20p, Newton, 7:40a, eastbound.

Westbound: 11:00p, Des Moines, 7:00a, eastbound.

Des Moines-Ames Bus Connection via Jefferson Lines. Leave Ames 5:15 a.m., arrive Des Moines 6:00. Leave Des Moines 11:30 p.m., arrive Ames 12:20 a.m.

Cedar Rapids-Iowa City Bus Connections: Via Missouri Transit Lines leave Cedar Rapids 7:45 a.m. arrive Iowa City 8:30. Via Continental Trailways leave Iowa City 9:00 p.m., arive Cedar Rapids 9:45.

RESOLUTION NO. 9—TRANSPORTATION

(Report from Committee for Student Rights and Freedoms, Submitted by Greg Herrick)

Whereas the University of Iowa Committee for Student Rights and Freedoms finds intercity public transportation to be severely deficient in this community; that in particular, no railroad passenger service has existed in Iowa City since May 31, 1970.

Whereas the Committee for Student Rights and Freedoms notes that railroad passenger service is a minimal contributor to air pollution, noise pollution and fuel usurpation; that the passenger train is statistically the safest mode of intercity transportation.

Whereas this Committee feels that the 20,000 students of the University of Iowa have a right to access to the cleanest, safest mode of intercity transportation available.

Whereas University of Iowa student Stephen Wylder on October 31, proposed to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) that it operate on an experimental basis a tri-weekly passenger train between Chicago and Omaha via Iowa City.

Be it therefore resolved that the University of Iowa Student Association Senate endorse the efforts of the Committee for Student Rights and Freedoms (Rail Passenger Service Sub-Committee, Stephen Wylder, coordinator) in renewing and revitalizing rail transportation to the University of Iowa and the state of Iowa as a whole.

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL NURSE SUPPORT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a serious problem being faced by the public schools in Anchorage, Alaska.

While elsewhere in the Nation, other school systems have adequate programs for school health administration, Anchorage does not. I am submitting a resolution drafted by the Alaska Nurses' Association, District I, which expresses the need for a strong and adequate school health program that would be administered by qualified personnel:

RESOLUTION REGARDING ANCHORAGE SCHOOL NURSE SUPPORT

Whereas, we recognize that school nurses under proper ratio will provide excellent care and health education of the school child; a service which can only be provided by this group due to their education and experience, and

Whereas, school nursing is a specialty of public health and school nurses are uniquely prepared in the areas of health counselling, health education, and provision of family centered nursing services in the community, and

Whereas, screening and preventative health measures carried out by profesional nurses in the schools result in savings of money, time, and human potential, and

Whereas, the school nurse must meet the same requirements as teachers for on-going education in order to keep current with changing needs in the school, and

Whereas, the increasing social and health demands in our society indicate greater need for qualified persons to help youth at an early age; therefore

Be it resolved that the Alaska Nurses' Association, District I, recommend and urge the employment of certified school nurses in the Anchorage Borough School District at the professional level;

Be it further resolved that school nurses be instated to a maximum of 1:1000 in the elementary schools and one nurse to each secondary school, and

Be it further resolved that any other supportive health workers employed in the school be under the direct supervision of the school nurse; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be sent to the U.S. Congressional Delegation; the Anchorage area State Legislators; State of Alaska Commissioner of Education; Greater Anchorage Area Borough Chairman and Assemblymen; Anchorage City Mayor and Councilmen; Greater Anchorage Area Borough School Administration and each member of the School Board; the Anchorage Borough School Education Association; the PTA Council, each school PTA, and local television and radio stations.

Approved unanimously by Alaska Nurses' Association, District I, November 18, 1971.

NEO-STALINISM IN YUGOSLAVIA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for many years in the West it has been said that Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia was a "different kind of Communist." He had, we were told, abandoned the ruthlessness and total rule so common to Communist governments in other parts of the world.

A great deal of this sentiment, it now appears, has been wishful thinking. Recently, Tito purged the leaders of his own party in Croatia, the second largest republic of the Yugoslav federation. The reason, as given by the leader himself, was that they were guilty of "rotten liberalism" and of "nationalism." In simpler terms, this means that they wanted a larger share in running their own government and their own lives. Such sentiments are anathema to Communist regimes in all parts of the world, and were similarly anathema to the regime in Belgrade.

The fact is that as Marshall Tito is reaching the end of his long reign, he does not want to leave a country which will collapse at his death or retirement, and so he is now carefully tightening his control so as to insure stability in the future. It is clear that a period of resurgent neo-Stalinism is in store for the people of Yugoslavia.

The Economist of London points out that—

Most of the sacked men and women had started their party careers as faithful linetoers, and when President Tito started decentralizing in the 1950s and 1960s their aim was no more than to win back from the central bureaucracy in Belgrade more money for their originally prosperous but now increasingly impoverished republic.

But, as they progressed, the Croat leaders brought young people and intellectuals into the party. They provided additional freedom, and pressured the government for economic changes. Their major sin, however, was nationalism and their desire for autonomy within the Yugoslav federation.

Commenting upon President Tito's actions, the Economist declares that—

The whole constitutional framework is once again in doubt. It must be feared that President Tito has made it more difficult for the peoples of Jugoslavia, particularly the Serbs and Croats, to live together. He has also darkened the outlook for reform in other communist countries.

The Economist expresses the view that—

If relatively liberal and independent Jugoslavia cannot shake off the inborn Stalinism that all ruling communist parties seem so prone to revert to in times of crisis, why should more orthodox regimes do any better. These thoughts may depress western liberals, as well as liberal Communists. But Mr. Brezhnev will be a happier man.

Those in the West who still speak of internal reform in Communist countries would do well to consider carefully the recent events in Yugoslavia. The evidence seems to be overwhelmingly against the proposition that the totalitarian nature of Communism is changing in any important respect.

I wish to share this article which appeared in the Economist issue of December 18, 1971, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

AN OLD MAN IN A PANIC

The coup that President Tito carried out over the weekend in Croatia, the second largest republic of the Jugoslav federation, was a pushover. The Croat party leaders, whom he had accused of "rotten liberalism" and "nationalism" in a long confrontation in his hunting lodge in northern Serbia on December 1st, resigned without any fuss. It did not prove necessary even to use the tanks and troops that had surrounded Zagreb, Croatia's capital, to subdue the students who on Wednesday were still proclaiming their support for the deposed leaders. The police did that job, and if a few policemen and students

got hurt in the process this was partly because the police lacked recent practice in the use of the truncheon. The arrest of intellectuals and other "undesirable elements" identified with the sacked leaders went just as smoothly. Not one, out of more than a hundred, apparently slipped through the net. It was, as Lloyd George once said of another country, a rape, but only a little one; and everything was over before you could say "Long live the self-managing, socialist, federative republic of Jugoslavia."

Yet last weekend's operation may come to be regarded as a colossal blunder committed by an ageing ruler acting in a panic on bad advice. Admittedly, thousands of such shakeups have taken place under communist regimes ever since Lenin invented democratic centralism, which means the obedient toeing of the ruling group's line. But for some years now the Jugoslav communists have not seemed to be that kind of party—not to the more enlightened Croat leaders such as Mr. Miko Tripalo and the others who have now been kicked out.

Most of the sacked men and women had started their party careers as faithful linetoers, and when President Tito started decentralising in the 1950s and 1960s their aim was no more than to win back from the central bureaucracy in Belgrade more money for their originally prosperous but now increasingly impoverished republic. But as they gained popularity by their spirited fight to win a better economic deal for Croatia, they felt flattered and encouraged. They brought into the party more intellectuals and young people. They conceded more freedom to people outside the party, particularly to the large number of Croats who are still practising Catholics. Their insistence on changing the country's inefficient economic system eventually led to last summer's drastic reorganisation of the entire federal structure.

THEY WEREN'T TRYING TO BREAK AWAY

Their pressure for economic changes had certainly made them unpopular with some people—in particular, with the big banks and trading corporations in Belgrade which had grown fat on the old centralised system. But this was not the main cause of the Croat leaders' downfall. Nor was it their alleged "nationalism" and "separatism"; it was only autonomy, not national independence, that they were after. An opinion poll published in the Belgrade weekly *Nin* on December 5th indicated that nearly three-quarters of the Croats expected that the recent constitutional reforms would strengthen Jugoslavia as a whole, as well as offering Croatia itself greater hopes of economic and cultural development. In fact, under the now evicted leaders, hopes for full independence for Croatia had waned rather than increased. But last weekend's coup could well lead to increased agitation for going it alone. Of course, the new men who have now been put in to rule Croatia will make themselves popular if they succeed in winning better terms from Belgrade than Mr. Tripalo and his colleagues could. But there is little chance of that.

So why did President Tito order this purge? He may have feared that the forming of a coalition of radical students and disgruntled workers, of which there were some signs during the recent student strike in Croatia, could set a dangerous precedent at a time when the whole of Jugoslavia is experiencing a wave of social discontent. He may have been afraid of going the way of Mr. Gomulka, who was brought down a year ago by the Polish workers even though they did not have much support from students or intellecturals. But it is much more likely that he decided to ditch the Croat leaders because he feared that Croatia had become too liberal and that the party's monopoly of power was in danger.

For months influential party men in Jugoslavia have been arguing that the country needs a stronger government. Some have even cast envious glances in the direction of Greece. Retired army officers, and even serving officers, have openly campaigned for more law and order, whatever that may mean to them. Until recently the president had resisted these siren voices, arguing that the country's unity could not be preserved by going back to the discredited old centralist system. Now he seems to have suddenly changed his mind. Did someone at last convince him that he risked losing his own grip on the country by tolerating all sorts of dangerous "pro-western" liberals? And that there would be no more communism in Jugoslavia after him? No doubt Mr. Brezhnev's was one of the foreign voices that bombarded him with such thoughts. President Ceausescu's of Rumania may have been another; he talked to President Tito only a few days before the fateful party meeting on December 1st and 2nd that sealed the fate of the Croat leaders. Attacks on non-Croat leaders like Macedonia's Mr. Crvenkovski, one of the architects of Jugoslavia's constitutional reform this year, suggest that the hardliners are working to put Jugoslavia's clock back before it is too late.

IF EVEN TITO CAN'T BE LIBERAL

The coup in Croatia does not make Jugoslavia overnight the most illiberal of communist states. But the solution of the multinational federation's problems has not been brought any nearer. The whole constitutional framework is once again in doubt. It must be feared that President Tito has made it more difficult for the peoples of Jugoslavia, particularly the Serbs and the Croats, to live together. He has also darkened the outlook for reform in other communist countries. If relatively liberal and independent Jugoslavia cannot shake off the inborn Stalinism that all ruling communist parties seem so prone to revert to in times of crisis, why should more orthodox communist regimes do any better? These thoughts may depress western liberals, as well as liberal communists. But Mr. Brezhnev will be a happier man. There is in the air a new whiff of his 1968 doctrine of limited sovereignty for socialist countries. And for the first time it is not coming from Mr. Brezhnev. It is President Tito, of all people, who is applying it to a part of his own country.

WAR OR PEACE: THE CHOICE REMAINS HANOI'S

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star of January 30, 1972, devoted its lead editorial to an extended examination of the status of the Vietnam peace negotiations in the wake of the President's surprise disclosures on January 25. In assessing where the responsibility lies for the failure to achieve a reasonable settlement the Star concludes:

The choice between war and peace is Hanoi's. And as the President has disclosed, this has been the case since last August. For its own reasons and at the cost of much suffering to all the people of Indochina, North Vietnam has chosen to prolong the war. If it continues to do so, its leaders will bear a heavy burden at the bar of history. The door remains open; they have only to walk through.

I commend the entire editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

WAR OR PEACE: THE CHOICE REMAINS HANOI'S

President Nixon's eight-point peace plan, disclosed over nationwide television Tuesday evening, offers a reasonable and just framework within which a Southeast Asian settlement could be reached. While the North Vietnamese have not yet flatly and finally rejected Mr. Nixon's proposals, there is very little reason to believe that any real progress toward peace will be made in the immediate future.

The North Vietnamese reluctance to end the war appears to be based on a number of factors. In the first place, they have not been fighting for nearly 30 years to achieve a settlement which is reasonable and just. They seek a setlement both unreasonable and unjust: The total capitulation of South Vietnam. And were the United States to agree to Hanoi's terms—the overthrow of the Thieu government, the unconditional withdrawal of all our forces and equipment and an end to every form of aid to Saigon—it is clear that they could achieve their objective. But this the United States cannot and should not do.

That the United States cannot and should not do this is only partially related to the merits or demerits of the Thieu regime. To agree to a limitation on our sovereignty (which is what agreeing to end all aid would be) and to betray an ally would demean this country and render its worldwide treaty commitments worthless. The administration has made this clear to Hanoi time and again.

The rulers of North Vietnam may be basing their unrealistic demands on a false reading of the domestic political situation in this country. It is possible that they hope for another major drive on the part of the so-called "peace forces" here (in reality, those who favor an object surrender to the Communists) which would force Mr. Nixon to capitulate. But the air, most of it hot, went out of that sorry balloon with the failure of last year's Mayday demonstrations to "shut down the government." The campuses and the streets have been quiet since then, with only the real psychotics and hard-core neo-Marxists making that mind-bending trip.

Alternately, the men in Hanoi may be so remote from reality as to believe that Senator George McGovern or some equally unlikely peace candidate may succeed in defeating Mr. Nixon at the polls in November, thus clearing the way for an unconditional surrender on the part of the U.S. It *could* happen; but it's about as probable as snow in August.

If one gives the North Vietnamese credit for greater political prescience than this—and probably one should—it may be that they realize it will be to their advantage to settle with Mr. Nixon before rather than after the election but that they wish to delay that moment as long as possible in the hope of extracting better terms.

Indeed, it appears likely that the North Vietnamese are uninterested in a cease-fire (one of the elements of Mr. Nixon's plan) at this time precisely because they plan to launch a major offensive to coincide with the beginning of the lunar New Year on February 15. That this will take place about a week before the President's visit to Peking is no coincidence.

The North Vietnamese clearly fear that Mr. Nixon's Peking summit, to be followed by a visit to Moscow in May, may result in a settlement imposed by the two Marxist superpowers, which provide Hanoi with $1 billion in aid annually. While the North Vietnamese could continue to fight on (and to hold our prisoners) without Russian and Chinese aid, they could do so only at such a low level that their dreams of victory would evaporate.

There are many reasons why Peking and Moscow might prove amenable to a Southeast Asian settlement not too far removed from that proposed by Mr. Nixon. They have no pressing desire to pull America's chestnuts out of the fire. But in an evolving and in-

creasingly complex world, each has more pressing concerns than total victory for the successors of Ho Chi Minh. The Russians, for instance, are interested in a European security conference which would legitimize their World War II conquests. The Chinese, for their part, are worried about their frontiers with the Soviet Union and anxious to see a reduction of the American presence in Asia. Mr. Nixon, by all accounts a clever poker player, will be not without some high cards to play when the hands are dealt in Peking and Moscow.

In recent months, the war in Southeast Asia has been going rather well from the point of view of the North Vietnamese. Their troops have routed the Cambodians northeast of Pnompenh and hurled Laotian units from the Plaine des Jarres and the Bolivens Plateau overlooking the Ho Chi Minh trail. There are heavy concentrations of Communist troops near the intersection of the frontiers of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam, while elements of the North Vietnamese 320th Division have been spotted skirting the Demilitarized Zone which separates North and South Vietnam and heading south. The intention of these units may be to launch a go-for-broke "second Tet" offensive in the Central Highlands with its ultimate objective the coastal plain.

At present there are about 145,000 American troops left in Vietnam, of which only the 196th Infantry Brigade, near Danang, and the Third Brigade of the First Cavalry Division (Airmobile), north of Saigon, are combat units. So the brunt of the ground fighting will be borne by the South Vietnamese, with American planes providing air support.

In his speech Tuesday, Mr. Nixon warned that he would not hesitate to use every means at his disposal, if fighting continued, to protect the American troops remaining in Vietnam. And at least one of his motives in disclosing the fruitless secret negotiations with Hanoi was to prepare the American public for a perhaps unprecedent U.S. aerial riposte to the anticipated North Vietnamese ground offensive. In view of the generous nature of the terms offered North Vietnam, including an estimated $2.5 billion in postwar aid, it is certain that Mr. Nixon will have the support of the mass of the American people in such an enterprise, if not that of every presidential hopeful.

By the time Mr. Nixon reaches Moscow, there will be fewer than 69,000 Americans left in Vietnam, a number which probably will diminish to about 30,000 by the time voters go to the polls here in November. But if the American prisoners held in North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are not released, this residual force will remain and the aerial war will continue. Hanoi, which by that time may be under heavy pressure from Moscow and Peking to do some real negotiating, may then come to realize that it is in its interest to come to an agreement.

Basically what the United States has to offer Hanoi in exchange for the prisoners is the withdrawal of our residual ground force from South Vietnam and the end of American air attacks on North Vietnam. The agreement could be as simple as that or, alternately, it could involve a complex Indochinawide political settlement.

The choice between war and peace is Hanoi's. And, as the President has disclosed, this has been the case since last August. For its own reasons and at the cost of much suffering to all the people of Indochina, North Vietnam has chosen to prolong the war. If it continues to do so, its leaders will bear a heavy burden at the bar of history. The door remains open; they have only to walk through.

But it is essential that the North Vietnamese recognize, as the President put it, "the important difference between settlement and surrender." The American people are eager for the former; but there can be no question of the latter.

NORTH CENTRAL POWER STUDY REPORT

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the incisive comment of Don L. Brown, Montana State fish and game director, on the North Central Power Study Report, which was compiled by the Bureau of Reclamation and power supply entities in the North Central and Rocky Mountain States.

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

STATE OF MONTANA,
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
Helena, Mont., January 27, 1972.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I would like to thank you for sending to this office a copy of the *North Central Power Study Report,* Phase 1, Volume 1, dated October, 1971. We have reviewed this document with great interest, and, I must admit, great concern. Since your covering letter invited comments, I would like to offer the following thoughts that occurred during our review of this report:

The report was apparently entirely based on the assumption that the energy demands of this nation will continue to double every ten years, and this demand must be met without question. It is our opinion that there are several things wrong with this assumption. The first is that the demand projection has been based upon, among other things, population projection data which recent history has proved to be incorrect. It is also our feeling that eventually the policy of meeting all electrical energy demands, no matter what their purpose, must be revised and some of the frivolous uses of electrical energy curtailed, simply due to the environmental price the production of electrical energy at this time extracts.

It is obvious from the report that Montana possess an incredibly wealthy natural resource. It is further obvious from the diagrams on pages 18 and 21 that both the coal and water resources of eastern Montana are going to be exploited to produce electrical energy to be consumed in Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota and Nebraska. It can be further assumed that the capital to develop these resources, and consequently the profits to be gained, are going to predominantly accrue to interest groups outside of the State of Montana. It would therefore behoove those interested in Montana's prosperity to carefully scrutinize the concept to which we are about to commit our state.

From this report as well as from the proceedings of the coal symposium held in Billings in November of 1969 which you were instrumental in establishing, it is obvious that coal is a valuable and very versatile resource. It can make and do an almost unlimited variety of things.

In the perspective of 100 years, it is conceivable that the most shortsighted thing we could do would be to burn it in an inefficient generating plant to be in turn consumed as electricity in the midwestern United States. The inefficiency of the projected power plants is well documented on page 23 of the Central Power Study Report, where it is stated, "For example, magneto hydrodynamics holds the promise of converting coal and lignite to electrical energy with efficiencies approximating 60 percent compared to efficiencies of present technology of about 30 to 35 percent."

At this point it is recalled on February 10 of 1970 you urged in the Congressional Record that the government invest more in research toward developing a M. H. D. pilot plant on our western coal fields. The wisdom of that request is certainly substantiated by the information contained in the report being reviewed.

The entire point of my letter at this time is to urge that we do not blindly commit our valuable coal fields simply because there appears to be an immediate and present demand for electrical power, when in the long run, simply burning this coal at a 30 percent efficiency may be robbing future generations of resource development options not yet dreamed of. If we adopt a cautious and go-slow program in coal field development, it would also afford us time to conduct adequate research into restoring the land so that it once again produces, among other things, the fantastic wildlife crop this Department is responsible for perpetuating.

I would also like to call to your attention some specific items in the report that cause us some apprehension.

On page 5 under Item 14, environmental requirements are discussed. The report says, "In special cases where it is believed an existing local regulation was impractical, a reasonable requirement still within the federal law was used." I believe in essence what this says is that if Montana's pollution control requirements, such as sulphur dioxide emissions, are too strict to suit the energy development interest, those requirements were subjugated to the more lenient federal requirements.

On page 6 under Item 3, Environmental Impact, the entire paragraph seems to indicate that there is a preference for polluting a remote area, such as eastern Montana, so that the pollution load can be removed from more populated areas where the electricity is to be consumed. I do not believe this type of attitude is in Montana's best interests.

On page 10 where coal reserves are discussed, the following sentence is called to your attention: "Reserves at these sites are adequate for at least 35 years of planned operation." This seems to be a rather short time to exploit vast coal fields. I believe it again strengthens the argument that we must look at alternative uses for this resource before we commit it to consumption in inefficient plants to illuminate areas far removed from Montana at the expense of one of our most valuable nonrenewable resources.

On page 12 the text discusses the dry-type cooling and dismisses it as impractical because additional capital would be required with an increase in the cost of electricity resulting. It appears from this attitude that we will not only sacrifice our coal, but also our water, so electricity can be consumed cheaply in areas far removed from Montana. This discussion of the relative merits of wet cooling versus dry cooling is also carried on on page 16, and leads to the same conclusion. Since the report assumes the wet-type cooling technique, the diversion of Yellowstone River water out of Montana for this purpose, probably in violation of the Yellowstone River Compact, is outlined on page 18.

It does not appear that this entire general attitude toward Montana's resources is being considered with Montana's best interests in mind.

In closing I would like to reiterate that our specific interest in this report is the wise use of Montana's land and water so they both can continue to produce the excellent fish and wildlife resource for which this state has become famous.

We certainly thank you for making this information available to us, and hope our comments will be of some value to you.

Sincerely,

DON L. BROWN,
State Fish and Game Director.

CHALMERS P. WYLIE WARNS OF GROWING RUSSIAN MILITARY SUPERIORITY TO UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the challenge of the 1970's, I believe, will be the willingness and ability of the United States to rebuild its defense posture, so as to be able to secure the peace that everyone seeks.

Our very able colleague from Ohio's 15th District, CHALMERS P. WYLIE, warned of the internal forces dismantling the deterrent effect of our strategic military capability when he addressed a group of AMVETS at the annual Pearl Harbor Day memorial service last December sponsored by the Linden AMVET Post 89. In putting the contemporary situation in its proper historical perspective, Congressman WYLIE observes:

In a short five years, the United States of America will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the noblest experiment—in government, in economics, in social ethics, and the very system of living—that mankind has ever undertaken. In order to ensure the success of that celebration, I believe the United States must maintain a credible defense policy.

I believe the message is clear and it is certainly pertinent, and I encourage you to study the full text of Mr. WYLIE's address which follows:

CONGRESSMAN CHALMERS P. WYLIE WARNS OF GROWING RUSSIAN MILITARY SUPERIORITY TO UNITED STATES

Although thirty years have passed since December 7, 1941, the gallantry of Americans at that time, and in the later struggles in Korea and in Vietnam, has made it possible for freedom to exist today.

From the time of its birth shortly after World War II, the AMVETS organization has expanded to a membership approaching 250,000 and has shown its faith in freedom, its belief in our country, in democratic ideals, and in constitutional government. AMVETS is made up of patriotic, humanitarian, hard working and good-hearted Americans who have championed many worthy causes over the years, and have achieved much indeed that deserves the deepest and most sincere praise from their fellow Americans.

Thousands of veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam have joined AMVETS and contributed unselfishly to its growth and its effectiveness as a force for good in our society. In the forefront of AMVETS' traditional activities is the annual sponsorship of Pearl Harbor Day ceremonies.

On December 7, every American reflects on an event, one single event, the memory of which will endure as long as American history is written. It is recorded as "The Day of Infamy;" and so it shall be remembered. For on this day 30 years ago, without warning and almost simultaneously, Japan attacked various U.S. and British possessions in the Pacific. The U.S. Pacific Fleet was attacked at Pearl Harbor: 7:55 Sunday morning, December 7, 1941. When the attack was over, 2,403 Americans had lost their lives. Citizens of every state are listed on the rolls of those who were killed that tragic Sunday morning.

On this 30th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, each of us must salute the memory of those who died on that fateful day. We should also render our thanks to the military and civilian defenders of our country, past and present, who have made it possible for us to continue to live in relative security. On this day, too, each of us must rededicate ourselves to the principles for which this Nation stands—to renewed devotion to our duty to maintain our Nation strong and free—and to renewed efforts to attain world peace.

Pearl Harbor provided a lesson that we must never forget: Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. Modern weapons of warfare, and the swiftness of their delivery, mean that today a devastating attack can be carried out on the United States within minutes, and that no one—man, woman, or child—is safe from the quick death of the bomb's blast or the lingering death from fallout. In the face of this fact of life, we cannot shirk our duty to maintain a defense posture second to none.

SUPERIORITY VANISHED

I would like to talk briefly today about my concern, and what should be the immediate concern of all Americans for the state of this nation's defense posture. There is little doubt among military experts that the United States has lost its significant margin of strategic military superiority over the Soviet Union in the last few years and is in serious danger of sinking into a position of inferiority by 1975. This dramatic switch in the global balance of military power has gone largely unnoticed by the American public. But it is a matter of growing concern in the governments of western Europe and Asia whose security has rested on unquestioned U.S. superiority since the end of World War II.

Over the past few years we have heard much discussion about reordering our priorities. Admittedly, there is no inherent virtue in maintaining extensive and costly military forces or in developing increasingly sophisticated weapons. I believe, however, that the first priority of any society is to provide for its own survival. Following Vietnam the Nation must be kept on the course of prudent reductions in weapons expenditures, but a defense capability must be maintained that will protect the American people against the threat of war and also against nuclear blackmail.

The fundamental philosophy and strategy of the United States is to deter war and preserve peace. The only way to ensure that peace continues to prevail is to make certain that, if the need arises, one is strong enough to enforce it. When our first President, George Washington, addressed the first joint session of the Congress on January 8, 1790, he declared: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." On September 9, 1971, President Richard Nixon had this to say to a joint session of the current Congress: "If we do not stay a great power, the world will not stay safe for free men." Those who would leave America defenseless before her potential enemies are by no means advancing the cause of peace.

CHANGE DISTURBING

Within the last few years, there has been a disturbing change in the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union, and if present trends continue, the Soviets could achieve a preponderance of strategic power that would leave our security impaired by doubt and uncertainty and our friends and allies exposed and vulnerable. The survival of democratic principles comes into question when we compare what the Soviets have accomplished in enhancing their military power during the past decade with what the United States has accomplished and consider what they are capable of doing in the next decade if they maintain their present momentum.

The expanding Soviet strategic threat is reflected in the rapid growth of their intercontinental ballistic missile inventory. Since initial deployment in the early 1960's, the Soviets have developed a number of ICBM systems. Since 1965, an accelerated research, development, testing production, and deployment program has resulted in a force today approaching 1,500 launchers—considerably larger than our own force of 1,054 ICBMs and almost seven times larger than the Soviets' 1965.

On the basis of this level of missile activity in recent years, we must realize that the Soviet ICBM force could exceed 2,000 ICBMs by the mid-1970's. The total number of ICBMs is significant, but even more important are the qualitative improvements, total payload capacity, development of multiple reentry vehicles, and the wide variety of options thus provided by these systems. For example, the Soviets have developed a Fractional Orbiting Bombardment System (FOBS), which follows a depressed trajectory as it circles the earth and is therefore hidden from our long-range radar for a greater period of time. The U.S. has no counterpart.

Supplementing the ICBM force of the Soviet Union are many shorter range, medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles. Although not a direct threat to the United States, they do present a threat to our overseas forces and bases as well as to our allies.

SUB GAP CLOSES

The third category of ballistic missiles involves the submarine-launched force. While the United States still has a substantial quantitative as well as qualitative lead over the Soviets in this area, the gap continues to close. Present production rates for Russian nuclear-powered SLBM launchers could bring them to equality with the United States in the next couple of years. By the mid-1970's, they could have about fifty operational SLBM launchers carrying 800 missiles.

With regard to our own SLBM force, the United States plans to retain all 41 Polaris submarines through mid-1976 and convert 31 of them to the Poseidon; which will carry multiple independently-targetted reentry vehicles (MIRVs). Thus, although the United States will continue to have a total of 656 operational SLBMs, the total number of warheads will be greatly increased.

Rounding out the Soviet offensive power is her bomber force, which has remained relatively static at a little over 900 aircraft since 1965. The United States still has a substantial lead over the Soviets in numbers of intercontinental bombers. This advantage is expected to continue through the mid-1970's, even if the Soviets decide to produce and deploy their new swing-wing bomber for the intercontinental mission.

There are three general measures customarily used in summarizing the overall strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. These are numbers of delivery vehicles, total megatons, and numbers of warheads.

In regard to the total numbers of the U.S. and Soviet intercontinental strategic offensive delivery vehicles, it is estimated that the Soviets could come abreast of us in this measure of strategic balance within the next year or two, and will most likely exceed us by the mid-1970's.

The Soviets are already far superior to us in total strategic offensive megatons, the second measure of the strategic balance.

Only in numbers of strategic offensive warheads is the United States likely to maintain

its lead over the Soviet Union during the 1970's. But even here, the Soviets have the potential to overtake us eventually since their missile forces have considerably greater "throw weight" or payload capacity than our missile forces.

SOVIET DEFENSE STRONGEST

In order to gain a full appreciation of Soviet strategic strength, one must look at the defensive forces as well. By almost any yardstick, overall Soviet strategic defense systems are the strongest in the world. Although the United States is taking some steps to modernize its air defense system, we are of course less vulnerable to attack by aircraft than the Soviet Union and have no plans to match them in terms of numbers. While the Soviets are still ahead of us in ABM defense, we do expect to have some Safeguard sites in operation by the mid-1970's.

In sum, I believe it is fair to say that the overall strategic balance, during the last five of six years, has been shifting in favor of the Soviet Union. Our comfortable lead has now all but vanished, and within the next five or six years we could actually find ourselves in a position of overall strategic inferiority.

Soviet achievement of a clear cut strategic superiority must be avoided. Aside from the military implications, such a development could also have a very important impact on our foreign policy. It could destroy the confidence of our friends and allies in the deterrent power of our strategic forces. We could pay a very high price in the effectiveness of our diplomacy if the credibility of our strategic deterrent came into question.

Although by far the gravest military threat to the United States today is posed by the Soviets' massive strategic power, one must also keep an eye on the emerging threat from the Chinese Communists. The Chinese are apparently still refusing to participate in any disarmament talks. Presumably they feel that the possession of a strategic nuclear strike capability will greatly enhance their bargaining power throughout the world.

In a short five years, the United States of America will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the noblest experiment—in government, in economics, in social ethics, and the very system of living—that mankind has ever undertaken. In order to ensure the success of that celebration, I believe the United States must maintain a credible defense policy.

Military preparedness is the responsibility of all Americans. Its purpose is to prevent conflict; to make resort to force an unattractive method of solving international problems; to provide the deterrence to war and violence; and thereby to promote the solution of international problems by negotiation and non-violent means.

The type of strength that is needed to give enlightened leadership to this troubled world is more than just military strength. Our national strength is the summation of the strength of free individuals joined in communities and states and organizations such as AMVETS. The tradition of individual responsibility, of local and voluntary action, has contributed to the greatness of the American character.

Thirty years ago, the national strength was suddenly called upon and Americans responded courageously. Although the memory of man is sometimes short, we must never forget the tragedy that awakened this Nation to the reality of a world in which peace and freedom cannot be taken for granted. Profound changes have occurred throughout the world in the intervening thirty years, but the lesson learned at Pearl Harbor is more important today than ever before.

Let us remember with reverence those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor and with respect those who fought through the harrowing years of war that followed. On this, the 30th anniversary of Pearl Harbor, let us pay our respects to all those gallant Americans whose heroic contributions in World War II, in Korea and in Vietnam have served the cause of liberty.

It is only by remembering and acting on the lesson of Pearl Harbor that we can hope for peace and security for our families and our friends, today and for the future.

PHIL DONAHUE BRINGS A NEW PERSPECTIVE TO PRISON REFORM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay long overdue tribute to a most relevant piece of broadcasting, the unique, live programing of the Phil Donahue Show from inside the Ohio State Penitentiary in Columbus, last November, and to call attention to a similar series that will be done by Mr. Donahue from the Women's Prison at Marysville, Ohio, the week of February 7.

During the week of November 8–12, 1971, I was privileged to be part of that series of telecasts of the Phil Donahue Show originating from the Ohio State Penitentiary, with inmates as the "studio audience," free to participate with questions and answers, and special phone lines allowing television viewers to contribute as well. It was a thought-provoking experience.

I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Donahue as a person who, at a time when many speak of the need for understanding between all men, is really willing to put forth the effort that understanding others demands. Phil Donahue and Avco Broadcasting are to be congratulated for taking their public responsibility to educate and inform, not simply entertain, seriously, in attempting to bring about some broad public understanding of one of the most serious aberrations of our troubled society—the horror that is the American system of nonrehabilitative penal confinement, and the staggering rate of recidivism produced by that system, a monument to total failure.

The Phil Donahue Show confronted a vast television audience with realities that are distasteful, but must nonetheless be faced if the Nation is to deal seriously and in any meaningful way with the problems of our correctional institutions.

Ranging from a first-hand account of the most famous prizefight of the last decade, to a grizzly focus on the stone age institution that is death row, the week's programing ran the gamut from top drawer entertainment to serious and informed discussions of the thorny elements of the problem, elements including penal reform; the question of capital punishment; prisoner rehabilitation; conjugal visits; the Attica tragedy and the racial imbalance between inmates and guards.

Many, many people contributed, including World Heavyweight Champion Joe Frazier, beginning the week with a discussion of his famous bout with Muhammed Ali, his singing career and his devout churchgoing; composer/singer John "Gentle On My Mind" Hartford, with his deep understanding of the sensitivities of the young who see so much that is wrong and so few trying to correct it.

There was Mr. Blues himself, B. B. "The Thrill Is Gone" King, a man who has taken it upon himself to bring some joy into the lives of the despairing, appearing at prisons around the country for concerts, just to let inmates know that someone on the "outside" really does care.

There was special guest, famed trial lawyer F. Lee Bailey, outspoken critic of the system and leader of prison reform advocacy for the American Trial Lawyers Association; millionaire Louis Wolfson, himself imprisoned for some months, and one who has many insights into the nature of the problem; Bennett Cooper, Commissioner, Division of Correction for the State of Ohio, for whom the realities of the situation are a real part of life each day, and Warden Harold J. Cardwell, whose complete interest and cooperation made the series possible.

But making it all work was Phil Donahue, a former newsman who believed that the foundation for the penitentiary telecasts should be a real idea exchange. "Most people agree," he said:

> That our system of penology is in many ways medieval. But change comes slowly and we breed recidivism rather than rehabilitation. One reason that prisons have become so brutal is their isolation from society's view.

Phil Donahue is attempting to insure that "isolation from view" does not become the broad defense for inaction. With the Reverend Billy Graham and B. B. King already set as guests, the Marysville telecasts the week of February 7, like the Ohio State Penitentiary series, are sure to be eye openers.

Phil Donahue sees the prison telecasts as a beginning, after a century of considering the prison the vacuum of society, devoid of checks and balances necessary for order. The result has been a brutal system about which no one cared. From the Phil Donahue Show should come an awareness—an understanding of the problems confronting those involved with our penal institutions—from the hopeless feelings of the inmates, to the equally deep-seated frustrations of prison officials and staffs.

PROPOSED 25-PERCENT INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE WOULD MAKE A MOCKERY OF PHASE II LIMITATION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that the Congress would seriously consider increasing the minimum wage to $2 per hour, or to $2.25 as proposed in the Senate. This proposed 25-percent increase would make a mockery of the Pay Board's guideline which seeks

to limit wage increases to a 5.5-percent level.

Moreover, at a time of relatively high unemployment such a move would, of course, aggravate the problem and pour more fuel on inflationary fires.

I will include as a part of my remarks an article on this subject prepared by the First National City Bank of New York. It contains documented evidence of how such legislation would add to unemployment rolls, including nonwhite teenagers. The article contains this significant statement:

The net effect of previous minimum-wage legislation has been to increase unemployment among unskilled workers, especially nonwhite teenagers where the rate has risen to more than 30 percent.

In order that all Members may read this highly revealing and convincing discussion, it follows:

THE MINIMUM WAGE, OR HOW NOT TO HELP THE POOR

(The net effect of previous minimum-wage legislation has been to increase unemployment among unskilled workers, especially nonwhite teenagers where the rate has risen to more than 30%.)

The impact of minimum wage legislation has gone a long way toward proving that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. No matter how well-meaning the motives of those who supported previous increases in the minimum wage, the result has been monotonously consistent—the low-paid and unskilled have been forced into the ranks of the unemployed.

Despite a plethora of statistics supporting this perverse result, Congress apparently has not got the message. Another increase in the minimum wage has quietly moved through the appropriate Congressional committees. And once again, its proponents appear to be looking only at one side of the labor balance sheet—the income side—and ignoring the other side: employment.

While it is true that those who remain employed receive higher wages, fewer are in fact employed. The higher minimum leads employers to replace unskilled labor with machines and skilled workers, thus increasing the unemployment of the most disadvantaged portion of the labor force and increasing employment opportunities for the more mobile, skill sector. For example, if widget makers are faced with a 25% increase in wages because of a rise in the minimum wage, they may very well invest in automatic widget machines and lay off part of their work force. This will increase the demand for skilled workers to run the widget-making machines and increase the demand for workers to produce them. But most likely the increase in employment of skilled workers will be smaller than the decline in employment of the unskilled. Furthermore, by decreasing employment possibilities, the higher minimum narrows the opportunity for on-the-job training—a route whereby the unskilled can become skilled.

Women, teenagers, nonwhites and particularly nonwhite teenagers are especially hard hit. Before 1956, when the minimum wage was 75¢, the quarterly unemployment rate among nonwhite teenagers ranged between 13% and 18%, several percentage points above the rate for whites. However, within two years after the minimum wage went up 33%, the unemployment rate for white teens rose to 14% while the rate for nonwhite teens jumped to 27%. Since then, three more increases in the minimum have been introduced. And the nonwhite teenage unemployment rate has risen to over 30%, more than twice that for whites.

Part of the rise in the teenage unemployment rate since the middle and late 1950s is attributable to the accelerated growth of the teenage labor force, as the postwar baby crop reached working age. Rigidities and frictions in labor markets have limited the ability of the economy to immediately absorb this flood of young workers.

The relatively high teenage unemployment rates today are partly due to the considerable slack in the economy. Some of the increased unemployment can be attributed to changing cultural values—new attitudes toward work and leisure—among teenagers. But it is difficult to ascribe all of the rise in teenage unemployment in the past 15 years to these demographic, cyclical and cultural forces. The widening unemployment differential between white and black teenagers cannot be ascribed simply to "structural" changes in the labor force. Econometric research on the impact of minimum wages is quite consistent in its findings—the impact on nonwhite teenagers is both large and negative.

In spite of this large and growing body of evidence, Congress is considering two bills, both of which would increase the minimum wage over the next two years. The Williams bill would increase the minimum from the present $1.60 per hour to $2.00 the first year and to $2.25 thereafter, while the Dent bill would increase it to $1.80 and then to $2.00. More importantly, both bills increase substantially the number of workers to be covered by minimum-wage legislation. The combined impact could add several more percentage points to the teenage unemployment rate.

DOUBLE STANDARD—OR NONE?

Congress probably will pass one of these bills, though the Nixon Administration seems to have some trepidation about the effect. Apparently officials are sufficiently impressed with the shockingly high unemployment rate of nonwhite teens and with the effects of past changes in the minimum on this group that they have made it clear that while they favor the increases included in the Dent bill, they would like to see the rate for workers 18 and under remain at $1.60.

There is ample evidence that such a differential, in this case 20% after one year, would have a significant effect in fostering employment opportunities for teenagers. A 1970 study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that the evidence from a variety of sources, including experience in foreign countries, suggests that "a substantial differential between youth and adult rates would increase job opportunities for teenagers." The study went on to say that 20% was a substantial differential.

But if one accepts the logic that the minimum wage makes the unemployment rate higher for some groups than it would otherwise be, and the evidence for this appears to be overwhelming, then why not go all the way and eliminate the legal minimum entirely. Clearly this alternative would run contrary to a strongly held article of political faith. The minimum wage has become an integral part of the conventional wisdom in the fight against poverty and an extensive reeducation program would be required to remove it. Nevertheless, elimination of this legal floor under wages would ease the transition from school to employment and preserve job opportunities that would otherwise disappear. However, abolishing the legal minimum would in no way mean abandoning the fight against poverty. There are more direct means of providing a sufficient income level for all families—if that is what Congress is truly interested in doing.

If that is the case, Congress should seriously consider the advice of Professor James Tobin, a former member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Kennedy, who wrote: "People who lack the capacity to earn a decent living should be helped, but they will not be helped by minimum-wage laws, trade-union pressures or other devices which seeks to compel employers to pay more than their work is worth. The likely outcome of such regulations is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all."

Legal minimum wages, in other words, only complicate the already difficult task of eliminating poverty.

TEXAS REFINING CORPORATION OFFERS OPPORTUNITY TO OLDER CITIZENS

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today in our Nation there are more than 20 million Americans age 65 and over. This is a relatively new phenomenon in our society, and new programs, both in the public and private sectors, will be required if we are to meet the needs of our older citizens.

As the White House Conference on Aging recently pointed out, the most common problem these 20 million Americans face is inadequate income.

Between 1950 and 1960, employment in this Nation reached record rates in the newer and growing industries. Unfortunately, these new industries tended to hire younger workers, and at the same time there was a marked decline in employment in those fields where large numbers of older workers held jobs.

The extreme difficulty the displaced, older workers experienced in obtaining jobs in the newer industries led many to seek early retirement. And at the same time many of the Nation's larger industries adopted mandatory age retirement programs.

According to many of our leading psychiatrists, forced retirement has a deleterious effect upon many older citizens. Not only does this practice contribute to poverty among the elderly, but it also has profound psychological consequences.

Certainly we must never forget that among the 20 million older Americans there are many who have the competence, the physical capacity, and the desire to work.

I am proud to say that one of the companies to have the foresight to see the great contribution these older citizens can continue to make is the Texas Refinery Corp. of Fort Worth, Tex.

The president and chairman of the board of Texas Refinery Corp. is my good friend, Mr. A. M. "Aggie" Pate, Jr., who has established an unusual personnel program that has helped solve the inadequate income problem for a good number of our older citizens.

The Texas Refinery Corp. is a unique Fort Worth manufacturing firm which markets its own products—specialized lubricants, protective coatings, and chemical cleaners—in all 50 States and 100 foreign countries. The Texas Refinery Corp. actively solicits, hires, and trains men and women often considered underproductive by other industries. As Mr. Pate has said:

Many firms spend a small fortune educating and training key individuals, only to turn

them out to pasture at age 65 . . . when they are most valuable in terms of knowledge, skill, and experience. Every time such companies retire one of these men or women, they are helping the Texas Refinery Corporation to accelerate the spectacular growth we are enjoying.

Mr. Pate has remarked:

Age and education are not factors which determine the degree of success which may be achieved through desire and determination.

The Texas Refinery Corp. successfully employs men and women of all ages, skills, and education, and together both they and the company have prospered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD two stories that appeared in the Fort Worth newspapers last month concerning a gathering of the Texas Refinery Corp. employees on the occasion of the company's golden anniversary celebration.

[From the Fort Worth Star Telegram]

SECOND CAREER BRINGS HONOR

(By Martha Hand)

K. C. "Kelly" Williamson of Anchorage, Alaska, at 72, well into the autumn of his life, could have chosen a rocking chair.

Instead, he was honored in Fort Worth Wednesday night for achieving success in a second career.

Williamson is one of some 80 men over 65, who with their wives, are here to help A. M. "Aggie" Pate Jr., president and chairman of the board of Texas Refinery Corp. celebrate the firm's golden anniversary.

For most of his life, Williamson worked for a modest salary.

Born in Aspen, Colo., he worked for a time in Hawaii and then 22 years ago moved to Alaska.

When he reached retirement age, he was earning less than $9,000 annually from the federal government as a Corps of Engineers employee in Alaska.

He and his wife, Mary, had raised their four children and it seemed likely he would settle down.

But TRC, a unique manufacturer of specialized lubricants and chemical cleaners, changed all that.

And Kelly Williamson was destined to help prove Aggie Pate's stubborn theory that mandatory retirement policies of many American industries are, in many cases, a waste.

This year Williamson earned $15,000.

"And you must remember that in Alaska our sales time is cut to half that of the lower 49 states because our weather shuts down activity half the year," Williamson said in an interview at Green Oaks Inn.

Mary Williamson, seated beside him, said she really wouldn't mind having him around the house all the time, retired, except for her own conviction that it would be fatal for him.

"They'd be shoveling dirt on him two days later," interrupted his longtime friend Don Dippert of Tacoma, Wash.

Dippert had no idea that the "best was yet to be" when he retired with the rank of captain in the U.S. Army.

His wife is a Brownwood native and he just happened to read an ad of TRC's in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram as he was en route to take a job with an oil company in Oklahoma.

"Changed my life," said Dippert.

During 1971, Dippert, who is 69, earned well over $40,000 with TRC.

Roy Parker, 70, who says he never managed to make $3,000 a year on his own farm up in East Brookfield, Mass., is another TRC "Golden Years" success story.

So is Ernest Burdine, 67, of Shelbyville, Tenn. and John Nicholson, 67, of Bakersfield, Calif.

Along with some 80 other men and their wives, they were honored at an awards banquet at Green Oaks Inn Wednesday night. The convention will continue through Jan. 2 and the successful commission salesmen will be special guests at the Cotton Bowl game Saturday.

Pate says he likes to hire men and women "at the crossroads of their careers," no matter what their age or education, "provided they have the desire and strength to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps."

Not all of the success stories of Pate's TRC are from the "Medicare Set." One of those honored Wednesday was rookie of the year, Ed "Butch" Cook of Tuscaloosa, Ala., 28.

But Pate feels that many men turned out to pasture at age 65 are "most valuable in terms of knowledge, skill and experience."

He insists desire and determination to make money are traits he looks for, not age or education.

"Every time companies (with mandatory retirement policies) retire one of these men, they are helping to accelerate TRC's spectacular growth. We want men of all ages, education levels and together . . . we will climb new prosperity plateaus," Pate explained Wednesday.

The apparent success of Pate's plan may well start a new trend in American industry, Kelly Williamson believes.

[From the Fort Worth Press]

WIVES LIKE "AUTUMN YEAR" JOBS

(By Drenda Williams)

Mrs. Robert E. Lee is spending New Year's Eve in Fort Worth.

And although her husband isn't the famous general who gained fame during the Civil War, he is one of a group of men who has received world-wide recognition.

Lee is a salesman for Texas Refinery Corp.—one of several salesmen for the company who is in the "autumn of his years."

And the salesman of all ages are in town this weekend for the company's golden anniversary celebration at Green Oaks Inn.

Lee, at 56, really doesn't qualify as a member of the company's "medicare group of salesmen" except that he has been with the company only eight years.

As his wife explains, "It is a little unusual for a 48-year-old man to be switching jobs, and it is equally unusual for a company to hire a man that age."

The slim southern belle also says that the job change has been quite an experience for the family that now lives in Atlanta, Ga.

"I've never seen such an exciting organization—my husband just loves it—and everyone is so happy doing what they're doing."

Mrs. Lee explains that although her husband had been in sales for many years, his business never involved traveling.

"We get to travel a lot now. It is an entirely new life, one many men would not have the courage to accept in the middle years of life."

Another wife whose husband began a sales career even later in life than Lee is Mrs. Roy Parker, of E. Brookfield, Mass.

"My husband was 54 when he sold the farm he had run with his father," recalls Mrs. Parker.

"I didn't think there was any company that would hire a man his age, especially in a field where he had no experience."

That was 16 years ago, and now Parker, at age 70, is one of TRC's top salesmen.

During those 16 years, Mrs. Parker has accompanied her husband on many of his calls, an experience that came in handy when Parker was in the hospital recently.

"I'm not much of a salesman," laughs Mrs. Parker, "but I had ridden along with Roy enough that his customers knew me. When I told them Roy was in the hospital, they gave me orders."

Very proud of her husband's success, Mrs. Parker says she really gets exicted when younger salesmen for the company remark, "We may never be able to keep up with Roy."

Not all wives attending the anniversary meeting, which closes Sunday, have husbands who joined the company late in life.

Dot Cook looks more like somebody's daughter than a wife of a salesman, but she's here to watch her 27-year-old husband Ed receive TRC "Rookie of the Year" honors.

Asked if she feels awkward since many of the salesmen and their families are older, the mother of three explains, "it's just like a big happy family."

THE SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the growing international competition for economic supremacy in the world will be based in the next decade on the extent of a country's technological advancement and leadership.

If our nation is to remain strong economically and be able to improve social conditions as a result, we must maintain and advance our technological advantage.

The space shuttle program is the keystone of our technological progress in the next decade. I support it fully and urge my colleagues to do the same.

A recent editorial of WCBS News Radio strongly backs the space shuttle, for good and strong reasons. I am setting it forth for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress:

SPACE SHUTTLE

The Space Shuttle program will come under heavy fire when it is debated in the Congress. It is already being criticized by many people.

The criticism heard most often is that the money should not be spent on space while there are so many pressing problems on earth.

WCBS disagrees with this reasoning. Vast amounts of money are being poured into the social problems of America. Judging from the results, money alone is not an answer.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has a fiscal 1972 operating budget of some 26 billion dollars. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has a budget of nearly four billion.

Even with these amounts, we are still not close to solving the problems of our cities, of education, of health care and of pollution.

The six-year request for the Shuttle is five-and-a-half billion dollars. This money could be spread over several other agencies. But the impact on their total budgets would be relatively small.

Our social problems are not being solved with the massive amounts of money already being devoted to them. The little extra available if the Shuttle were abandoned would make little difference.

But scrapping the Shuttle would eliminate the long-range benefits we expect to come from the manned space flight program. This is too big a price to pay for what little we would get if the money were dispersed.

NIXON CLEARS THE DECKS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans were encouraged with President Nixon's speech to the Nation about our peace efforts in Southeast Asia. I have read several editorials in newspapers that express confidence in his work and hope in his proposals. One of the best was "Nixon Clears the Decks" which appeared in the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel on January 26. It follows:

NIXON CLEARS THE DECKS

President Nixon's Vietnam speech Tuesday night ought to change a lot of thinking about that frustrating, infernal war and the extraordinary efforts to end it.

The settlement plan he said had been privately offered the North Vietnamese Communists and rejected is eminently fair, even generous.

If the North Vietnamese are half as interested in ending the war as they have been claiming, Nixon gave them the opportunity plus.

If they believe what they have been saying, that they want "self-determination" by the people of South Vietnam, Nixon gave them the chance to get it.

The offer of South Vietnam's President Nguyen Van Thieu and his vice president to resign a month before new elections is more than the Communists of the North had any right to expect.

If, as the Communists say, it is the right of the South Vietnamese to choose, once again, their own leaders, they cannot object to an election supervised by an international agency.

President Nixon said he offered last May to pull out all U.S. and allied forces by a definite date in exchange for the release of all prisoners of war (on both sides) and a cease-fire.

What can be fairer or more practical than that?

The President revealed he has been privately negotiating with the North Vietnamese for 30 months. His latest offers of a settlement have not been rejected, only ignored.

The last contact with the North Vietnamese was Nov. 17, Nixon said. No word since. In that light, he decided to make public details of the secret talks in the hope that this might "break the deadlock."

We have no notion of whether this will succeed—but if you can't get a breakthrough up one street, the only thing to do is try another.

Just a few days ago, the North Vietnamese, while withholding an answer to Nixon's push for negotiations, officially were broadcasting from Hanoi a demand that the United States set a "definite" date for withdrawing all forces "unconditionally."

The United States cannot withdraw "unconditionally." It cannot wholly withdraw without an agreement on the release of the prisoners of war. It cannot, on the way out, wantonly scuttle the Thieu government.

Nixon's course, as he outlined it Tuesday night, is the only honorable, decent course he could follow. And, in view of the obviously deliberate stalement set up by Hanoi, his decision to make public the long series of secret talks was a necessary decision—it just might be productive.

In Washington, and perhaps elsewhere, the first question, of course, was: Why did the President choose this time to reveal the secret and futile talks?

Was it to still the political clamor for a definite date for final withdrawal? No doubt he had that in mind. But read your newspaper; obviously it hasn't altogether had that effect. But his disclosures do make the carping sound pretty puny! And destroy its validity.

Was the timing of this speech politically motivated? All we can say is that it is an election year and the President is a politician.

So what! The job is to get the war ended, American forces home safely and, most important, release of the prisoners of war. Anything which accomplishes that the people can support, political overtones or not. Besides, anything a president does, in any year, invariably has political overtones, intended or suspected.

The essence of it is that the President has been trying. He already has brought home the overwhelming majority of U.S. forces in Vietnam. This has been accomplished, up to now, on a practical although rapid basis, and without loss of honor or betrayal of commitment.

This is one place, despite anything else, where the President has been faithfully keeping a promise. On that basis, we can commend what has been tried and, with confidence, go on hoping for an ultimately wholesome and conclusive solution to this tragic adventure.

A NEW WORLD INDUSTRIAL SAFETY RECORD

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the employees of the Procter & Gamble's Ivorydale soap plant for setting a new world industrial safety record of more than 4½ million man hours without a lost-time accident.

Howard C. Pyle, president of the National Safety Council, presented a plaque to J. B. Bodtker, soap plant manager, and Jack Bond, vice president for the soap plant of Ivorydale's Employees' Representation Association, at a special breakfast at Ivorydale. He called the new record a "National Safety Council standard for the soap and glycerine industry against which the efforts of thousands of other workers will be measured."

Among the honored guests at the breakfast were Cincinnati Mayor Thomas A. Lukens, St. Bernard Mayor Charles M. Young, State Senator Stanley Aronoff, and State Representative Chester T. Cruze.

In messages to the employees, Gov. John J. Gilligan and Senator ROBERT TAFT, Jr., hailed the new record as a significant achievement.

J. M. Ewell, Procter & Gamble vice president-manufacturing and employee relations, extended congratulations on behalf of the company's more than 45,000 employees around the world. Mr. Ewell said:

You have shown us the way and each of our manufacturing people will be following your progress.

The old industry mark was set by Procter & Gamble's Kansas City plant in 1968. The industry record has been held successively for the past 20 years at Procter & Gamble plants at Chicago; Long Beach, Calif; Kansas City, Kans., and now Ivorydale.

NADER REPORTS ON THE STATES "OVERSTATE" AND "OVERSIMPLIFY"

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on past occasions, I expressed my concern over Ralph Nader's distorted attacks on the State of California. He has struck again with the same misstatement and exaggeration, this time at Delaware and the Du Pont family. The San Diego Evening Tribune recently presented a fine editorial analysis of Nader's questionable research techniques and biased motivation in this project and I am pleased to share this editorial with my House colleagues:

NADER REPORTS ON THE STATES "OVERSTATE" AND "OVERSIMPLIFY"

Ralph Nader, who has expanded his crusade against big business to encompass state government, is still unable to conceal his motivating bias against the corporation.

The most recent report prepared by Nader-directed investigators centers on Delaware, which is described in an 800-page study as a "company state." The Du Pont family, which controls the world's largest chemical company from headquarters in Wilmington, is charged with dominating the people, politics and press.

And, as after a recent and equally critical report on California, Nader has been accused of manipulating its content to support preconceived conclusions.

"Every corporate action is attacked, even those in which the company expends large amounts of time and money for community projects," said Du Pont president Charles B. McCoy.

He called the report "one-sided and negative."

Indeed, it is the imbalance of the Nader studies that overshadows valid criticisms, which are often lost among evident inaccuracies and innuendo.

In California, the Nader group concentrated on obvious instances of haphazard development, of which Californians were well aware, and concluded that residents of the state are victims of a conspiracy among legislators, public officials and land speculators.

The Delaware study dwells on the highly-visible presence of a major international corporation in one of the nation's smallest states.

While ascribing to the firm a responsibility to promote the welfare of the capital city and the state, the Nader report views each effort of the company to discharge that responsibility with suspicion.

Du Pont's support of a United Fund drive is attributed to a company desire to manipulate social services for the benefit of the "elite." Participation in a community program to encourage minority businesses is seen as a scheme to keep the federal government out of Delaware.

The chief weakness of the Nader forays into the states, perhaps, is the arrogant assumption that a hasty study by investigative teams of uncertain qualifications justifies recommendations for "corrections."

As McCoy puts it, the Nader reports "grossly overstate the problems" and then "oversimplify proposed solutions."

By attempting to prescribe solutions to complex state problems after a superficial analysis, Nader only undermines his credibility with citizens long-familiar with state woes and long-concerned with the search for answers.

The California study was deplored by Nader supporters who feared that it would negate the many acknowledged gains he had scored in the areas of safety and consumerism.

Early reaction to the Delaware report suggests the fears are warranted.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, my last newsletter for 1971, entitled "Issues for the New Year," said:

Election years are traditionally long on talk and "image," short on action and genuine issues. Election year 1972 seems more likely than ever to follow this pattern. The issues people talk about during a campaign are often not the real issues which concern the hard decisions which must be made if our Republic is to survive and remain free.

I listed the principal real issues, on which hard decisions are desperately needed, as follows:

1. Strengthening our national defense.
2. Knowing our enemy and dealing with him as an enemy.
3. Restoring freedom to our economy.
4. Reducing Federal spending and the Federal deficit.

The character and content of President Nixon's state of the Union message delivered to a joint session of Congress January 20 was almost exactly what I had expected and predicted—and feared—for this election year. Only one of the four issues I listed was even mentioned in the 30-minute address the President gave to Congress and on national television. He said nothing about the nature and lasting threat from our Communist enemy. He said nothing about when or how mandatory price and wage controls will be removed. He said not a word—then—about Federal spending and the Federal deficit.

Price and wage controls were discussed, to be sure, in the 15,000-word written message the President sent to Congress supplementing his briefer oral address, and there was a cautious reference in that lengthy document to the "expansionary budget" submitted January 24, which will be discussed in my next newsletter. It certainly is "expansionary" right now, with the Federal deficit put at an appalling $38.8 billion for the current fiscal year, by far the highest deficit for any fiscal year in all our history except for World War II, which makes the $25 billion deficit of President Johnson's last year in office look almost pennypinching. As Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, said:

> On the domestic front, there does not appear to be a single area in which the President sees no role for the Federal Government. In no field does he advocate ending or even cutting back an existing government program, no matter how ineffective. The march of new bureaucracy, new deficits, and new controls continues without a pause. This, apparently, is what the President's New American Revolution is all about. It seems to me more like the New American Regimentation.

As for communism, that "dirty word" was never uttered. The most that Congress and the public heard from the President about our sworn enemy was that most ancient and tattered of all "liberal" cliches about foreign relations—that though we "have great differences" with "the Peoples Republic of China and the Soviet Union," we must "do everything in our power to insure that we will be able to talk about these differences rather than fight about them."

One might expect that kind of utterly trite oversimplification from a college student or young professor these days, in view of the glaring inadequacies in the education most of them have had where communism is concerned. But it is astonishing to hear it from a man once widely regarded as exceptionally well informed about communism, who as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities—now the Internal Security Committee—helped bring about the conviction of Alger Hiss. Almost the first thing the most elementary objective study of communism reveals is that it is their standard policy to both talk and fight—wherever and whenever they can find anyone gullible enough to trust their word or confused enough to think that something can be gained by talking to and making agreements with them despite their record of breaking agreements more consistently than any other government leaders in history. Have we been "talking about our differences rather than fighting about them" during the last 3 weary years of the war in Vietnam while the Paris "peace talks" ground slowly on, concurrently with the killing? Were we "talking about our differences rather than fighting about them" during the period of almost the same length when the Panmunjom talks went on in Korea, right along with the killing? In fact, the period when we were talking with them the least was also the period of the least fighting, during the years from the end of the Korean war to the Bay of Pigs.

The President did, at long last, mention national defense in a context other than taking pride that we are spending less on it—though he could not refrain from hailing the fact that "for the first time in 20 years, spending on defense has been brought below spending on human resources." He announced an increase in defense spending in his speech to Congress and the Nation, and in the full written state of the Union address spelled out that this was primarily for the purpose of "preserving the sufficiency of our strategic nuclear deterrent, including an allocation of over $900 million to improve our sea-based deterrent force—to build additional missile launching submarines, carrying a new and far more effective missile" as well as replacing more submarine-carried Polaris missiles with the new and improved Poseidon, replacing older land-based missiles with Minuteman III, and deploying the Safeguard antiballistic missile system.

On this one issue, therefore, of the four mentioned earlier, he did take a step in the right direction. But, as Congressman ASHBROOK pointed out:

> The President's message shows no sense of urgency whatever concerning the dangers the United States faces today. This is particularly disturbing in the light of the massive Soviet buildup that began in 1965 and which continues at this moment.

Last August more than 80 Congressmen, many of them respected members of the President's party, took the floor in the House of Representatives to express their deep concern about the rapidly declining defense capabilities of the United States. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, head of the Strategic Air Command, said last year that:

> This country is in greater danger today than it was at the time of Pearl Harbor or at any time, in my judgment, since the eighteenth century.

You would never guess it from hearing or reading the President's state of the Union message.

The one really new subject in the state of the Union message was more bad news for those engaged in what is increasingly becoming a last-ditch fight against the final takeover of our public schools by an elitist educational establishment which hardly bothers to hide its scorn and contempt for the wishes of the American parent. The best remaining weapon in that fight has been "the power of the purse"—the requirement that schools must go to the voters for approval of bond issues and tax rate increases to carry on and extend many of their programs. The almost successful attempt by the education establishment in California several years ago to remove, without public knowledge, the law requiring a public vote on local school tax rate increases showed the importance they see in this roadblock to their ambitions.

After this attempt failed, the California Supreme Court stepped in with its ruling that the entire local property tax for schools is unconstitutional. Two other State courts have followed suit. In his state of the Union message, President Nixon alluded to these three court decisions as giving the "problem" of school property taxes "greater urgency." He said that later in the year he would make "final recommendations for relieving the burden of property taxes and providing both fair and adequate financing for our children's education." The tone of his remarks left little doubt that he will propose a substantial and probably total abandonment of local financing for local schools—another surrender to judicial usurpation of power.

If he does so, his much-applauded statement to Congress immediately afterward, that "local school boards must have control over local schools," will quickly become meaningless. He who pays the piper calls the tune. If local communities do not pay at least a very substantial part of the cost of their own schools, there is no possible way that they can continue to control them. Perhaps, through local school boards, they would still have, on occasion, a choice among different methods by which new educational programs—sex education,

for example—are to be carried out. But the people of the community would lose the option of rejecting the program itself as unnecessary or harmful, by refusing to vote the money for it.

The lines in the President's state of the Union message most disturbing to me came close to the end of it, when he said:

The leadership of America is here today, in this Chamber—the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, the Senate, the House of Representatives. Together, we hold the future of the Nation, and the conscience of the Nation, in our hands.

Do we? Have the American people gone so far down the road to dependence, apathy and centralization of power that their future and their conscience are "held in the hands" of persons in government? If so, government will soon cease to be our servant and become our master.

QUALITY OF LIFE—HUMAN SERVICES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the young people are leading the migration away from the countryside because of lack of opportunities, it was pointed out by Rev. Lawrence C. Gavin, one of the speakers at a recent 10-county seminar on rural development held in Worthington Minn.

Father Gavin pointed out:

If you want to be "where the action is" in Wilmont, you have to be over 55, which most of the town folk are, and be a member of the Senior Citizens' center.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert Father Gavin's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to give my colleagues a better understanding of what is happening in rural America:

QUALITY OF LIFE—HUMAN SERVICES

(By Lawrence C. Gavin)

It may strike you as odd that a clergyman is asked to address a conference on "Crisis in the Cornbelt." Frankly, I am a bit uncomfortable too. However, this very fact that we do not feel fully at ease in one another's meetings, to a degree, pinpoints a problem of our complex society. We tend to divide life into tight compartments and we plan very little communication between these compartments. In fact, the very reason I am before you today is because I objected to the program or the compartments of today's conference. As I listened to the Planning Committee, the farm programs were there; the industrial development programs were there; the continuing education programs were there; the roads, rails and airplanes were there, but people were not there, or here. We tend to use people to develop material resources rather than using material resources to enrich the lives of people.

The problem of the pastor is that he often moves in a very idealistic world, and has little understanding of the basic economic facts of our complex, productive society. The layman tends to proceed as though this is a man's world to be managed according to his own economic theories. Both are in error—this is God's world. God made it. Man is but the manager of God's creation. Man does not proceed as though God did not exist. You may object: "We are not here to talk about God." True, but I have a banner on my wall at home which gives the reason for my introduction. It says, "No where does God come so close to man as in man." And it is that man that is the subject of my presentation. I am not an economist, nor am I a farm specialist. I am the pastor of a farming community, Wilmont, Minnesota. My concern is the well-being of the people of our small places.

The greatest natural resource any place has is its' people. If those people are migrating, or staying and suffering injustice and inequities, there must be a way to solve the crisis. I would like to speak into three areas that need our attention: attitude, communications and cooperation with each other, and planning.

Who are these people? Rather, who do they feel they are in the eyes of the rest of America? An event that happened to me may shed light on this for you. Shortly after being assigned to Wilmont, I attended a church supper at Iona, Minnesota. I was standing in the middle of the church hall visiting when a woman I had worked with in the Winona Council of Catholic Women spotted me. In a very loud voice she said, "Father Gavin, what did you do wrong to get sent out here?" I won't tell you what I did, but beneath the question lies years of conditioning, years of fact and fiction.

Who lives in rural America? Not who used to live here, but who lives here now. Those who stayed. We can marshall a lot of facts and figures to answer that question, but when all finished we will find that people are people, whether rural, urban, or metropolitan, they are basically the same. But wait—all men, indeed, have equal worth, since their worth is determined by their creation and not by their intelligence or place of residence. All men do not have the same capability. The greater the person's capacity, the greater his responsibility to help people of lesser capabilities to assure quality of life.

A spirit of neighborliness built the country side in the early days of our region. I am sure some of you here before me today have heard their grandparents tell of the cooperation in the Adrian Settlement that was started in September, 1877; or the Avoca settlement started in April of 1878, or the John Sweetman Settlement up around Currie in the 1880's. A barn-raising bee or a threshing ring. The same quality of neighborliness is needed today between the farms, the towns and the center cities to built the spirit of our area community.

The rural crisis that faces the nation is due not to a lack of food and fiber, but is due to a breakdown of meaningful relations between people. It is basically a problem of attitude toward our fellow man. Let us just take our attitude toward the poor as an example. First of all, do we really believe we have poor? The answer is NO, we do not believe there are any really poor people. Lew Hudson can write all he wants, and Gerald Hiel can give us all the statistics in the world and we still procrastinate, and hedge around and then finally just refuse to accept the obvious. If one or two or a hundred cases are dropped in our laps we hide behind the old myths, "It is their own fault if they are poor" or "I know a guy who . . .". Before we can have quality of life for all, we have to erase the myths that are dividing us as a people.

I don't know when I have been so disappointed as a year or so ago when it was reported that the President of the United States had requested a famous folk singer to sing "Welfare Cadillac" at a White House party. Thank God the man refused. The perpetrating of such myths on any level is the very heart of our crisis of attitude.

The poor are here—they are the old, and the very young. They are hidden by our greatest asset "Open Space." As often happens, we have stereo-typed all poor in the ghetto. The fact is we have not only more space, but more poor than the ghettos. Only when we accept the fact that they exist and are my brothers, can we then move on.

Move on to what? Finding ways to allow the people who have stayed to grow up if they are children, or be fulfilled by productive lives if they are young adults or adults, and to share being alive if they are our elderly. The Southwest Minnesota Opportunity Council-Community Action Agency has a great philosophy for doing just that. The basic purpose of the Community Action Agency is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, state, private and federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations, and secure the opportunities needed for them to become self-sufficient, or in keeping with the theme of this talk, so they can enjoy fully the quality of life.

If you want to be "where the action is" in Wilmont, you have to be over 55, which most of the town folk are, and be a member of the Senior Citizen's center. As productive as this program is, it could be even more productive of dignity and quality of life if our attitude toward the elderly would change. We have the American know-how to harness the power to shoot man to the moon. Can't we harness the power of our elderly in such a way that their last years may be productive, not of goods for money's sake, although this is a possibility, but productive for human dignity's sake.

The success of the Community Action Agency, Welfare Agency, Health, Housing, any people to people help agencies, depends so much upon "attitude" of the people of this region and of the leaders elected and appointed. It also hinges upon the second area of my presentation.

Bigness and newness are the mood of America. The bigger the better, the newer the nicer. The towns of these ten counties are not big nor are they new. There is a whole school of sociologists who say, "In that case, they will die. They have served their purposes, team-haul towns, sixty minutes from farm to market, and since, cars and trucks have replaced the team, so small towns must die." You and I know these people are right if the small town remains what it was founded to be; the center of trade, the only center of life for its' people, and the farms a team-haul around. These towns were built on a spirit of strong competition and rivalry; one with another, and this may have been necessary. We don't want the small town to lose its' life or its identity, but how do we save them.

It calls for a people who foster goodwill. While they push their own interests, they will do it in a responsible way. They will seek to get ahead, but not at the expense of their neighbor. In all cases, two things are necessary. Each community has to take an honest look at itself, and come to a decision as to what it can really do and be—not all by itself, but in close interdependence on the farms, towns and cities in the sixty-minute area round it. Then in communication and cooperation with those around, be fully alive to what it does best.

The key to life is communication. America is organized on a vertical basis and the lines of communication run from a local unit to a county unit to a state unit to a national unit. There is little horizontal dealing within a county or between counties. Vertical communication makes us dependent upon far away resources. Horizontal communication makes people aware of their interdependence.

The Honorable Ray F. Schisler, Mayor of Worthington, invited the eighty-six mayors

of this ten-county area to a brain-storming session December 6, 1971, at the Worthington Country Club in preparation for this conference. Those present were asked to voice their concerns and needs. The need for better communication between all people was mentioned in all the groups. The other concern that was voiced loud and clear was the lore of political punch, the lore of political power. Present time calls for a people who are willing to face up to reality. If the eighty-six mayors stand alone, they stand little chance of being heard. If all of us are willing to stand together, we can be heard.

We have asked our public officials to come here today to listen to these talks. Why? Not because we are going to tell them something new, but because we are doing it *together*. The three major farm organizations kicked things off this morning through their spokesman, Norman Lawson, and by voice are agreed upon a fourteen-point program. This is a beginning and if we are really honest, we have to come face to face with our sins. Sins on the part of the public and private sectors. One of the purposes of this conference is to show the elected and appointed officials who were invited here today that we do want to speak with a united voice. Town and country people contribute to their own neglect by an unwillingness to face up to realities. There are still significant differences between life on the farm, the small town, the city, and the metropolitan centers. However, it will be more helpful in achieving the goals of this conference and fostering the enrichment of life to emphasize that the people in different places not only need each other, but today are willing to work together.

Communities have the capacity to fulfill different functions, but to do so, self-interest and large community concerns need to be in balance. We need interest groups; we need town pride. These must not be ends in themselves, but means to achieve the development of an area. Loyalty to a place must not stand in the way of meeting basic needs. It is no longer important at what particular geographical spot a high school, hospital, or church is located. The important thing is that educational, health, and church services are accessible to the people so that their needs can be met.

Town and country society is no longer a land area made up of independent family farm units, isolated villages, and towns, each with its own separate social institutions. Today it is one web of human activity tied together into an area complex.

The old image of loyalty to a place and social independence still exists in the mind of many. This image must be replaced by an image which reflects a spirit of involvement and coordination of business efforts, a concern for area development, and an interest in quality communities.

I have tried to draw together three things that may help develop and assure a quality of life for our people in the ten-county area. I would be gravely amiss if I did not speak strongly to the major need. We have made gods, false gods of the "things" of the earth—production, money, possessions, fame, power, and then wonder why we have trouble. The bickering, mistrust and selfishness of all of us has to be put aside. We cannot honestly ask the political sphere for help if we are not open and willing to help each other. The strong must help the weak, not stay weak but grow stronger. If all we are interested in is "building bigger barns" for ourselves at the expense of our fellow men, then we are doomed to fail.

We need roads and plants and crops and education, but for the quality of life of men, all men.

UNITED STATES' FIRST RECOGNITION OF NEED FOR A POWERFUL NAVY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, February 6 is an important date in the history of this Nation. It marks the signing of the treaty of alliance between the United States and France, an association that turned the tide of events during the Revolutionary War giving the Colonial troops the necessary naval presence and manpower to effectively meet the British.

February 6, 1972, we celebrate the 194th anniversary of the alliance. That association represents fulfillment of the recognition by Colonial military leaders of the absolute necessity of a powerful Navy if the war for independence was to be won.

A bond we have today to our history is the continued need of a strong, modern Navy. The United States is more than at any time in its history dependent on its Navy, merchant marine, and water-borne commerce to meets its requirements. A powerful Navy is still essential to a free United States.

During the war the British demonstrated time and again the usefulness of a Navy. The lessons were not lost on the Americans. Lacking a strong Navy of our own we turned to France, winning their support which was formalized in the 1778 signing. The action made possible the British defeat at Yorktown, a reversal of American discouragement with the war's operations, and eventual winning of independence from Britain.

Mr. Speaker, an outstanding article on this subject has been published in the February edition of Sea Power magazine. Author William Humphreys reveals the effective use the British made of "amphibious warfare"; Washington's growing recognition of the need for a powerful Navy; and the great importance Count De Grasse's blocking of Chesapeake Bay of September 15, 1781, was to the outcome of the war. I urge my colleagues to read it.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Sea Power, Feb. 1972]

"A THOUSAND FEINTS"—GEORGE WASHINGTON LEARNS THE LESSON OF SEA POWER AND A FRENCH FLEET TIPS THE BALANCE

(By William J. Humphreys)

William J. Humphreys went to Europe early in 1940 as a war correspondent for the Associated Press. He later joined the New York Herald Tribune and covered Western Europe for that paper until 1960. Until 1967 he ran a public relations office in Paris, when he retired to write a forthcoming book on French intervention in the American Revolution. He now lives in Brittany.

Histories of the American Revolutionary War are long on the valor of its heroes but short on the strategy guiding them, and the emphasis is not a little deceptive.

Needless to say, the dictionaries of the American language contain no words for overstating the bravery with which the outgunned and outmanned Continental Army and Navy outlasted the enemy. But in putting so much stress on battle action, meritorious though it was, and in paying so little attention to planning and operations, with all their setbacks, our chronicles accentuate episodes without telling us how independence was really won.

The most important by-product of this unbalanced approach is the prevailing, landlubber school of history. A basic misconception, where the Revolution is concerned.

This off-target idea is the assumption, when it is not being chauvinistically presented as a contention, that the Revolution's success already had been fully assured before the first French sail was sighted off our shores, in response to the Franco-American Alliance of 1778. This delusion maintains that naval operations were never decisive in the game plan, or high-command strategy. It would have us believe that naval operations were so secondary that victory, apart from its merely political formalities, already had been achieved three years before Yorktown.

George Washington's correspondence as Commander-in-Chief, from Boston in 1775 bidding his officers farewell, is a direct and complete contradiction of this cockleshell opinion.

The vast collection of his daily reflections of the war shows that the longer the struggle lasted, the more convinced the Commander-in-Chief became that disaster was overtaking the Fight for Freedom on a go-it-alone basis.

The justification for this perspective was his growing understanding of how sea power was dictating every strategic turn of the battle. The Revolutionary War was for Washington a progressive education in the imperative need of a French naval presence in American waters both before and after the signing of the Alliance on February 6, 1778.

"WAR FOR AMERICAN DEPENDENCE"

European historians display more awareness of Washington's dire requirements than our own authorities. They do so by prefering the term, "War for American Independence," while "American Revolutionary War," with its built-in suggestion of self-salvation is seldom encountered.

The difference is an accurate reflection of European thought between 1776 and 1783, when Old World high commands saw the Revolution merely as a police action taken by England against a colonial economy which had neither an armaments industry nor convertible currency with which to buy arms. To offset these handicaps, the benevolent intervention of France was held to be essential.

Thus, the War for American Independence engulfing the Revolution as one of its many theaters of operations, was a worldwide naval contest to force England to disperse her fleet and eventually surrender the Anglo-American Colonies. The respected naval thinker, Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, USN, fully appreciated this viewpoint:

". . . the alliance with France and subsequently with Spain brought to the Americans that which they above all needed—a sea power to counterbalance that of England. Will it be too much for American pride to admit that, had France refused to contest control of the sea with England, the latter would have been able to reduce the Atlantic seaboard? Let us not kick down the ladder by which we mounted nor refuse to acknowledge what our fathers felt in their hour of trial."

Washington's writings are an unrelenting and poignant witness to his schooling in this problem limned by Captain Mahan; one of his earliest lessons received in March, 1776, when the British decided to yield Boston to its Patriot besiegers. At that time, Revolutionary spirits were still buoyed up by

the action at Lexington and Concord the previous year. Optimism reigned, but was untutored.

Thus, there were cheers when the enemy garrison sailed away from Boston, even though there were no Patriot warships of sufficient firepower or tonnage to say nay to the departure or even to annoy it. Ashore in Boston, Washington was left under the misapprehension that the British Fleet's destination was New York, where it was logical for him to hope this same force could again be engaged.

NOVA SCOTIA'S LOYALTY

But as he learned to his disadvantage, the English had set their course for Halifax where they used Nova Scotia's loyalty to the Crown to screen the embarkation of reinforcements and provisions for the Battle of Long Island. It was this confrontation within the limits of modern Brooklyn that cost the United States the loss of Manhattan Island and its port—both invaluable to all the enemy's future operations. So deeply did the British dig in there, that they still were in the process of evacuation months after the 1783 peace treaty was signed.

Certainly, the loss of New York City's harbor was a *fortissimo* lecture on the advantage of amphibious operations and the facility with which the enemy could conduct them.

Thereafter, as his own handwriting confirms time and time again, Washington was never unaware of the essential, maritime character of the war. And it was inevitable that he saw that his handicap, the *sine qua non* weapon missing from the United States arsenal and absolutely unobtainable on a purely self-help basis, was a navy. A real navy.

We had none. Not so much as a single ship-of-the-line to defend our coasts or to suggest an incipient battle fleet. That fleet never was and never could be, until victory and independence could give the nation the time to build line-of-battle ships and the expertise to fight them.

On the other side of this coin with an empty face, the legend was capable of staggering men who were both contemplative and intrepid. The enemy of the newly declared United States was internationally rated as the world's only superpower, a distinction that rested exclusively on the Royal Navy's proven reputation of invincibility. None of this reputation was to be impaired by the consecutive losses of New York and Philadelphia and by Washington's inability to offer any effective resistance to these amphibious operations, a technique which his correspondence describes as "naval co-operation."

NEITHER INFORMATION NOR TIME

There had been 150 enemy sails counted when the British appeared off Sandy Hook prior to the Battle of Long Island. When Philadelphia's turn came, 260 vessels had 15,000 troops aboard when they left Staten Island in July, 1777, executed a feint at the mouth of the Delaware, disappeared and then reappeared in the Chesapeake. Obviously, Washington had neither the information nor the time it alone could provide to enable him to oppose the enemy's landing on Maryland's Eastern Shore, at the head of the Elk River.

Hermann Maurice, the Comte de Saxe, a Marshal of France, and one of that nation's more cherished heroes, used to say that his secret for winning battles was "in the legs." But it seems evident that his dictum was intended to apply solely to Fontenoy and other dry-land actions, and not to the footsore pursuit of sea power.

Indeed, it would be surprising if a man of Washington's perception had failed to see that the inviolate mobility of the enemy's troop transports under the Royal Navy's care was imposing a hopeless destiny upon him: always to react without being able to initiate. Nonetheless, the Commander-in-Chief bravely set about defending Philadelphia as best he could. When his line on the Brandywine was turned by the invasion forces, the way to Philadelphia was cleared. Before Washington could fall in his counterattack at Germantown, Cornwallis had already marched into what was then the second largest city in the English-speaking world.

Like Singapore nearly two centuries later, the Delaware River forts that were supposed to defend Philadelphia from a naval assault were taken from the rear.

Once again, England had demonstrated that she had to employ only a fraction of her sea power to preserve the impunity with which her ground troops could be moved up and down the coastline, striking where and when they would.

COMMONSENSE ARGUED

Ships-of-the-line, vessels with 74 guns or more, were the solution to Washington's predicament, but our yards, without peer in the construction of lighter craft, lacked the skills and experience to build the heavyweights capable of interfering with the enemy's freedom of movement. Frigates, a few of which our shipwrights could manage, were the cruisers of the 17th and 18th Centuries. They were speedy enough to run away from the heavier guns of the heavier ships-of-the-line, but it was suicidal for the faster, lighter frigates to dare to stand and trade blows with the dreadnaughts that were able to create. Proof of this shortcoming in our shipbuilding category was the 74-gun *America*. Several years were spent in assembling her, but she was destined never to fire a shot in anger.

Thus common sense argued that our frigates and other vessels should avoid engagements with heavier tonnage.

Before going into action, John Paul Jones and other naval heroes served their country best by scouring the horizons for odds that were no worse than even. Men were easier to replace than the sails they set and the guns they fired. Bluntly inventoried, the American war effort at sea added up to no more than what it was ashore. At best, the struggle consisted of hit-and-run tactics, or the mere harassment of the world's leading industrial and naval power. As such, it might sustain hopes of wringing a settlement of sorts from Parliament, but in the event of England's full mobilization, it could never be expected to exhaust her arsenal and so impose American independence by arms. Only what Washington called "a naval cooperation," a battle fleet strong enough to challenge the English invulnerability to sea, could dignify the American Revolution with a strategy and a chance for outright victory.

Washington's comprehension of this situation was never more apparent than when the enemy convoy of 260 vessels were embarking men and supplies at Staten Island in July, 1777, preparatory to capturing Philadelphia. It was an awesome spectacle. The Congress may be pardoned for nagging Washington to discover the expedition's destination.

But the port of embarkation had been effectively sealed off, and our spies were unable to crack the secret. Accordingly, on July 2nd, Washington was forced to write a note to John Hancock, then President of Congress, that sustained the suspense rather than relieved it. The strain showed in Washington's terse reminder to Hancock that the United States, with no navy of its own, was fighting the formidable sea power of England. "Their Fleet," the Commander-in-Chief wrote, "gives them the most signal advantages, and opportunity of practicing a thousand feints."

DESTINATION STILL UNKNOWN

On July 25th, when Hancock was advised that the Staten Island armada had sailed but that its destination still was unknown, Washington again seized the opportunity to remind Congress that it was up against the world's number 1 maritime nation.

"The amazing advantage the Enemy derive from their Ships and the Command of the Water," Washington wrote, "keeps us in a State of constant perplexity and the most anxious conjecture."

If Philadelphia's fall trumpeted the value of sea power, its deliverance from English hands the following year was no less instructive. Without so much as a solitary Continental trooper knocking at the gates, the British evacuated the city, bag and baggage. The surrender without a fight seemed almost magical. More than 10,000 enemy troops quit their prize with much haste and no dignity. By the morning of June 18, 1778, they were across the Delaware and hurrying across the Jersey flatlands to the safety of their Manhattan Island fortress.

However, it was not magic but *sea power* that explained the precipitous exodus from Philadelphia. France, the number 2 maritime nation, had signed the alliance with the United States the previous February 6th, and there was good reason to believe that Spain, honoring her share of the *Pacte de Famille*, would soon join the other Bourbon Crown.

As soon as London received confirmation March 25th, the fastest frigate in Portsmouth was dispatched to America on a voyage that might be compared with Paul Revere's ride. A paraphrase of the message for urgent delivery in occupied Philadelphia may be fairly stated in the following words:

The French are coming! Their intervention means Admiral d'Estaing's Toulon fleet may have already sailed for the Delaware to sever your own only line of communications. Head for New York! Get out of town before it's too late!

TREATED AS A FAILURE

Our analysts are wont to treat d'Estaing's cruise as a notable failure. They cite his reluctance to storm New York harbor's bristling defenses and his withdrawal from Newport, R.I., after the August hurricane of that year had knocked several of his vessels out of action.

Admiral d'Estaing, whose mere appearance in American waters was later credited with the British withdrawal from Newport, is more kindly treated by the Admiralty and War Office records in London. They are in no doubt about the cause of Philadelphia's bloodless liberation a success story hard to find in our own history books.

In any event, Washington recognized the significance of d'Estaing's rather modest reconnaissance. He became more positive than ever that the salvation of the fight for independence hinged solely on massive intervention by the French Navy. Therefore, he had no hesitation in approving LaFayette's application for a furlough to return to France, when the approach of cold weather ended the 1778 campaigning. Obviously, no one was better qualified than M. le Marquis to plead and in Versailles.

As it had been for hundreds of years, the army was the senior service in France, and it was a comforting thought that Lafayette was not only a part of it but also an established hero of the United States struggle for freedom. If anyone could be articulate about the reason why American battles were holding actions, the veteran of the fiercest ones should be the man of understanding.

M. le Marquis did much more than plead Washington's case. If we may believe his *Memoires*, he deliberately disobeyed Congress in the process. As explained in his own account of his Paris mission, his insubordination was intended because it was the surest way to provide a strategic weight of French naval assistance for the United States.

The *Memoires* explain that Congress was fearful of enmities left over from the French and Indian War, and for this reason, it specifically directed Lafayette not to ask for ground troops to be sent to the United States. French soldiers in the United States could provoke "anxiety and discontent," according to the *Memoires*. Petitioning France to send troops to America was actually a device to circumvent apathy at the topmost level of government, Lafayette's own words relate. They charge that Louis XVI, Vergennes and other ministers did not lead the nation into war but were dragged into it by public opinion.

Since French Army units were officered by nobility like himself, the Marquis was entitled to assume that soldiers going to the United States would be under the command of some of the Versailles Court's favorites, and that once the favorites were ashore in far-off America, the naval support without which the war could not be won would be much easier to obtain.

The *Memoires* speak of the author in the third person, and the Marquis has this to say about his intrigue against his King and Court:

"Lafayette knew that by employing young officers of the Court and by attracting in this way the attention of the French people to this little corps, the Ministers would be forced sooner or later to make use of it by giving it naval superiority on the American coastline."

Sufficient sea power to alter the course of the war, the *Memoires* sdd, had been Lafayette's "principal objective." But other operational claims on the Navy had been making the naval support "difficult to get."

Thus, "it was not achieved before 1781, and then just for a few weeks. The event (i.e. the Battle of the Chesapeake Capes in which Admiral de Grasse made possible the victory at Yorktown) had proved how right Lafayette was to exhort day after day the necessity or naval superiority."

On his return to Boston in April, 1780, after a year's absence, the Marquis brought word that "the little corps" of 5,000 men under Rochambeau soon would follow him across the Atlantic, but there was no Congressional rebuke for his disobedience. There was irony in this development. While Lafayette had been in France trying to wind up the war, it had been winding down in America.

ITS LASTING CONTRIBUTION

The currency of the period, then in the act of coining a lasting contribution to the American language, was "not worth a Continental;" inflation was rampant.

Feeding on the economic misery keeping step with the nearly worthless paper money, discontent was abroad in the land but it had nothing to do with the imminent presence of French soldiers. Moreover, the unrest was not merely a manifestation by civilians, as the mutinies in the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Lines soon were to verify. Not surprisingly then, Washington and Lafayette were most anxious to give immediate employment to the seven French ships-of-the-line escorting Rochambeau's men across the Atlantic to Rhode Island.

As soon as M. le. Comte stepped ashore at Newport in July, 1780, the Marquis de Lafayette was on hand as Washington's welcoming emissary and also to propose a joint attack on New York City without delay, with the seven ships-of-the-line providing the essential naval support. In this way, the war could be won in a single blow, and American resistance saved from sagging into defeatism.

Rochambeau declined, asking for a face-to-face meeting with Washington before deciding any major moves. It was a wise precaution. As Rochambeau had good reason to suspect, the Royal Navy had not been far behind him during his Atlantic crossing. In fact, a squadron under Admiral Graves put into New York just three days after the French convoy's arrival. "The tables were thus completely turned as regards naval supremacy," it is said by noted naval historian Captain Dudley W. Knox, USN (Ret.)

On this account, the Washington-Rochambeau conference at Hartford, Conn., the following September had little to do except to agree formally on the inability of the Franco-American armies to take a decisive action without "a constant naval superiority" to guard against an amphibious operation by the enemy hitting their flanks.

VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO OVERLOOK

As a matter of fact, it was virtually impossible to overlook this fundamental. The participants had to break off their discussions and dash back to their respective stations when a courier dashed in on a lathery horse and reported that Rodney had just enhanced the enemy's naval advantage by dropping anchor in New York harbor. The situation looked more critical than ever. Ever since the conclusion of the Franco-American Alliance, the Royal Navy had been growing at the rate of more than 2,000 seamen each month, and in submission to these and other menacing developments, including the economic and financial plight of all of the original states, the Comte de Rochambeau decided to send his son, the Vicomte, back to France to solicit both hard cash and the Navy.

Lafayette also put his pen to work for the same cause. Writing to Vergennes on January 30th, 1781, he spoke for Washington and others in authority here when he said that "Everyone . . . it is physically impossible for us to support offensive units without ships." For the campaign months ahead in 1781, "a solid maritime superiority" had to be provided in the United States, "the true theater of war."

Like Rochambeau, Washington felt compelled to send a personal representative to France to request a special delivery of specie (coined money) and naval assistance. His instructions to his delegate, Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens, were to lay before Louis XVI and his Ministers the following grim survey of the United States:

"That next to a loan of money a constant naval superiority on these coasts is the object most interesting. This would instantly reduce the enemy to a difficult defensive and, by removing all prospect of extending their acquisitions, would take away the motives for prosecuting the war."

On March 5th, the King's Ministers bowed to the logic of these arguments, and Admiral de Grasse was issued his orders to concert his actions during the summer ahead with the Franco-American armies in the United States.

In preparation of that concert, Washington and Rochambeau paraded their men through cheering throngs of Philadelphians on September 3rd. It was a stunning display of confidence in French naval power, because the Battle of the Chesapeake Capes was not to be fought until two days later.

PROMISE TO SHOW HIS FLAG

As a matter of fact, the trusting generals of the Franco-American coalition did not know then whether de Grasse was weatherbound in the distance or nearby. All they had in hands was the French Admiral's promise to show his flag in the Chesapeake, where Cornwallis was also waiting for naval intervention to save him.

The Allied troops were already south of Philadelphia and its cheers of "On to Yorktown!" and "Vive le Roi!" when word was received near Chester that the French Fleet, led by the 100-gun "Ville de Paris," the flagship, had entered the Bay and was disembarking 4,000 French troops from the West Indies to help Lafayette seal off Yorktown by land.

With one exception, the sea, all of Cornwallis' escape routes were now closed. The trap was almost sprung, and this responsibility was up to de Grasse when the Royal Navy was sighted off Cape Henry with the intention of succoring the Yorktown garrison.

Admiral de Grasse's eagerness to meet the challenge may be measured by the fact he left 90 officers and 1,800 men ashore who were directing the beachhead landing of the West Indian troops. Although this constituted a handicap, which his officers later described as putting them on the defensive, the 24 French ships-of-the-line shot up Admiral Graves' 19 vessels so badly that the English admiral chose to return to New York.

Some historians have compared the Battle of the Chesapeake Capes with the dry-land action at Waterloo, where the rest of Europe gave Napoleon his comeuppance. Others, in the naval tradition, have said that it was more important than Trafalgar, where Nelson died reasserting England's naval superiority over its enemies.

Had Washington lived long enough to form his own opinions about Waterloo or Trafalgar, it seems unlikely that he would have quarreled with any of these analogies. For him Yorktown, coming after the Battle of Chesapeake Capes, must have seemed an anticlimax.

DISPUTED CLAIMS PAYMENT—WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that the Defense Department is planning to allow contractors to collect at least 6 percent annual interest on the final settlement of disputed claims. I fear that this new regulation will be a potentially multi-million-dollar gift to hundreds of defense contractors. The new regulation, which will be part of the ASPR rules, will apply to all new contracts in excess of $1 million.

I have called upon Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird to cancel this new regulation. I believe it is simply a waste of taxpayers' money. If this new regulation goes into effect, a contractor who received a $20 million claim, after 5 years of dispute, would be paid a whopping $6 million in interest alone.

Presently, claims totaling at least $100 million are in dispute. Contractors can attempt to collect claims for any extra cost in the performance of a contract above the original price which allegedly is the fault of the Government.

I believe that this new regulation, in addition to being extremely costly, will have two adverse effects. First, the Government will be tempted to settle some unjustified claims in order to avoid a disputed claim that earns interest. Second, once a claim is considered in dispute, the contractor may hold up a final settlement to increase interest payments.

It is also interesting to note that the defense industry lobby is pressing for a further liberalization of this new and costly loophole. The industry hopes to place interest payments on a sliding scale and change the date at which a contract

is considered in dispute, lengthening the time that the Government must pay interest.

This new regulation and industry's pressure for a liberalization of the regulation is just another sign that the entire claims system is not working. Outstanding claims against the Navy alone total more than $800 million. During fiscal 1971, only 3 out of 86 outstanding claims with the Navy were settled. The system is slow, imprecise, and extraordinarily costly. I believe our claims system needs thorough study and, undoubtedly, a comprehensive reform. This new regulation, which will be enormously expensive, will only encourage more waste in our already mismanaged claims system.

The letter to Secretary Laird follows:

JANUARY 28, 1972.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: I understand that the Department is planning to include in its ASPR rules a provision for the collection of interest on disputed claims by contractors as part of a final settlement.

Under this regulation, as I understand it, the contractor will be able to collect at least 6% interest on settlements of disputed contracts. This provision will apparently apply to all new contracts over $1 million once the regulation is in force. Thus if a contractor received a $20 million claim after five years of dispute, the government would be forced to pay a whopping $6 million in interest alone. That's simply a waste of the taxpayer's money. I believe that this regulation is a mistake and I hope that you will cancel it.

In addition to wasting the taxpayers' money, this new regulation would have two additional adverse effects. First, contracting officers may be tempted to settle some unjustified claims in order to prevent a claim from becoming a disputed claim. Secondly, the contractor may attempt to slow down the process of resolving disputed claims in order to gain larger interest payments.

It is my understanding that the defense industry lobby is pressing for further liberalization of the rule to widen this costly new loophole. The industry hopes to obtain a sliding interest payment schedule that would undoubtedly increase the interest costs. Also, the industry hopes to change the date on which a claim would become eligible for the collection of interest.

Industry's attempt to collect interest I believe is just another sign that the claims system is not working. The Navy, for example, settled only three of 86 outstanding claims in 1971. Over $800 million of claims are currently outstanding against the Navy alone.

After carefully reviewing this new rule I have concluded that, overall the regulation will be enormously expensive and will encourage more waste in an already mismanaged claims system. I hope that the regulation is cancelled.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

BARBOURSVILLE, W. VA., ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION AWARD

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, not once, not twice, but three times in a row, Barboursville Elementary School in Cabell County, W. Va., was designated as a demonstration center by the President's Council on Physical Fitness in recognition of its outstanding program of health and physical education. During 1971, Barboursville Elementary School was one of only 41 elementary schools in the United States to receive such an award and, to my knowledge, the only school in the tri-State area of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio.

This was made possible by the dedication and motivation of a man, a staff, and a fine young student body.

Mr. William T. Tweel, director and instructor at the school, has been a major force in bringing together a spirit of youthful cooperation among the students. Mr. Tweel calls it total group participation and attributes success to the involvement of many adults and students working together.

To Mr. Tweel, to the principal, and staff, to the many young boys and girls, and their parents, we owe a debt of gratitude for bringing out that which is good in our young people.

It is my sincere hope that Barboursville Elementary School will continue to serve as a leader in this program area for the future.

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the January 26 edition of the Northern Virginia Daily of Strasburg, Va., included an excellent editorial on the subject of Federal deficit spending.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "A Deficit Is a Deficit Is a Deficit," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A DEFICIT IS A DEFICIT IS A DEFICIT

The review of the President's annual budget has become an almost predictable routine each year. The monetary requirements of federal agencies grow in direct proportion to the rapidity in which a paternalistic government bores more deeply into the lives of everyone.

Nobody thinks in terms of balanced budgets anymore. In fact, one hardly hears the phrase these days. The people are apparently thoroughly conditioned to the fact that government is expected to spend more than it takes in. It has become a way of government fiscal life.

President Nixon's budget for the fiscal year July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973 is no exception. It calls for outlays of $246.3 billion and income of $220.8 billion. It anticipates a deficit of $25.5 billion which is doubtless conservative. Announced anticipated deficits generally are.

During the current fiscal year the Nixon Administration had estimated the deficit to be $11.6 billion. It is now known it will approach $40 billion. What about the deficit for fiscal 1972–73? Estimated at $25.5 billion, we are willing to wager it will be somewhere closer to $45 billion.

The remarkable thing is that deficits are so commonplace that presidents no longer apologize for them or the fact that almost invariably the final deficit figures overrun estimates. President Nixon even appears to be using this new budget and expected deficit as a campaign talking point, stressing that the "planned deficit would stimulate economic recovery at a proper pace without risking a new wave of inflation."

We do not know exactly what the President means by this because our understanding is precisely to the contrary. We recollect that most economists in the pre-wage-freeze days were saying quite openly and convincingly that it was continued government deficit spending of the past decade or two which is one of the chief causes of today's high point of inflation.

Or, consider this presidential statement: "Deficit spending at this time, like temporary wage and price controls, is strong but necessary medicine. We take that medicine because we need it, not because we like it; as our economy successfully combats unemployment, we will stop taking the medicine well before we become addicted to it."

What is the President really saying? He is telling us that deficits are evil but that he must promise us a whopper at this time, only a temporary one mind you, just enough to give that nasty old economy a needed shot in the arm. When we get things under control, like irritating unemployment, we'll stop "taking the medicine before we become addicted to it."

Who's fooling whom? No hophead was ever more hopelessly addicted to heroin than this country is to deficit financing. The people know this, the politicians know it, and the Administration knows it, so why doesn't the President stop kidding around?

The fact is Congress has been presented with a budget which calls for expending $246.3 billion. We anticipate a deficit of $25.5 billion. It's election year and we can expect to be hearing a lot about the Nixon budget and the promised deficit. Whether it's a good budget or a bad one will be fully debated in the halls of Congress and out in the hinterlands.

Our only advice to candidates, Republicans and Democrats alike, is—voters are not stupid, they can understand a budget. But, more to the point, the voters know that a deficit is a deficit is a deficit is a deficit.

CANCER RESEARCH

HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, the role of cancer research has been the subject of recent interest to the administration and has resulted in a bill just approved by this Chamber. For this reason, I would like to make public recognition of a new project at the Bethesda Naval Hospital which is making a significant contribution in the early diagnosis of lung cancer. A young Navy physician, Lt. Cmdr. Joseph F. Smiddy, has been involved in the development of a new technique for the use of a flexible fiberoptic bronchoscope in the diagnosis of cancer when only minimal symptoms of the disease may be present or where a chest X-ray may only be suspicious of the problem. Dr. Smiddy's work began in 1969 at the University of Kansas. On joining the Navy in 1971 it became evi-

dent to his superiors at the Bethesda Naval Hospital that this was an inspired young man with a revolutionary procedure. Utilizing flexible fiberoptics extensive areas of the lung can be examined for the early findings of tumor. The unique aspects of this procedure consists of the ability to be able to perform the examination easily and comfortably by either a surgeon or internist without the risk of anesthesia and either in the doctor's office or the hospital.

The naval hospital at Bethesda and its senior medical faculty should be highly commended for not only acquiescing in the progress of Dr. Smiddy's work, but strongly encouraging and even sponsoring his activities in the form of a naval research grant. At present, this technique is beyond the research stage and Dr. Smiddy's concern and that of his naval superiors is that this procedure become disseminated throughout the medical community. University research centers, Veterans' Hospitals, National Institutes of Health, and Malcolm Grow USAF Medical Center are actively organizing programs for utilizing this technique. It has even extended to the private communities of Metropolitan Washington. In the Alexandria area, pulmonary physicians have been successfully using this technique for the past 6 months. The Georgetown Medical Center under the leadership of Dr. Sol Katz, is also engaged in a program of training pulmonary physicians in the utilization of the Smiddy procedure. For the record, it has the formidable title of "Transnasal Bronchofiberscopy." For the patient, it represents a potential new lease on life when the early signs of lung cancer may strike. Such techniques as this, and many other forms of progress in cancer, not only need support in basic research, but also support in dissemination of vital information for the medical practitioner to extend to his patient in conquering this dreaded disease.

In closing, I would like to insert in the RECORD Dr. Smiddy's most recent report published in December 1971 in Annals of Internal Medicine:

FLEXIBLE FIBEROPTIC BRONCHOSCOPE

The availability of a flexible fiberoptic bronchoscope has extended the area of the bronchial tree that can be examined, by several orders of branching and with improved quality of image. The controllable tip readily permits examination of the upper lobes. A 1-mm diameter channel permits instillation of anesthetic or lavaging solutions, insertion of brush or forceps biopsy instruments, and aspiration of secretions. Used transnasally, this bronchoscope is now preferred for diagnostic bronchoscopy in our hospital and at the University of Kansas. We are currently training physicians from the National Heart and Lung Institute and Georgetown Hospital who will be using this method in those institutions.

The instrument (Olympus Model FB Bronchofiberscope) and its use have been described (1,2). However, passing the instrument through a previously inserted rigid bronchoscope or endotracheal tube results in patient discomfort and usually requires the specialized facilities associated with conventional rigid bronchoscopy.

As we have reported orally, the instrument can easily be inserted via the nose with greatly improved patient tolerance and no compromise in diagnostic quality. The examination does not require operating room facilities, and the equipment can be taken to the patient's bed.

The technique described is based on our experience in 27 examinations.

After overnight fast the patient is premedicated with atropine and, on occasions, sedation or analgesia. The nose and pharynx are anesthetized by spraying the solution of tetracaise, 0.25 mg/ml, to which 0.06 ml of epinephrine, 1:1,000, is added. The distal end of the instrument is coated with 2 ml of lidocaine jelly. The instrument is passed through the nasopharynx under direct visualization. Two milliliters of the anesthetic solution are injected through the channel onto the vocal cords; the total amount of tetracaine used does not exceed 50 mg. The instrument is passed by direct vision through the cords and into the trachea. Additional anesthetic solution can be added as the instrument is advanced.

All segments of the bronchial tree are examined with the patient seated and his head in a resting position. The controllable tip and small diameter of the instrument make possible direct examination of all segments and most subsegmental bronchi. Suspected areas are photographed in still or motion picture color. Forceps bite biopsy and brushings for culture and cytology are obtained through the channel from appropriate areas.

Patient acceptance of this procedure has been excellent, and there have no significant complications.

THE YOUNG IN BOISE ARE HELPING THE OLD—ELECTRONIC EXPLORER POST 58 IS TO BE COMMENDED

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on two occasions I have commended to my colleagues the work of an organization known as the Friends of the Elderly located in Boise, Idaho.

The Friends of the Elderly have done an outstanding job of providing television sets, radios, phonographs, and other materials to senior citizens in the Boise area. Their work indicates what concerned citizens can do to aid senior citizens in need.

I am pleased today to report that the work of the Friends of the Elderly continues with a new facet added. Electronic Explorer Post No. 58 of Boise has offered its services to this organization in assisting in the repair of donated electronic equipment. The entire Scouting movement has had my strong support since I was a Scout myself. The work of these young men is in the best traditions of Scouting and exemplifies what can be done when people in a community care about the elderly.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Friends of the Elderly Receive Boost From Electronic Explorer Post" which appeared in the Boise paper, the Idaho Statesman, be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

FRIENDS OF ELDERLY RECEIVE BOOST FROM ELECTRONIC EXPLORER POST

A "shot in the arm" has come to the Friends of the Elderly.

Sixteen members of Electronic Explorer Scout Post 58 are at work repairing 135 donated television sets at the Friends' headquarters at 610 Main. The post, led by Ken Maxwell, a facility planner for the telephone company, is sponsored by Mountain Bell Pioneers.

Ernest K. Morehouse, one of the founders of Friends of the Elderly, has been coordinating the supplying of used television sets to elderly persons who do not have them. However, getting the sets in working order has been a problem.

Members of the post work each Thursday repairing the receivers.

Other volunteers who contribute time and work on the sets are Roy Cox, 1410 North Eleventh; and M. C. Huelett, Idanha Hotel.

Morehouse says volunteers are "desperately needed" to assist in the office work to answer the phone, type, and address envelopes between the hours of 1 to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Morehouse said he hoped soon to be able to set up a coffee lounge in the building at 610 Main "so elderly persons can drop in when they are downtown to relax and enjoy themselves."

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, John Locke, the 16th century English philosopher, once advanced the claim that "no man's knowledge here—on earth—can go beyond his experience." Although the theory is perhaps debatable, many of my colleagues will at least agree with the old adage that "experience is often the best teacher."

The international teenage student program—known as Youth for Understanding—is based largely on that premise. It proceeds on the assumption that in the field of international communication, as in other fields, there is no real substitute for personal experience. Communication, in fact, means more than knowledge—it means understanding. As YFU points out:

There is no better way to get acquainted with people of other lands than to live in the same home with them, eat at their table wtih them, and learn to see life as it appears to them.

The idea is not new, but unlike many similar exchange programs, YFU concentrates on the precollege age group. International students of high school age are selected by YFU national committees of other countries to come and live in an American home for periods of 6 to 11 months. Most important, the "homestay" includes study in an American high school—either in public or privately sponsored institutions—and full participation in family, church, and community life. The program is fully interracial and interdenominational in character, and participants are selected, not on the basis of wealth or social position,

but for their leadership potential. In certain cases, students are provided scholarships, either by YFU committees abroad or by such organizations as Lions, Rotary, Kiwanis, and church-affiliated groups. American high school students, in turn, are sent to live in homes abroad under comparable conditions. The learning process is, therefore, a two-way street, extending not only to the participants themselves, but to the host families which receive them.

From 1969 until 1972, for instance, 49 students from my State of Pennsylvania traveled abroad under YFU auspices, while 39 foreign students from countries in Europe, Africa, the Far East, and Latin America have been placed in Pennsylvania homes during the 1971–72 period alone. I am, of course, pleased to note that my fellow Pennsylvanians are actively involved in this worthwhile international effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said that we live today in a constantly "shrinking world"—brought about by rapid technological change. It is also an increasingly dangerous world which confronts the youth of today and the leaders of tomorrow. Those of us who have lived through two World Wars and the subsequent tragedies of Korea and Vietnam have learned one important lesson: The United States cannot exist in isolation from the rest of the world. What takes place abroad has its ultimate effect at home. In this respect, the practical education provided by the YFU experience cannot begin too soon.

I welcome this opportunity to express my support for the Youth for Understanding program, which clearly represents one small but significant step in the right direction.

MILITARY STRENGTH IS VITAL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of this country's most distinguished Russian experts is Col. Irving Salomon, a long-time friend and constituent. Colonel Salomon now devotes his full time as a Kremlin-watcher and for this reason his comments are often timely and succinct. I include his column from the San Diego Union of December 31, 1971, as a part of my remarks:

MILITARY STRENGTH IS VITAL

(By Irving Salomon)

It is very important that everyone should recognize that the Soviet understands and respects only military strength. Lacking in defensive armament, if diplomacy is not backed by defensive armament it goes from possible accommodation to disadvantageous confrontation.

American citizens must realize that the Soviet newly acquired armament has not only greatly nullified our own military potential, but, equally important, also our diplomatic stance. The disparity of our competitive military posture enables the USSR to utilize diplomatic coercion on our allies and bewildered neutrals.

The time has come when American citizens—those not connected with the military—be conscious of our equipment shortcomings. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, even if they appear to be hopeful, in the end will be euphoric.

Unless our own parsimonious armament attitude changes and unless we continue technological developments the threat of a superior enemy force will become even greater.

The administration has begun to recognize our precarious posture. It wants desperately to maintain our present conventional forces.

The attitude among proponents of a weaker American military is not understandable. These people should read recent statements by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, who states unequivocally that increased Soviet armament is a giant step toward a major Soviet diplomatic offensive.

American people insure their lives, homes, cars and many other things. Yet, the most important insurance that protects our way of life is inadequate. If American people were fully aware of our vital military needs there would be very little complaint about added taxes for such purposes.

ERIC E. HILLARY OF DALLAS, TEX., TO REPRESENT BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Dallas, Tex., Eric E. Hillary, has been selected as one of three National Youth Representatives to represent over 6 million members of the Boy Scouts of America in a special report to the President.

Eric, a 19-year-old Eagle Scout, was selected on the basis of his outstanding record in conservation, community affairs, religious and Scouting activities. He became an Eagle Scout in 1969 and has served in several Scouting leadership positions, including senior patrol leader, junior assistant scoutmaster, and others. Eric is a member of Post 998, which is sponsored by St. Luke's Presbyterian Church, and attends the Highland Hills Methodist Church, where he has served as president of the youth usher board and the youth fellowship group. Eric maintained a high scholastic average as a member of the senior class at J. N. Ervin High School. He is presently attending East Texas State University, majoring in radio, TV, and journalism.

As a National Youth Representative, Eric will be made a member of the national executive board of the Boy Scouts of America, a group of volunteer national leaders who establish the organization's policies and programs.

Eric's father, Josh Flannigan, Jr., is employed with the Southern Methodist University in Dallas and his mother, Bernice E. Flannigan, is a teacher.

Eric and the two other National Youth Representatives, accompanied by other Scouting leaders, have spent this week at Scout headquarters in New Jersey, in New York City, and here in Washington. I have had the pleasure of meeting with Eric in my office and of presenting my staff to him.

Eric represents the finest tradition of Boy Scouting and is a young man of whom all of us can be proud.

AREA COOPERATION ESSENTIAL

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the ills of the countryside are of great concern to many of our people. They hold meetings, give speeches, and write editorials about possible solutions to the economic plight of rural America.

An example of this concern is a guest editorial by Rev. Ken Wendinger which recently appeared in the Ortonville Independent and which, with your permission, I insert it in the RECORD:

AREA COOPERATION ESSENTIAL

(By Rev. Ken Wendinger)

Let's go back to the good old days! For those who know me, this is an amazing statement. People 60–70 years ago had some commendable traits that we need to imitate today. Our fathers and grandfathers cut and shocked their grain by themselves or with a hired hand. By and large it was a family affair. But they were smart enough to realize that they had to unite with their neighbors or other families to thresh their grain. A cooperative effort saved them time and money. Now our families are small towns or villages. They are struggling for survival against economic odds and lack of manpower resources.

Our towns in this area must now imitate the spirit of cooperation our grandfathers had. The 1970 census shows that towns with a population of 3,000 are now at the crossroads. Some will increase a little and survive, others will die. For every six farm families that quit, one businessman in town will leave. If Ortonville united with other towns in the area, we could have the resources and potential of a city with 10–12,000 population. Our schools could provide an enlarged curriculum and extra classrooms. An industrial site and its development could become an area project that would benefit everyone in the area. Recreational and cultural opportunities could be made more readily available for all, especially our youth. Farmers need and must support small towns but the businessman must also help the farmer receive a just price for his product. The rivalry and sometimes antagonism that exists between town and country is a luxury we can no longer afford.

What kind of future planning is going on between Ortonville, Clinton, Odessa, Graceville, Big Stone City, Milbank, etc.? Will we insist on duplicating efforts, spend money on identical projects and fail by ourselves because one town is too small to get the job done? Pride in one's town and individualism have their place but they can undermine the welfare of the larger community.

By this time many will have an objection to every proposal offered, like, "You can't cross state and county boundaries, people won't cooperate, or we've never done it that way before." Senator Robert Kennedy is supposed to have used this quotation: "I dream of things that are not, and I ask, why not?"

SENATOR TUNNEY SALUTES MARINE S. SGT. HARVEY WILSON FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO YOUTH

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, one of the great features of our society is the work that individuals in all walks of life, regardless of race, creed, or national origin, do in helping others lead more interesting and meaningful lives.

They find extra time and resources to contribute that something extra, that added ingredient which assures the success of programs, forges good ideas into organizational realities, assists ongoing projects toward better service.

Marine S. Sgt. Harvey R. Wilson is such a man.

He has returned to San Diego following a year's tour of duty in Vietnam, and has now resumed his work there as a community volunteer with his extraordinary commitment, energy, and diligence.

In 1970 the San Diego Junior Chamber of Commerce saw fit to designate him one of the 11 Outstanding Young Men of San Diego in recognition of achievement in his chosen profession and his dedicated service to the growth and progress of the community.

It is unusual for a military careerist to be cited for voluntary work in a local community by the Jaycees. He or she seldom has time, due to rotation in assignment, to establish roots in any one place. His efforts and contributions won such notice that we might tend to overlook the fact that Harvey Wilson is a black man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article printed in Chevron, the weekly publication of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, on Friday, March 6, 1970.

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

DEPOT SERGEANT HONORED BY SAN DIEGO JAYCEES

A Marine Corps Recruit Depot Marine has been honored as one of San Diego's "Outstanding Young Men of the Year—1969" by the San Diego Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Sergeant Harvey R. Wilson was one of 11 young men honored at a banquet Thursday night at the Atlantis Restaurant. The announcement was made by Jaycee vice president Colin W. Wied to the 200 persons who attended the annual Outstanding Young Men banquet.

Robert W. Arnhym was the master of ceremonies for the event and Assemblyman Pete Wilson gave the keynote address.

Born in Chicago in 1936, Sergeant Wilson was raised in Des Moines, Iowa. He has served aboard Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, several times—his first tour as a recruit in February 1953.

Sergeant Wilson said he became involved in community projects in San Diego years ago. "At first I was just around making a few suggestions and giving a few ideas. Gradually I became more involved, first with one thing and then with another."

He estimates that he devotes about 40 hours a week to activities in San Diego besides his regular job as administration chief at the provost marshal's office aboard the depot. He is currently the South Bay District vice chairman of the Boy Scouts of America and has worked as a swimming instructor for children in a "less chance" area. He is a member of the San Diego Jaycees, Masonic Lodge Number 79, the Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity camping committee, the Model Cities Program and the Education and Economic Development Committee.

Explaining why he started "getting involved," Sergeant Wilson said, "I wanted to better prepare my kids, to make them better citizens."

"I have two boys," he continued, "and I wanted to involve them so they would have more than I had. Once I started getting involved I saw things that could be done for other people, especially young people."

"If certain things are made available to young people now, those things will help prevent riots like those in Watts and in Detroit later," he explained. Expanding on the subject he said, "Hopefully, if we can influence all age groups in a project to fit their needs they will not have enough time to become involved in destructive actions."

The sergeant said that when working with people in a less chance area it is important to make the programs and projects relevant to the community. He said that a program's success depends on getting a positive response from people, getting them involved in programs in which they can help themselves.

Sergeant Wilson conceived the idea of a Professional Sports Explorer program for the city's high school age youth. He said that this year he hoped to have programs for youth involving them with San Diego's professional athletic teams, the Rockets, Padres and Chargers.

"Ninety per cent of my time" Sergeant Wilson said, "is spent with the Boy Scouts." He first started working with the Scouts in San Diego in 1967.

His work with the Boy Scouts concerns the Southeast San Diego area. This area is about 58 per cent black and 22 per cent brown. It's a less chance area where the scouting program involves ways below the city average of one out of four boys.

"We're recruiting manpower right now to get the program moving. But our biggest job" he said, "is making scouting relevant to boys in the area with programs on a level with the rest of the community."

Sergeant Wilson explained that most families in Southeast San Diego could not afford to send a boy to a Boy Scout camp during the summer. "We're developing a program for this summer where every boy will be able to go to camp with barracks and hot food."

"To make scouting relevant to these boys, we're going to give them the essentials for survival in the outdoors. It's not going to be a luxurious vacation. They're going to be sleeping under the stars. There may be fresh milk and fresh fruit," he said.

At last year's Boy Scout Jamboree at Farragut State Park in Idaho, Sergeant Wilson was an aide to Archie Moore, one-time light-heavyweight boxing champion, who is a community relations specialist for the national council of the Boy Scouts of America. For his work at the Jamboree Sergeant Wilson was commented by the national council.

Sergeant Wilson has attended Virginia State College, San Diego City College and Southwestern College. He hopes to pursue a liberal arts degree with a concentration in human relations and psychology when he leaves the Marine Corps.

During his 17 years enlistment in the Corps, Sergeant Wilson has toured the Far East, Japan and Okinawa, served with the Fleet Marine Force Pacific Drum and Bugle Corps.

He attended the Defense Language Institute in Washington, D.C. and graduated from SCUBA school at Subic Bay in the Philippines in 1966. He spent a year in Vietnam with Headquarters Company, 4th Marine Regiment and the 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion before returning to the United States in December 1966.

Sergeant Wilson is a recipient of the Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Medal, Presidential Unit Citation, Certificate of Commendation, Pistol Expert Badge, International Shooting Fund Medal, Southeastern Regional Marksman and Combat Action Ribbon.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, California, San Diego, and the Marine Corps are proud of its men like Harvey R. Wilson.

SECRETARY LAIRD INTERVIEWED ON ABC'S "ISSUES AND ANSWERS"

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, to assist Members in their evaluation of the situation with respect to Vietnam, what has taken place and what is contemplated, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the transcript of ABC's "Issues and Answers" program televised last Sunday on which Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird appeared.

Many of the questions were penetrating—the type of questions the American people are asking—and the answers of our able Defense Secretary were forthright.

The transcript follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

(Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird interviewed by Roger Peterson, ABC Pentagon correspondent, and Ted Koppel, ABC diplomatic correspondent)

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Secretary, welcome to Issues and Answers.

There is renewed fighting in South Vietnam today. We've been hearing reports all day. Is this the beginning of the renewed activity you have been predicting all along and if so, how serious is it going to be?

Secretary LAIRD. There has been a buildup opposite the B–3 front, which is Military Region 2 in South Vietnam, which has been noticeable during the last two months. I believe that the South Vietnamese have the capability and the capacity under our Vietnamization program to handle this combat situation. I don't mean by that that they will win every battle, but they will win the vast majority because of the equipment and the training that they presently possess.

Mr. PETERSON. Do you feel that the fighting that's breaking out today and apparently will continue, means that Hanoi will, in effect, reject the President's peace plan?

Secretary LAIRD. I think at this time of year, for the last two or three years, there has been an increase in combat activity and an increase in the aggressiveness of the North Vietnamese. This is not something new but I certainly feel that they will try to have several spectaculars this year, probably some time in February, and undoubtedly again this summer and some time before the Presi-

dential election here in the United States. I am confident that the South Vietnamese have the capability to handle most of these battles. I don't think the people should get into a panic situation simply because the South Vietnamese do conduct several very tough battles during this year.

Mr. KOPPEL. Mr. Secretary, as you have suggested these things do tend to happen seasonally and this is one of the seasons when the North Vietnamese traditionally start moving troops into position. But it is not seasonal for the President of the United States to make the kind of exhaustive and intensive peace proposal that he has just made publicly. Aren't you a little discouraged if the portents, the signs, still seem to be pointing towards an offensive? Doesn't that simply a rejection by the North Vietnamese?

Secretary LAIRD. Not necessarily. As you know, when President Nixon took office there was only one route to end American involvement in Vietnam and of course that was the negotiation route and not much had happened on that route, and so a second track was opened up and that was the Vietnamization program to give the South Vietnamese the capability of handling their own in-country security, to take over the combat responsibility which should be theirs. I believe this program has moved forward on schedule and ahead of schedule in all aspects. And this is one way that we can end American invovement and terminate American involvement in Vietnam should the negotiation track not be successful.

Mr. KOPPEL. I am not questioning now your estimate of the success or relative failures of Vietnamization but the President said the other night, and I would like to quote him accurately, "If the enemy's answer to our peace offer is to step up their military attacks I shall fully meet my responsibility as Commander-in-Chief to protect our remaining troops." Now you better than anyone other than the President would know what he meant by that.

Secretary LAIRD. He means exactly what he says. We will protect the remaining American forces.

Mr. KOPPEL. Do we not have a situation now where the North Vietnamese are threatening American troops? There was an attack today on an American base in the central highlands.

Secretary LAIRD. We will continue to protect those American troops. When President Nixon took office, as you know, the casualties were running as high as 300 a week and those American casualties are down now to averaging less than ten, between zero and ten, in each of the last 16 or 17 weeks. We intend to keep casualties low as far as Americans are concerned as we terminate American involvement in the war.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Secretary, the way that you've been keeping casualties low is through increased bombing——

Secretary LAIRD. The way we kept American casualties low has been the success of the Vietnamization program. We have been withdrawing Americans. When President Nixon took office the troop strength was 549,000; that was the troop ceiling. With the new announcement of President Nixon, the troop strength will be on May 1, 69,000. We have withdrawn over 87 percent of the Americans, Sometimes this is overlooked.

Mr. PETERSON. All right. But now you are down to something like 12 maneuver battalions in Vietnam. How can you protect these remaining Americans other than through airpower, through artillery? Are you going to renew the bombing of North Vietnam?

Secretary LAIRD. We will continue to use American air assets in order to protect the remaining forces. This should be pointed out, that the bombing that has been carried on is substantially less. The tactical air sorties are only 25 percent of the rate that was in existence the year President Nixon took office. B–52 sorties are down to about half. We will certainly keep our options open as far as the use of airpower, but we have continued to live by the understandings, but we have conducted certain protective reaction strikes when our aircraft and when our pilots' lives were placed in jeopardy and we will continue that particular policy as far as Vietnam is concerned.

Mr. PETERSON. Do you rule out any renewed bombing of North Vietnam if Hanoi does not signal in some way that they are willing to accept portions of the President's peace proposal?

Secretary LAIRD. We will protect Americans that remain in Vietnam as we continue our withdrawals. I do not get into advanced planning or advanced operational orders. I believe that this would be a very bad mistake for any Secretary of Defense to engage in that kind of speculation on this kind of a program.

Mr. PETERSON. I remember on your year-end news conference I asked you the same question and you said you did not rule out that possibility. Are you now ruling it out?

Secretary LAIRD. I am not speculating as to what those possibilities might be. I do not believe that we should discuss possible operation orders one way or the other at this particular time. I don't think it serves any useful purpose.

Mr. KOPPEL. Mr. Secretary, one thing that I know concerns you and certainly concerns the American people, is the very outside possibility that at some point you and the President might consider sending American troops back into Vietnam. Could you at least rule that out for us?

Secretary LAIRD. I certainly would rule that out because our program on Vietnamization is turning over the combat responsibilities not only on the ground, which has been turned over to the South Vietnamese, but also the air responsibilities. Many people fail to realize that when President Nixon took office the South Vietnamese combat air power was made up of approximately 250 combat aircraft. The South Vietnamese now have well over one thousand. They have gone forward with a training program, one maintenance program, and the air parts of Vietnamization are moving forward very rapidly and very effectively. It takes a little longer in the air part of Vietnamization because of the training of the pilots, the training of the mechanics, but we are turning over the air responsibilities too in our Vietnamization program.

The fastest way, however, for us to become disengaged in Vietnam is still the negotiating route, and the President this last week has revealed to the world a very adequate and effective negotiating track and I believe that the entire world is aware of the seriousness of the United States to disengage through the negotiating route. Should that fail, however, the Vietnamization program gives us this opportunity to terminate American involvement as soon as the prisoners-of-war issue has been settled and the missing-in-action have been accounted for.

Mr. KOPPEL. Since you have now ruled out the possibility of sending America's troops back in, since we will be down to 69,000 troops by the first of May of this year, that does seem to leave the only option then with renewed air strikes. I mean we are already hitting the North Vietnamese.

Secretary LAIRD. You just don't understand the Vietnamization program because the Vietimization program is giving the capability to the South Vietnamese to handle not only the ground combat responsibility, but also the in-country air responsibility and the logistics responsibility. This program is working. They are taking a hold of this situation.

Now we can't insure the will and the desire of these people, but we can give them the tools, the training and the support that's necessary for them to accomplish this purpose and that's what we've done. Our program is not based on Americans taking over the responsibility, as was the program in 1965–66–67, up to '68. The program was changed in 1969 on instructions of President Nixon.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Secretary, you are going to be down to 69,000 troops in Vietnam by the first of May, is this or could this be an all-volunteer force in Vietnam at that time?

Secretary LAIRD. It's possible that as you get down to a lower level that you could have volunteers. We're moving in the direction of an all-volunteer force world-wide. As you know, one of the things that I was instructed to do by the President of the United States when I became Secretary of Defense was to move toward an all-volunteer force and we have set that as one of our goals of this Administration.

Mr. PETERSON. You had no draft calls in January. You said there was a possibility of no draft calls in February and March. Have you reached a decision on that?

Secretary LAIRD. There will be no draft calls during the first quarter of this calendar year. That will include January, February and March.

Mr. PETERSON. Why not?

Secretary LAID. There are several reasons for it. First, we've had these two substantial pay increases, one that took effect on November 15th, another taking effect on January 1st, which were part of the movement towards an all-volunteer service. We've increased the pay and the projected pay of privates by 399 (299) percent and this is part of our program to move towards an all-volunteer force.

In addition to that, our Vietnamization program has been successful and we're withdrawing people from South Vietnam at the rate now, an average rate of some 23,300 a month.

In addition to that the Congress, in its wisdom, reduced the size of the army by some 50,000 (man years). This means in order to make the average man-year strength that is required under the congressional authorization bill, we will have to let 70,000 people out of the United States Army. So those four reasons are the reasons for no draft calls during the first quarter of calendar year 1972.

I might point out that the President's program to meet this all-volunteer goal has been moving rather rapidly. When he came in draft calls were 300,000, approximately, a year. We went down the next year to 200,000. Last year we were less than a hundred thousand. So we are moving in the direction of accomplishing the goal of President Nixon of a volunteer force.

Mr. PETERSON. Do you have an idea of what the total draft calls will be for this year if there is no draft for the first three months?

Secretary LAIRD. I would not want to make that kind of a projection now because we'll have to see what effect these new pay increases, which total over $3 billion, have upon our recruiting and our retention programs. But we have made a success in moving in the direction of all-volunteerism in the military services and I do think that we've been able to eliminate many of the inequities of the draft system which was also one of the goals of President Nixon.

Mr. KOPPEL. Mr. Secretary, if your plan continues to go according to schedule, under some of the points you have outlined now, would you like to see zero draft calls in April, May and June, for example? Is that something that you are shooting for?

Secretary LAIRD. I would like to reach the goal established by our President just as soon as possible.

Mr. KOPPEL. And that would entail that?

Secretary LAIRD. We would like to meet the goals just as soon as possible but I can't give you a read-out, or an approximation of the effect of these pay increases totaling over $3 billion on retention as far as the Armed Services are concerned.

We also have some problems as far as the National Guard and Reserve. As we apply the total force concept to our planning, as we face the manpower realities and the costs of manpower, the Reserve and the National Guard take on increased importance, and we may have some difficulties in filling these particular billets and that's why we are coming to the Congress with new suggestions in this area in order to make the total force concept work during the period of 1972 and, as we look on, in our five-year planning for the national security needs of this country.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Secretary, do you foresee any possibility that, if you can have a no-draft army, what about a draft for Reserve and National Guard because many of the men join that simply to avoid the draft?

Secretary LAIRD. It's something we have to look at. I would hope that there were other incentives that we could use and experiment with to try to attract young men and women to join the Reserve forces of our country, but we will look at all of these alternatives. It is a problem that we have to face up to as we move towards the zero draft call goal established by President Nixon.

Mr. KOPPEL. Mr. Secretary, there is one loose end I'd like to tie up on Vietnam. Who is providing the military hardware nowadays for North Vietnam? The last estimates I heard suggested that 80 per cent of the hardware was coming from the Soviet Union. Is that figure still essentially accurate?

Secretary LAIRD. Yes. One of, of course, the biggest items coming in is the economic aid. They don't call it military assistance; they call it economic aid and they ship many trucks into North Vietnam. Almost all of those trucks are coming from the Soviet Union, as well as 90 per cent of all of the military aid and other assistance. The key to peace, as far as limiting of supplies in North Vietnam, is in Moscow and I think that most Americans understand that now.

Mr. KOPPEL. I am sure you are going to be making some recommendations to the President before he goes to Moscow. Would that be one of them. That he would exert a little pressure there to get the Soviets to cease and desist?

Secretary LAIRD. This is part of the President's program for peace in the outline that he had to the American people and the world just this last week. He discussed a very thoughtful program of limiting military assistance both to the North and to the South and that is certainly a matter that needs to be considered in the negotiation area.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Secretary, could we move on to your new budget? $83.4 billion, an increase of $6.3 billion over last year's. Last week on this program Senator Mansfield said he would not vote for such a large increase. What do you think your chances are of getting this through Congress?

Secretary LAIRD. I think our chances are very good. These funds are needed and necessary in order for us to keep up with the tremendous momentum that has been shown by the Soviet Union in the arms field during the last few years. This momentum has not decreased; it has continued at a very rapid pace.

Take, for instance, in this budget we have the acceleration of the ULMS program. I testified this week before the House Armed Services and House Appropriations Committees on this program.

The Soviet Union has gone to the point where now under construction and in being they have a larger number of Polaris type submarines than the United States possesses.

Mr. PETERSON. Do they have just 42 or more?

Secretary LAIRD. Approximately 41 or 42, in that general area. This momentum, if they continue it, at the rate of construction that they are going forward with eight to nine a year, this puts them in a very strong position in the year '74, '75 and in that particular time period.

I think that most Americans want us to keep the option open and to accelerate the program so that we can start a construction program in this area. If the Congress approves our supplemental appropriation for $35 million that we have asked for for this fiscal year, plus the $900 million that we are asking for in the 1973 budget, we will have this option open. Admiral Rickover, Admiral Zumwalt, Admiral Smith, Secretary Chafee and others have assured me that if this supplemental request is approved we will be able to go into the architect-engineering contract award and be able to move up the likelihood of our having such a submarine in 18 to 24 months, putting it in the time period of '77–'78 instead of the time period of '78–'79 or '79–'80.

Those 18 to 24 months could be very important. You'll remember very well, I am sure, how important those 18 to 24 months' speed-up in the Polaris program were, to have those Polaris submarines out after the Congress took action at the time President Kennedy had his confrontation with the Soviet Union on the Cuban missile crisis. That action of the Congress was important then. I think the action of the Congress is important now to speed up this program in view of the Russian momentum.

Mr. PETERSON. You talk about the new underwater long-range missile system. If you can get the money from your supplemental budget, if Congress approves the money you're asking for next year, you're saying you can speed the development of this system up about two years?

Secretary LAIRD. Yes, from 18 to 24 months.

Mr. PETERSON. Is there any reason why you shelve what was called "Expo," the long-range Poseidon missile, and decide to go into an entirely new submarine and system instead? The costs are tremendous.

Secretary LAIRD. The costs are tremendous, of course, in any of these systems, but we believe that it is necessary for us to get a submarine system that can operate from ports within the United States, and I believe that this adds to the realism of our deterrent, and the cost differential is not that great when you consider the advantages to the deterrent force of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. It will still be 1976, '77, something like that, before you could have it? '76?

Secretary LAIRD. It would be 1977–'78 instead of the '79–'80 period. Those are the 18 to 24 months. Those are the time frames that I am discussing.

Mr. KOPPEL. Mr. Secretary, have you determined to your own satisfaction yet whether the Russians are indeed building an aircraft carrier? They have always stayed away from that kind of thing in the past.

Secretary LAIRD. They have helicopter carriers in the ASW mode that they do use and exercise not only in the Mediterranean but in other areas.

As far as their building an attack carrier, I can't really give you a definite appraisal on that at this time. We're watching that situation very carefully.

Mr. KOPPEL. Are you concerned about the Russians possibly cashing in their chips with the Indians or the new government of Bangladesh in terms of having a naval base in that part of the world?

Secretary LAIRD. There will be a naval presence. The Soviet Union has had a naval presence for some time in the Indian Ocean. As a matter of fact, today we have two ships in the Indian Ocean. One is the Mobile and the other a destroyer that is operating in that area. I think there is a port call being made and unloading military equipment today in Ceylon, but there will be a Russian presence in the Indian Ocean for some time.

Mr. KOPPEL. I was asking you specifically about a port. Are you concerned that in exchange for all the aid they gave the Indians during the recent crisis, do you think they are going to try to get some kind of port facility in India?

Secretary LAIRD. I think they will try. I don't know how successful they will be.

Mr. KOPPEL. As far as our own presence is concerned, is that going to be a relatively permanent thing now?

Secretary LAIRD. During the last few years, of course, we have operated in the Indian Ocean. It is not a permanent situation as such, as you refer to a task force which we had in there for a few days that has moved out, but we will have operations from time to time in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Secretary, talking about Soviet momentum. What about the missile development? There is all kinds of talk about new holes, new missiles or a hardened site. Do you have any further information now that you can talk about?

Secretary LAIRD. The momentum as far as the SS–11, which is comparable to our Minuteman system; the large missile, the SS–9, which compares with nothing we have in our inventory; that momentum is going forward and the construction is continuing on these new missile sites in the Soviet Union.

Mr. PETERSON. There were reports that they may have about 300 SS–9's.

Secretary LAIRD. In my Defense Report to the Congress which I will be presenting to the Senate Armed Services Committee on the 15th of February, I will go into detail on these systems, along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We will go into detail on the presentation of all of the items in our budget in great detail, as well as the assessment of the Soviet threat as it compares with the Allied strength in the world today.

Mr. PETERSON. Have they made any major strides forward from last year at this time?

Secretary LAIRD. Yes, they are stronger.

Mr. PETERSON. In what areas?

Secretary LAIRD. They are stronger as far as the strategic forces are concerned and also their Navy and in the modernization of their Army.

Mr. KOPPEL. Are we in danger of, in effect—and I hate to use the phrase—of losing the arms race to the Soviets?

Secretary LAIRD. We are in a strong position as far as the United States is concerned at the present time. That danger does present itself in the time period of 1975 and 1976, if we do not take the action that has been recommended by the President of the United States in his budget message to the Congress last week.

Mr. KOPPEL. I don't think we would be fulfilling our obligations if I didn't very quickly ask you this last question before our time is completely up: What are the feelings of the Secretary of Defense on the subject of lady midshipmen, or midshipladies, or whatever we would call them?

Secretary LAIRD. I have always been for women and I would certainly encourage the Congress as a co-equal branch of the government, if they desire to appoint women to these Service schools, they would also have the responsibility to appropriate the funds and the construction money for dormitories and other facilities. Dormitories and these facilities do not exist in our Service schools at the present time and if the Congress wants to go down that road, they have the responsibility to provide the facilities, and they haven't done it thus far.

Mr. KOPPEL. But certainly you are not going to go on record as opposing the idea?

Secretary LAIRD. I would never go on record opposing women.

Mr. KOPPEL. Mr. Secretary, thank you very much for being our guest today on Issues and Answers.

IMPACT OF LONGSHORE STRIKES ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the New York Times, "Dubious Emergency," called to my attention the existence of a study initiated by Office of Management and Budget Director George Shultz while he was still Secretary of Labor. This study casts grave doubt on the argument that the west coast dock strikes are the major inhibition to economic recovery that the administration has been claiming. It specifically states that:

The economic impact of strikes on the economy are usually exaggerated.

I share the concern of countless farmers and ranchers throughout rural America that this strike may have had a negative impact on farm exports. Nonetheless, this study lends me to believe that the administration, and particularly Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, is making a desperate attempt to cover up its miserable failure in agriculture by trying to lay the blame entirely on the dockworkers. This argument does not explain to me why farm prices were at such a dismal low even before the strikes took place.

I have acquired a copy of this study and have been examining it closely. Before legislation is passed which would interfere with the free collective bargaining process Congress should also examine this report. I would like to call to your attention now the summary of findings found in the second chapter of the report.

CHAPTER II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The three longshore strikes studied are those which tied up East Coast and Gulf ports for the periods December 23, 1962–January 27, 1963; January 11–March 6, 1965; and December 20, 1968 to various dates between February 15 and April 13, 1969.

In general, U.S. foreign trade patterns during and after these three periods failed to reveal any long-run effects which could be directly attributed to the strikes. The strikes had no visible impact on the economy as a whole—industrial production, retail sales, national income, or total employment.

The longshore strikes of 1962–63, 1965, and 1968–69 do not appear to have caused any lasting unfavorable shifts in the basic trends of either imports or exports. The general pattern in all three strikes was: Some buildup in both exports and imports in the month before the longshore contract was due to expire and additional building in the month before the Taft-Hartley injunction expired; sharp drops in both exports and imports during the months the ports were closed; and then a significant recovery in the two or three months following the final settlement.

In both 1962–63 and 1965, U.S. exports in total were considerably greater than U.S. imports and the absolute changes in exports were greater than those for imports. In 1968–69, exports and imports were much closer to being equal in total and the absolute change in exports was relatively close to the absolute change in imports. The U.S. merchandise trade balance fluctuated around zero before, during, and after the 1968–69 strike.

Our estimates of average daily net loss in the U.S. trade balance attributable to the strke are about $9–10 million per day in the 1962–63 and 1965 strikes and roughly $3–5 million per day in the 1968–69 strike. The range of the estimated average daily loss in the 1968–69 strike is fairly large because the strike ended in different ports on various dates between February 15 and April 13, 1969. The estimates of the total net loss in the U.S. trade balance are: approximately $350 million in 1962–63; about $450–500 million in 1965; and roughly $250–300 million in 1968–69. None of the total net losses appears large in comparison with total U.S. foreign trade—$41 billion in 1963; $49 billion in 1965, and $70 billion in 1969. The U.S. favorable trade balance was $5.2 billion in 1962, $7.9 billion in 1964 and $1.4 billion in 1968 (includes military assistance grant-aid shipments).

The fact that we have been unable to find a significant impact on the national economy does not mean, of course, that the strike had no impact. Clearly it affected some businesses and ship operators—some of these losses, inconveniences, and increased costs incurred are traced in subsequent sections of the report.

This finding is parallel to that of the Department's 1961 study, "Collective Bargaining in the Basic Steel Industry." In that report one major conclusion is:

"It is our opinion that the economic impact of strikes on the economy are usually seriously exaggerated. Too often the losses of production, employment, and wages are evaluated in a context which assumes that there would have been continuous high-level operation had there been no strike. Such losses, as noted previously, if they are to be placed in a realistic focus, must be weighed over a time span that encompasses a period prior to the strike, the period of the strike, and a period long enough following the strike to permit restoration of inventory. The secondary effects of strikes must be evaluated in a context which recognizes the extent to which industry is subject to seasonal and cyclical forces, the fact that American industry generally operates well below capacity and the fact of inventory accumulation at several stages beyond basic steel itself. Viewed in this perspective most strikes can last much longer (even in an industry as basic as steel) than is generally believed before the economy will be seriously hurt. History in steel indicates that once strikes really begin to be seriously felt over wide segments of the economy, pressure from those affected will in most instances bring about a settlement."

Several factors have contributed to the comparatively small long-run impact of longshore strikes. There is evidence in the data as well as statements from companies deeply involved in foreign trade that there is both activity in anticipation of the strike and a great deal of makeup after the ports reopen. Larger companies in particular tend to spread their anticipatory or defensive actions over a long period of time. The extent of this offset depends on available capacity. For example, the ports were operating near capacity in 1969, making it difficult to clean up the congestion after the strike. This was not so in earlier years.

It is worth noting that the 80 day "grace period" which resulted from the invocation of the Taft-Hartley injunctions, may have contributed to the reduction of the strike impact by providing a clear signal that anticipatory activity was needed and by allowing an appreciable period of time to engage in such activity. At the same time, it is reasonable to expect that similar behavior might occur in anticipation of a threatened strike if it were made clear in advance that a Taft-Hartley injunction would not be sought immediately. Indeed, the evidence of anticipatory buildup in September, the month preceding Taft-Hartley injunctions, lends credibility to this possibility. Moreover, our findings indicate that there is typically as much or more buildup in both imports and exports in the post-strike recovery period as there is in the pre-strike period.

There appears to be no evidence of a permanent loss of export markets because of a strike. Any permanent losses would presumably show up in a slowdown in the rate of growth of either exports or imports not directly traceable to other causes—no such slowdown appears in the data and questioning of both major U.S. exporters and U.S. embassies failed to develop examples of permanent loss of customers or access to markets. This relative stability of markets for goods moving in foreign trade despite the loss of some sales during the strike most likely reflects the high proportion of finished manufacturers in U.S. trade. At present, over two-thirds of U.S. exports and almost 60 percent of imports are finished products, an appreciable share of which are well insulated against the effects of temporary breakdowns in delivery schedules. These goods reflect unique technological developments and patents, brand name maintenance, or consumer acceptance.

The steady growth of the multinational company with extensive international interplant transfers also undoubtedly has an impact on the stability of markets for finished goods. Because their various plants and subsidiaries are, in effect, captive markets, interruptions in the transportation system, such as those caused by strikes, will not generate changes in trade patterns for these companies. Market permanency, however, does not exist for many commercial agricultural products such as soybeans or wheat. These are normally sold on a strictly competitive basis involving price and delivery schedules. Inability to make delivery during strikes is reported to have caused significant losses of specific sales by the U.S., but not any appreciable loss of ability to repenetrate the market once delivery again becomes possible.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY

With few exceptions, such as sugar cane and parts for some foreign vehicles, the strikes did not appear to generate shortages of materials or components in this country. Although waterborne commerce through East and Gulf Coast ports accounts for approximately half of total U.S. trade, the gross declines in trade between November and January, the height of the strike, were only about 35 percent in 1963 and 1965 and 30 percent in 1969. This reflects the fact that some commodities such as petroleum imports and coal exports are not affected by a longshore strike. To a minor degree, some shifting to air and alternate ports occurred.

Major manufacturing firms with significant export markets or reliance on imports indicate that they were generally well prepared and in a position to sit the strike out. These companies experienced some disruption of production and delivery schedules and some loss of profits because of strike-induced higher costs—use of alternate routes or modes of transportation, increased inventory costs, temporarily redundant personnel, loss of sales to better-prepared competitors, and so forth.

Although the national economic impact of a prolonged strike appears to have been minimal, the strikes have severe or even disastrous impacts on some small immediate port neighborhoods and businesses, and on many individuals. The halt in port activity adversely affected small truckers, importers and exporters whose livelihood depends on

a steady flow of merchandise, small retail establishments featuring imported products, and many of the port-supporting groups such as restaurants, bars, and so forth. The extent that the strike may have affected physical health or national safety (security) is difficult to determine. However, the impact on the movement of Department of Defense cargo has been minimal and requests for special treatment based on health or security needs were normally honored.

The most visible impact of a longshore strike is on the oceangoing fleet and its workers. The Maritime Administration estimates that failures to sail cost U.S. merchant seamen about $21 million in potential wages, most of which cannot be made up since there are no means, such as overtime, to recover lost earnings. There have been estimates that it costs around $6,000–$7,000 per day to operate a vessel, even when it is tied up by a strike. At the peak of the 1969 strike, 650 vessels including 185 U.S. ships were tied up in ports—the direct costs to the U.S. vessels were thus over $1 million a day. Some of the costs can be made up when the strike ended by higher revenue from greater ship utilization—cargo already waiting in the ports for ships and faster turn-around times as a result of cargo consolidations. Again, the extent of this makeup depends on how near to capacity the ports and shipping-related companies operate under normal conditions.

Employment can also be affected by a strike. In a full employment situation, however, there tends to be a great deal of labor hoarding and, therefore, few layoffs. This was the case in the 1968–69 strike where the only significant layoffs took place in the sugar refining industry where stockpiles were consumed before the strike ended. There were also a few sporadic layoffs in individual companies because of particular material or component shortages, or lack of business in service industries.

There is also a question as to whether the strike has any effect on the earnings of longshoremen. With the significant exception of the Port of New York, longshoring is frequently only an incidental occupation for an individual, and, based on historical experience, he will have ample opportunities to make up any losses by extended overtime work when the strike is settled. Using Baltimore as an example, in the year ending September 30, 1968, almost 40 percent of the 5,500 registered longshoremen worked less than 100 hours in the year and nearly 50 percent worked less than 700 hours. Only 36 percent of the registered men worked 1,300 or more hours. If 1,800 hours is considered a full year's work (allowing for vacations, holidays, etc.,) less than 20 percent of the Baltimore longshoremen can be considered as regular longshoremen. Except for New York, it is clear that the bulk of the longshoremen are casual workers, and conversations with stevedoring companies, port authorities, and other experienced people lead us to believe that they have ready access to other full-time employment. The regular workers are also in a strong position to be away from the piers for a fairly long period of time at the end of the contract year. Because longshoremen do not work for a single employer, their pay is handled through an employers' group established for this specific purpose. The group collects all fringe benefits from employers and then passes them on to the individual or to the union depending upon the particular benefit. In the case of vacation pay and holiday pay, a regular worker with a history of attachment to the port over the past several years collects a check in December covering these benefits for the contract year which ended on the previous September 30. This check is equal to approximately six weeks of full-time activity. In Baltimore it amounted to over $900. (He may also collect a sizable sugar-handling premium at the same time.) Even if the strike lasts beyond the December bonus of the average regular longshoremen, most have basic skills in handling machinery, etc., and are reported to have little trouble getting temporary jobs.

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, John Campbell, senior research fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, has recently presented an overview of Soviet-American relations in the journal Current History. His article, in the October 1971 issue, discusses these relations in the context of the SALT talks, Europe, the Middle East and the Far East. Mr. Campbell notes that—

The United States has not found a substitute for its 20-year policy of containing Soviet power. The Nixon administration's "doctrine" and the various changes it has made are a part of the search for a new policy. In the Soviet Union, the leadership is also burdened by the past and groping toward the future.

I recommend his article, which follows, to my colleagues.

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

(By John C. Campbell)

(NOTE.—Since 1955 John C. Campbell has been with the Council on Foreign Relations as the director of political studies and senior research fellow. Previously he was with the State Department as a specialist on East Europe and a member of the Policy Planning Staff. His most recent books are *American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe: The Choices Ahead* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965) and *Tito's Separate Road* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).)

What is the focus, in this third year of President Nixon's "era of negotiation," for estimating the state of Soviet-American relations? Does the classic "Soviet threat" still lie at the beginning and the end of America's concerns about national security and foreign policy? The public, in large part, wants to believe that the cold war is over. The skeptical school of thought notes that the Soviet government continues to depict Soviet policies as devoted to the struggle with American imperialism. President Richard Nixon's administration takes a practical middle course. It negotiates on issues where the Kremlin has decided that negotiation is useful. It tries to hold its ground on others where there is no such Soviet disposition to seek agreements. It points with alarm to other issues where the two powers are in danger of open conflict.

The picture is thus mixed. Negotiations on strategic weapons (SALT) go forward with a reasonable chance of agreement. Détente is again in fashion in Europe, but many political problems on which a true détente depends remain unresolved. The Soviets talk about the desirability of getting a settlement in the Middle East but will not play a constructive part in reaching one. The two powers are nowhere near the point where they can discuss on a broad basis how to limit and reconcile their interests in various parts of the world in the interest of greater security for both and for the rest of the world, nor would all welcome as an unmixed blessing an arrangement that looked like a Soviet-American condominium.

A congress of the Soviet Communist party always provides a convenient vehicle to allow the leaders to lay down the general propositions that sum up where they are and where they propose to go.

The 24th Congress, held in March, 1971, which confirmed Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev's status as first among the leaders, also confirmed the stability—some would say the immobilism—of the regime and its major policies. Brezhnev represents the middle-of-the-road domestic policies which have characterized the oligarchic rule of the "superclerks" since they overthrew Nikita Khrushchev in 1964. Such a regime might be effective in pursuing foreign policies already marked by success, but it has not shown much imagination either in new adventures or in a rethinking of its relations with the United States.

On the ideological front, Soviet attitudes evident at the 24th Congress were as harsh as ever. It is not possible to say how much the self-confident hard line of the Soviet leaders was due to their conviction that, as the Soviet Union was growing stronger and more assertive in international affairs, the United States was becoming weaker, unable to sustain its position abroad because of protest and failure at home. Not since the 1930's could the Soviets see so much in America's performance to substantiate the old thesis of capitalist crisis. Because that was the picture being drawn by the best Soviet experts on American affairs,[1] there is at least a strong presumption that it affected the thinking of the top leadership.

Policy, however, is made up of decisions. The thesis of the uncompromising struggle against capitalism has been accompanied for many years by another and allegedly equally Leninist thesis of peaceful coexistence between states with differing political and social systems, which also received its due in the main statements of the 24th Congress. The one other factor, often overlooked, is the degree to which Soviet decisions over the years have been reactions to American decisions.

Looking at the background of American policy, one is struck by certain similarities. Here, too, there exists a body of holy writ, which finds its most recent expression in the President's two "state of the world" messages of 1970 and 1971. They attempt to set forth a consistent United States world policy which retains what is essential from an earlier time, changes old approaches and priorities to fit new conditions, and generally lowers the American "profile." The "Nixon doctrine" themes—cutting down commitments which require United States forces to fight other nations' wars and stressing the need for friends and allies to do more for the common defense because the burden borne by the United States for so long has become too great—were perhaps the minimum concessions that had to be made to a public aroused over Vietnam and the mounting demands on the federal budget. But they were also a response to changes in the world picture and could not disguise what in the eyes of the world, and of Soviet leadership, was a contraction of American power.

What the President said about the Soviet Union itself therefore took on added importance. Some time before reaching the White House he had come to believe that in major matters involving danger of war or cooperation for peace the United States had to look to Moscow. In the proclaimed era of negotiation, direct communication with the Soviet government was to be the means of dealing in the large with the unresolved problems of Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Europe and other areas.

The experience of two years in office has modified the administration's original optimism with regard to how far and how fast

Footnotes at end of article.

confrontation could be replaced by negotiation. The Nixon administration's view of the Soviet Union as of mid-1971 was much like that of its predecessor.[3] It hoped for negotiated settlements; it wished to enlarge the areas of common interest with the Soviets; but it expected no general détente and no slackening of Moscow's efforts to expand Soviet power.

NEGOTIATING FOR ARMS LIMITATION

The Soviet leadership, following the humiliating experience of the Cuban missile crisis, gave the highest priority to achieving parity with the United States in strategic weapons and substantially reached it by the end of the 1960's. Thus the same question was posed to both countries; was it better to go ahead to even higher stages of an uncontrolled competition, with its mounting dangers and colossal cost, or to try to negotiate limits? It took a long time for the two governments to agree to negotiate, but they finally sat down together in Helsinki in November, 1969.

The first tangible sign that some agreement could be reached was the simultaneous announcement by the two governments on May 20, 1971, that they would concentrate on reaching early agreement on anti-ballistic missile systems (ABM) and on certain measures to limit offensive weapons.[3] It was enough of a positive sign to warrant optimism that an accord of some kind would be reached by the end of the year. Agreement on ABM might be relatively easy; the defensive shield around Moscow might be balanced against a similar shield protecting Washington, or comparable systems defending certain offensive missile sites might be allowed, with all other ABM's ruled out.

Just what SALT would produce by way of a detailed treaty might be of less significance than the mere fact of a first agreement on levels of strategic arms. Both sides, of course, had to contemplate the results of failure. A full-scale arms race resumed in the atmosphere of ill feeling attendant upon a breaking off of the negotiations would raise tensions dangerously.

EUROPE

Related questions possibly subject to parallel negotiation include the reduction of force levels and armaments in Europe and new arrangements for security on that continent. In the mid-1960's, the warming atmosphere of detente in Europe encouraged a revival of such talk, but the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 quickly cooled it. Then, after a decent interval, the Warsaw Pact countries began renewing their proposal for a European security conference, with an added reason for doing so—to get Western confirmation of the status quo, including the fait accompli in Czechoslovakia.

Eastern appeals for a security conference, however, were matched by Western proposals for a balanced reduction of force levels in Europe, first put forward at the NATO meeting at Reykjavik in June, 1968.[4] At later meetings in 1970 and 1971 the NATO ministers made the point that a European security conference might be useful if progress could first be made on reduction of forces in Europe and on a Berlin settlement. The Warsaw Pact states rejected the idea of preconditions to holding the conference, but Chairman Brezhnev showed unexpected flexibility when, at the 24th Party Congress, he mentioned the reduction of force levels as a necessary task and, in a speech on May 14, 1971, he said the time had come to start negotiations.[5] The NATO nations welcomed the announcement, but the Soviets did not hurry to begin.

Why all this fencing? For the United States it has long been a vital national interest, shared with the nations of West Europe, that those nations remain free and secure. NATO, the organized expression of that interest, was essential at the time of high tension with the Soviet Union. Now the problem is how to adapt NATO before public support erodes so that it may still provide security and at the same time be helpful in moving Europe toward political settlements which will eventually provide a firmer basis for security.

Soviet aims in Europe, now carried forward under the banner of détente and security, are the reverse: to bring about the eventual withdrawal of American military power, to encourage West European nations to lose interest in NATO, to keep them weak and divided, and bring them to an impotent and controlled neutral status. This latter long-term goal, termed "Finlandization" by some observers, is not publicly proclaimed except by implication. Another set of motives is more immediate and more modest: to hold East Europe within its orbit by winning Western acceptance of the status quo, including the German Democratic Republic.

This purpose lay behind the decision to negotiate the treaty of August 12, 1970, with the Federal Republic of Germany and to enter into talks with the Western powers on Berlin. The chief result of the treaty (and of the West German-Polish treaty of November 20, 1970, and eventual treaty between the two German states) is to eliminate the reunification of Germany as a practical issue and to certify the territorial status quo.

The first test is Berlin. If a satisfactory solution can be found there,[6] then West Germany's treaties with the U.S.S.R. and Poland will be ratified; negotiations on force levels and the European security conference will probably take place; and Europe may enjoy a relative stability unknown since World War II. West Europe has been increasing its trade with both the Soviet Union and East Europe and Washington has now belatedly begun to dismantle the barriers to its trade with the East. The Soviet Union's present desire for a period of relative quiet may be ascribed to a number of reasons. But whatever the relative weight of these reasons, Soviet policy seems to be giving the United States and its West European allies the chance to keep open the channels for future cooperation with the East while working out the not negligible problems which beset the Western community itself.

THE MIDDLE EAST

In the Middle East region, the former imperial powers, Britain and France, have lost almost all influence, leaving the United States and the Soviet Union in a situation of direct rivalry. The involvement of these two powers on opposing sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict has not only heightened the rivalry but has injected a risk of war into each stage of that conflict. As President Nixon said in a portentous statement on July 1, 1970, the Middle East was a more dangerous area than Southeast Asia because the two superpowers were in direct confrontation and were therefore flirting with the peril of a major war.[7] Perhaps he was overstating it, but his words were spoken under the shock of a bold Soviet move, the commitment of Soviet combat personnel (missile crews and aircraft pilots) to the active defense of Egypt against the strikes of the Israeli air force.

Much of the danger in the Middle East came from the absence of clearly defined limits between the two alliance systems. The United States had treaty commitments to Greece and Turkey as members of NATO and a less definite commitment to the defense of Iran. But the Soviets, while improving their own relations with those northern tier countries, had bypassed them to move into the eastern Mediterranean and the Arab world where they had established strong military and political positions. They turned an area which for decades had been under Western influence into one of open competition in which the momentum of an ever-increasing Soviet presence threatened established Western positions.

The Soviet naval squadron in the Mediterranean grew from next to nothing in 1965 to a force which at times reached 60 vessels and by 1971 was a major factor in the balance of power. Although it was still no match in combat strength for the United States Sixth Fleet, its presence had to be taken into account both as a military instrument and as a political influence on littoral countries. Moreover, as the Soviets gained the use of both naval and air facilities in both Egypt and Syria, they went a long distance toward nullifying the advantage the Sixth Fleet held by virtue of its carrier-based air power. Supplemented by the dominant military position the Soviets gained in Egypt through their combat personnel and some 10,000 advisers there, the growing Soviet naval power challenged both the United States and its NATO allies for whom the Mediterranean was both a frontier and a lifeline for the supply of oil.

The Kremlin's advocacy of the cause of the radical Arab states in the Arab-Israeli and inter-Arab disputes had one purpose: to bring the Soviet Union into the Middle East and to keep it there. United States policies of supporting Israel, keeping Arab friends and trying to promote an Arab-Israeli settlement had a number of purposes, but the principal aim was to check the advance of Soviet power into the region. Both powers supported United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967, which laid down the principles for an Arab-Israeli settlement.

During the course of 1969, the United States and the U.S.S.R. conducted a bilateral discourse on an Arab-Israeli settlement and at the same time took part in four-power talks with the other two concerned members of the Security Council, Britain and France. The Soviet-American negotiations produced a number of agreed points toward a plan which could be recommended presumably through U.N. Representative Gunnar Jarring, to the parties. But other points were not settled, and as the negotiations came to their sorry end, the Soviets denied their acceptance of points the American side considered as already settled.

The developments of 1970, during which the Israeli-Egyptian battlefront largely determined the pace and character of the diplomacy, drew the two powers into sharper confrontation. Israel's air war provoked U.A.R. President Gamal Abdel Nasser's call for help to Moscow, which in turn provoked the sending of Soviet combat personnel to Egypt. Then the remarkable success of United States Secretary William Rogers in getting both Egypt and Israel to accept a cease-fire, presumably with the benevolent support of the Soviet Union, seemed to give all sides a breathing space after a period of unpredictable danger. But the benefit to Soviet-American relations was dissipated almost immediately in the controversy over the introduction of Soviet missiles on the Egyptian side in the Suez Canal area. As far as the United States was concerned, this action was a deliberate violation of an agreement by Egypt and the Soviet Union. Although new American arms credits to Israel eased the situation, the setback to the prospects of Soviet-American negotiation and cooperation was unmistakable.

"Does the Soviet government want a settlement in the Middle East?" is a frequently asked question. Publicly and privately Soviet representatives have given an affirmative answer. But the Soviet Union is determined not to be outflanked on the Arab side. It wants to maintain its military presence in Egypt to preserve a relationship which keeps that country looking to Moscow for political guidance and arms. Much as Moscow wants the Suez Canal open for its own reasons, it does not intend to see the United States succeed in removing the main reason for Egypt's de-

Footnotes at end of article.

pendence on the Soviet Union—the continuing Arab-Israeli dispute.

The Arab-Israeli affair, of course, is not the only play running in the Middle Eastern theater. Elsewhere in the region the Kremlin has also been asserting its interest and its presence. With Turkey it has continued its policy of détente adopted in the mid-1960's, hoping that the downward trend in United States-Turkish relations would push the Turks away from NATO toward neutralism. In the area of the Persian Gulf, the Soviets have combined a cooperative relationship with Iran with continued patronage of Iran's unfriendly neighbor Iraq, which had a revolutionary potential among the small Arab emirates on the Gulf. They gave no indication that Soviet power would somehow move into the gulf when British power made its formal exit before the end of 1971, but there is no question of the liveliness of the Soviet interest.[8] A modest entry in the Middle East oil industry and visits of Soviet naval units to the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf attest to it further.

THE FAR EAST

At the center of the Asian equation is China, a great power by virtue of her size and her nuclear capability. And next to China is Japan, possessing economic strength which makes her potentially a great power indeed. In the days when Japan was a ward of the United States and China was a junior ally of the U.S.S.R., the theory of the bipolar world bore some relation to the realities of power politics in Asia. Now the Soviet Union and China wage their own cold war. Most important, they face each other in armed hostility along the longest land frontier in the world.

In this situation, it is noteworthy that the Soviet Union's détente policy in Europe helped it to concentrate massive military forces on the Chinese border, to compel China to negotiate on frontier disputes under threat of war (as it did in 1969), and to keep that pressure on indefinitely. China, for her part, could not feel secure when she faced military threats from the Russians in the north and from the Americans in the south; thus, when it was clear to Peking that the Americans were leaving Vietnam, the United States became eligible as a counterweight to the enemy in the north and to a resurgent Japan. It was also true that the United States would be in a far more favorable position in dealing with either of the other points of the triangle if it were in normal contact, able to negotiate and find common interests, with the other. The American decision to accept Communist China as a reality of international life was overdue. The announcement of the President's visit was an extra flourish which gave added emphasis to the new shape of an old game called balance of power.

In other parts of Asia, American and Soviet policies are in conflict but not in the old sense of a two-sided cold war. The Soviet Union would like to see a weakening of the United States' ties with Japan, but Japan is no third-world vacuum. The Soviets have had little leverage either in the economic deals they have offered or in the activities of the Japanese Communist party.

In Vietnam, the United States and the U.S.S.R. have fueled opposite sides of the war, but it is instructive that in the past few years the United States has found itself appealing for Moscow's help in persuading Hanoi to give acceptable terms for withdrawal. Moscow did not have that kind of influence in Hanoi, and what influence the Soviet leadership had it wished to expend for itself in its rivalry with China. It was also useful to have the war drag on to drain American attention and resources from other places and to feed the fires of isolationism. And the United States, which in seeking a way out of Vietnam has been concerned with many factors, may have been least concerned over advantages for the Soviet Union.

Again, in South Asia, the pattern has been shifting. Since the India-Pakistan war of 1965 the Soviet Union and the United States have had nearly parallel policies, trying to keep some standing with both sides and to discourage a renewal of the war. But China is also in the picture as a friend of Pakistan and as a potential enemy of India. The United States chose not to undertake large-scale arming of India, and the Soviet Union became the major supplier, gaining correspondingly in influence. When the crisis over East Pakistan burst into violence in the spring of 1971, these trends were intensified. China expressed her support of the Pakistan government. The United States lost influence in India because it refused to condemn Pakistan and cut off aid. The Soviet Union sacrificed its position in Pakistan in order to seize the opportunity to become the principal patron and supporter of India, a position made formal and projected for 20 years by a treaty signed on August 9, 1971.

THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE

Was this step, coming soon after the Soviet-Egyptian 15-year treaty of May 27, the sign of a new Soviet approach? It called to mind an earlier Soviet proposal for a collective security system of Asian states including the U.S.S.R. and presumably aimed against China and the United States.[9]

Great uncertainties exist in both countries regarding the future of their relations. The United States has not found a substitute for its 20-year policy of containing Soviet power. The Nixon administration's "doctrine" and the various changes it has made are a part of the search for a new policy. In the Soviet Union, the leadership is also burdened by the past and groping toward the future.

Both sides now appear to accept the general proposition that war on the grand scale is not a rational proposition. Both know that the use of force on a lesser scale cannot be ruled out. They also know they have a common interest in keeping violence within safe bounds, but they have not had the statesmanship to find sure ways of doing so.

The Soviet Union, despite the security inherent in its strength, is capable of violent action. It is troubled by the old nightmare of encirclement, now in a new capitalist-Communist form. Within the "world socialist system," so central to its view of the future, its former unchallenged dominance has been beset by sectarians of the right (Yugoslavia) and of the left (China). A military move against either, with all its dangers to world peace, cannot be excluded. The new Soviet role of global power may bring involvements which come to be seen as vital interests, a situation combining inflexibility with a high risk of war. Nor is it impossible that the United States, if it sees itself being pushed by the Soviets out of areas deemed of vital importance, will resort to force on the ground of "better now than later."

Working in the other direction is the tendency in both countries to see their direct confrontation as receding from the central place in their respective foreign policies. China and Japan and perhaps a united West Europe are coming on the stage as major actors. Countries of the third world have proved to be beyond control by outside powers, or not worth fighting about. Finally, with the passage of time the problems change. The difficulty is that the Soviet Union and the United States, being largely self-contained and parochial societies, may be the last to recognize the change.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See A. Arbatov, "Administratsiia Niksona u seredny distantsii," *S.Sh.A*, August, 1970, pp. 3–16.

[2] For differences in tone between the President's messages of 1970 and 1971, see Zbigniew Brezezinski, "Half Past Nixon," *Foreign Policy*, Summer, 1971, pp. 6–7.

[3] *Department of State Bulletin*, June 7, 1971, pp. 741–742.

[4] Final communique, Ministerial Session, issued June 27, 1968.

[5] *24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 30–April 9, 1971: Documents* (Moscow: Novosti, 1971, p. 28); *Pravda*, May 15, 1971.

[6] *Ed. Note:* The draft agreement signed by ambassadors of the U.S., the U.S.S.R., Britain and France on September 3, 1971, is a major step in this direction.

[7] *Department of State Bulletin*, July 27, 1970, p. 113.

[8] See for background, *The Gulf: Implications of British Withdrawal* (Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1969).

[9] Hemen Ray, "Soviet Diplomacy in Asia," *Problems of Communism*, March/April, 1970, pp. 46–49.

THE DEATH OF MAHALIA JACKSON

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, several days have passed since the death of our beloved Mahalia Jackson and we can now speak of her without the consuming emotionalism that burst from our hurting hearts. Instead we can give thanks and praise for the wondrous gifts she brought from a people to give to the world.

Mahalia Jackson died last Thursday, January 27, at the Little Company of Mary Hospital just outside of Chicago. As a legacy, she brought into prominence America's first folk songs the gospel spiritual—a music form that sings of pathos and joy, and portrays the spiritual richness created in spite of the deprivation of a people's rights.

This Congress and all America can rejoice in the fact that out of the poverty and bitterness of the ghettos of Louisiana, Mahalia Jackson could rise through her gift of singing to appear before Presidents and kings. For in a very clear manner, Mahalia was an appointed queen in her own right and one of this country's most loved and respected envoys.

She loved her God, she loved her country, she loved her people, and in all her 60 years, she made not one enemy for she knew no wrong. Mahalia was a woman deeply committed to her beliefs. Often during the rise of her career she refused requests to sing the more popular songs that would have led to even more fame and fortune, for her commitment was to God. Even upon reaching the height of her career she still appeared annually at the National Baptist Convention, for her commitment was to her religion. Her close association with Dr. Martin Luther King, in the struggle toward full freedom is evidence of her commitment to her people.

Mahalia Jackson was a woman of whom this country can be very proud. She will not be forgotten, because her music will live forever in the hearts and souls of thousands of Americans who loved her.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close on a more personal note. I knew Mahalia Jackson well. I felt privileged to have

known her as a friend. I am a member of the board of directors of the Mahalia Jackson Youth Foundation. She knew that she could call upon me at any time and I felt honored that she did. The country has experienced the loss of a great and dedicated person. The tragedy for me is more personal. I have lost a friend.

SUPPORT FOR STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT NEARS A MAJORITY

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years ago I first proposed that the House of Representatives reorganize itself to the task of eliminating environmental degradation in the United States. I proposed, to this end, the establishment of a standing Committee on the Environment with jurisdiction to consider legislation on the subjects of air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, noise pollution, herbicide and pesticide abuse, and weather modification.

At the time I realized the establishment of a new standing committee would not be an easy task. Only two new standing committees have been created since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Nevertheless, I felt a new committee was necessary in this case, because we had clearly reached the point where the national interest demanded an orderly, cohesive assault on environmental problems. While it was becoming more and more apparent that the various environmental degradation problems are closely interrelated, legislation treating these problems was being referred to a myriad of committees and subcommittees.

Today, I am again reintroducing legislation to create a standing Committee on the Environment. Nineteen of my distinguished colleagues are joining in cosponsorship, bringing to 203 the number of Congressmen who have sponsored or cosponsored identical resolutions. These Members represent 43 States and the District of Columbia. They include large numbers from both political parties, and perhaps most significantly of all, they serve on all of the 21 present standing committees of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has arrived for the House to act on this proposal. In both 1970 and 1971, the House passed a joint resolution to establish a nonlegislative Joint Committee on the Environment. Along with the overwhelming majority of the membership of this distinguished body, I supported that measure as an interim step in the effort to upgrade the quality of our environment. Unfortunately the joint committee still is not a reality. Even if it were, it would only have study and advisory functions, and its membership would consist largely of committee chairmen and ranking minority members who already carry extremely heavy loads with their present assignments.

The magnitude of the vote on the Joint Committee proposal has amply demonstrated this body's awareness of the problems caused by trying to resolve environmental problems within the framework of our existing committee structure. Rather than waiting indefinitely for a joint committee, why not face the problem squarely with the establishment of a standing Committee on the Environment in the House. Hopefully, the other body will eventually follow suit, but let us not delay further in answering the need for better environmental legislation.

A single standing committee would have numerous advantages over the present approach to environmental problems. Its members would be chiefly concerned with the subject of environmental degradation. They would have the benefit of a professional staff whose chief efforts would be directed to environmental matters. Especially important, they could view our environmental problems from a broad perspective, taking care to not attack one form of pollution by generating another of greater magnitude.

No other single step, Mr. Speaker, could do more to bring this body into the forefront of the crusade to upgrade our physical environment than to establish the standing committee I advocate. For many years I have contended that Congress should be innovative, and that it should not merely react in the fight to preserve our earth, its waters, and its atmosphere. But, to do this, our committee structure must reflect the nature of the problem. Only then will we be in a position to fulfill our obligation to leave the earth, its atmosphere and waters in better condition than we found them.

TRANSPORTATION STRIKE LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) and a bipartisan group of 58 cosponsors in introducing H.R. 12848, a bill to provide permanent mechanisms for handling labor disputes in the transportation industry. I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan on his untiring and diligent efforts to develop sound and workable legislation in this area. This bill is similar in many respects to the administration's Crippling Strikes Prevention Act with the exception that the administration bill would bring all transportation industries under Taft-Hartley, whereas the Harvey bill amends both the Railway Labor Act and Taft-Hartley. Both bills would increase the arsenal of weapons available to the President in dealing with an emergency strike situation in the transportation industry.

I think it is significant to note that the administration's bill has been pending before Congress for 2 years now with no action being taken. In the meantime, we have had a series of crippling strikes, the most serious being the dock strikes which have caused untold damage to our Nation, especially to exporters and farmers. The fact that we are now confronted with the distasteful task of attempting to end the west coast dock strike by legislation authorizing compulsory arbitration vividly demonstrates the need to devise a more comprehensive and permanent approach to settling these disputes, and the folly of trying to deal with each on an eleventh hour, ad hoc basis. The time has come for this Congress to divorce itself once and for all from this crisis mismanagement mentality and develop a more rational and effective means of handling these problems. I therefore urge immediate and favorable consideration of the legislation we are introducing. The American people will no longer tolerate inaction and delays in this vital area.

TOCKS ISLAND DAM PROJECT

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD today two letters concerning the Tocks Island Dam project.

The first, from Senator CLIFFORD CASE to Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality, sets forth the requirements that should be met before approval can be given to the project.

The second, I wrote to Chairman Train on December 6. This letter points out the many unanswered questions concerning the effect of the project on the lower Delaware River.

Both letters underscore the need for considerable further study by the Army Corps of Engineers before any construction should be allowed to begin.

The letters follow:

DECEMBER 6, 1971.

Chairman RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Council on Environmental Quality,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you for your letter of November 16th regarding earlier correspondence on the Tocks Island Dam Project. I certainly want to commend you for taking the judicious action which you did. I think that your decision to postpone construction activity on the dam is a landmark for the success of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I would, however, like to draw your attention to a facet of the Tocks Island Project which has become obscured due to the focus of attention on the eutrophic potential of the water impounded by the dam.

You may recall that in May, I testified along with Dr. William Gaither, Dean of the College of Marine Studies at the University of Delaware, as to the necessity of studying the potential downstream effects of the dam.

Dr. Gaither, in his testimony, pointed out five major areas of concern in the Delaware Bay which had not yet been adequately studied. They are identified in the attached copy of his testimony.

Upon reading the most recent draft of the Corps of Engineers Environmental Impact Statement, it is evident that these possibilities still have not been studied in the Delaware Bay.

I would hope that before any construction is started, the Corps of Engineers would examine the downstream effects where the benefits of the dam are the least and where the potential for damage is the greatest.

In your letter of April 7, 1971 to Robert Jordon, you cited the need for conducting a study which would include an examination of the primary and secondary effects of the dam. In light of the potential for damages to the Delaware Bay by this dam, I consider it vital that the Corps study the secondary effects, such as those posed by Dr. Gaither in his testimony.

Sincerely,

PIERRE S. DU PONT IV,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 14, 1972.

Hon. RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRAIN: Following our recent conversation, I should like to summarize my own position and my understanding of the position of the Environmental Quality Council and the Environmental Protection Agency in regard to the proposed Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir project.

I do not oppose the project as such, and I understand that the Council and the Agency do not oppose it either. But the Council and the Agency and I are opposed to the project unless serious environmental questions which have been raised in regard to it are satisfactorily resolved.

In the Agency's December 17th letter to the Army Corps of Engineers, the Agency points out that full provision must be made for protection of the environment of the area before any construction is begun. This is especially important since there have been reports that the Corps of Engineers would like to move ahead with the advertising for bids as soon as possible.

Among the environmental dangers perhaps the most serious is that, if the waters are impounded in a reservoir, as presently planned, "eutrophic conditions would develop rather rapidly." The oxygen would be virtually exhausted and the reservoir would be dead. Relevant here is the fact brought out by the Agency that pressures from developmental and recreational activities "could accelerate eutrophication."

Eutrophication of the reservoir would rule out its use for recreational purposes. Fish would not live in it and its stench would be intolerable.

To some degree, perhaps seriously, the quality of the water would be impaired. Moreover, releasing water from the reservoir could cause eutrophication problems downstream, including fish kill, as these waters would lack sufficient oxygen for fish survival.

It is my understanding that it is the position of the Council and the Agency, with which I fully agree, that the protection of the environment requires:

1. the development of a specific program, with all essential technology, to correct the conditions which otherwise will lead to eutrophication of the water when it is impounded;

2. that legally binding and practically enforceable commitments be undertaken for actually carrying out each of the steps necessary to prevent eutrophication; in this connection, the Agency and the Corps of Engineers point out that "cooperation will be necessary between local, state, inter-state, and Federal governing bodies and their agencies."

3. the assured availability of adequate financial resources to meet the enormous cost of construction and operation of the necessary anti-eutrophication facilities.

As the Agency said in its letter, "Without such firm commitments, the environmental impact of this project may well be a liability rather than the planned asset for this region."

The Council and the Agency are agreed that the steps necessary for the protection of the environment of the area, as outlined above, should be taken before construction begins. I agree. And the Council and the Agency have, and will continue to have, my complete support in this position.

Would you please advise me whether my understanding of the positions of the Council and the Agency, as I have outlined them, is correct.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

NATIONAL SPEECH CONTEST

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure this morning to join with other colleagues at a breakfast honoring 12 outstanding young men from all over the country who participated in a national public speaking contest yesterday at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, sponsored by the Reader's Digest Association and the Boy Scouts of America.

These young men are reporting to the President today as part of a nationwide anniversary celebration of the Boy Scouts of America.

I was particularly pleased that a young man residing in my congressional district, Mr. David Snell of Pekin, Ill., finished third in this competition and was awarded a $1,000 scholarship. I have had the pleasure of meeting David before and, in fact, have been interviewed by him from time to time in his capacity as an announcer for radio station WSIV in Pekin.

I congratulate him and extend my very best wishes to him for continued success in his future endeavors. I know he will continue to bring credit to his home community in the future and we are all very proud of him.

I insert in the RECORD an article from the Pekin Times, of Friday, January 21, 1972, about David and his accomplishments:

DAVE SNELL ONE OF 12 TO PARTICIPATE IN NATIONAL SPEECH CONTEST

A visit with President Nixon and a trip to New York City and Washington, D.C., is the payoff for David Snell, 17, of Pekin, as he competes in the national public speaking contest, sponsored by the Reader's Digest Association and the Boy Scouts of America.

Dave will report to President Nixon Thursday, Feb. 3, as part of the 62nd anniversary program of the BSA. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. B. G. Snell of 1321 Veerman street, Pekin.

The Report to the President is a part of the naionwide anniversary celebration of BSA. Six million Scouts, Explorers, and adults in almost 500 councils will participate in the celebration.

Competing for the $3,000 winner's scholarship, Dave will enter national competition with 11 other contestants. The final speaking competition will be held Feb. 2, when the contestants will address the Kiwanis Club at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

Topping the prizes from the Reader's Digest Association is a $3,000 scholarship for the winner, a $2,000 scholarship for the runner-up, and a $1,000 scholarship for third place. Fourth- thru sixth-place speakers get $400 and the other six competitors will receive $300 grants.

Hobart Lewis, president of the Reader's Digest Association and a member of the BSA executive board, will make the presentations. Team of judges will be headed by Robert Engle, Santa Ana, Cal., executive director of Toastmasters' International.

After the speeches, all 12 Scouts and Explorers will board the express Metroliner for Washington, D.C.

At the White House, members of the delegation will report to President Nixon on progress and developments in the Scout program this year.

Most significant announcement will be about Operation Reach, the new drug abuse prevention program. Operation Reach is designed to create an environment that will discourage drug experimentation among Scouts, Explorers, and their friends.

In addition to the White House visit, the group will meet with Cabinet members, labor leaders, and be honored by members of Congress at the traditional Congressional breakfast, held each year in the Rayburn House office building. Rep. John Y. McCollister of Nebraska will preside.

Snell is a senior at Pekin high school, where he is a member of the speech team. He has received awards at the local and statewide levels in public speaking.

He has been active in Cub Scouting and Exploring for a total of three years and is now vice-president of Post 1140, sponsored by radio station WSIV of Pekin.

Religious activities figure prominently in his life. He is a member of the Church of Christ in nearby Tremont, where he is a substitute preacher and teaches Bible classes.

Upon graduation from Pekin high school, he plans to study for a career in professional broadcasting.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES MUST NOT ABUSE SOUTH

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, 1972 is a presidential election year. It can be a time of constructive leadership and healing; a time of unification and renewal—as well as being keenly competitive.

May I give the perspective of the district which I have the privilege to represent in Congress relating to the proper attitude of national presidential candidates. Primarily, they should not be sectional; they should know no North or South, East or West. Their outlook should be truly national and it ill behooves a candidate from the new left to charge a man from the old right with being sectional.

The definition of a conservative may come as a surprise to some. It is one who would conserve the liberties of man and limit the powers of Government. A presidential candidate should possess those qualities.

In Congress we have acknowledged authorities in the field of finance and taxation, in the field of education, and in other fields who serve in the people's house, the U.S. House of Representatives. May we encourage these gifted, fundamental people to offer their leadership at the national conventions.

Mr. Speaker, I could never support a candidate for the highest office in the land merely because he is the better of two poor choices; neither would the people of Georgia support such a man.

The Book of Ecclesiastes teaches that there is a time to speak and a time to be silent.

Now is the time to speak. My promise is to never support the lesser of two evils, and I make my vow to oppose any presidential candidate who would abuse the South and, thus, the Nation, through sectional legislation or otherwise.

BLOODSHED IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day, the tragic situation in Northern Ireland becomes more needlessly bloody.

On the morning of February 2, 1972, as a portion of the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Today" television program, an interview was presented during which Dr. Patrick Hillery, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Ireland, made many thoughtful and interesting observations about the present conditions in his country.

This interview, with Edwin Newman, sheds a great deal of light on this tragic situation. I feel the United States should actively seek alternatives to the bloodshed and suffering which occur daily in that troubled nation.

To that end, I include at this point in the RECORD, the text of the interview with Dr. Hillery, so that all might better understand the situation in Northern Ireland:

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. PATRICK HILLERY

EDWIN NEWMAN. On Sunday thirteen people were killed by British soldiers during a demonstration in Londonderry in Northern Ireland. The Irish Republican Army threatened to kill thirteen British soldiers in reprisal, one soldier has been killed. To the south, the Irish Republic has been swept by sympathy strikes and there have been attacks on the British Embassy in Dublin.

Last night Patrick Hillery, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Ireland, flew to New York. He's looking for United Nations support for his government's demand that British forces be withdrawn from Northern Ireland. I understand he'll also be talking to the Canadian and American governments.

Dr. Hillery is with us this morning.

What exactly is it you are trying to do, Dr. Hillery? What do you want the United Nations to do?

Dr. PATRICK HILLERY. I doubt if they can do a great deal because the limitations which I met before two years ago will be still there. The Article 2–7 prevents the United Nations going into the domestic affairs of the country, and all six southeastern counties are, by definition of membership in the U.N., domestic to the United Kingdom. We don't agree that it should be, but that is the case. . . .

NEWMAN. That being the case what can . . .

HILLERY. That being the case we can only hope that the United Nations may, and other governments too, may impress upon the British that their policies in the north of Ireland are lunatic, they're aggressive, they're warlike politics—polices on a—on a peaceful nation. They're going to cause war in our country. They have already created, as you've mentioned, the IRA, which is a non-government army. It rises from the populous. It was always there to some extent, but it has been created now as a resistance movement in the north, as a—a movement in the part of the country over which we have control.

NEWMAN. You said British policies are going to cause war. What do you mean by that?

HILLERY. They have—they've been trying to maintain a regime in the north of Ireland which has lost 40 percent of the populous in support, and must be very much doubted by the others. They're doing this by internment, torture, and now open warfare on the innocent people.

We have followed peaceful policies, but it is not possible to control all our people, and the IRA you mentioned will have some support from the rest of our country.

NEWMAN. From the government?

HILLERY. If there will be a war, it's probably not going to be one like you think in terms of war, but there will be continuous use of force against British troops while they are in the north of Ireland.

NEWMAN. Not by the—not by the forces of the Irish Government?

HILLERY. No.

NEWMAN. You're not saying that?

HILLERY. No. But they are creating followers as the situation—it's a situation where our people are rather intolerant of the peaceful policies of a government, and very sympathetic towards the IRA activities. And I think, they have, as I say, created the IRA, they have now created a vast wave of sympathy for them and this simply translates into—into guns and money.

NEWMAN. And—and the government you speak for cannot control the IRA, or will not control it?

HILLERY. Cannot—we—we have tried to maintain the rule of law, and this meant avoiding the concentration camp type of society which they've created in the north. And in that way we have dealt with the IRA when they've broken the law, through the courts and—and the penalties of the courts. The courts are independent of the government, and the British are sometimes doubtful about the results of these. But in maintaining that type of society it has not been possible for us to totally control the IRA.

Physically it would be quite impossible. Quite impossible for any Irish government now to—if they wanted to, and which we don't want to—to bring in these abnormal methods of suppressing those who want to get the British troops out of Ireland.

BARBARA WALTERS. Dr. Hillery, you are going to Washington to talk with Secretary of State Rogers, is that so? Yes.

HILLERY. Yes, I am.

WALTERS. What—what specifically do you hope that he will do to either pressure or persuade the British Government of your sentiments?

HILLERY. This is very difficult because these are friendly governments with the British as well as with us. And any public pressure on the British would probably be unlikely from the American Government, unwelcome to the British and probably bring a stubborn response.

I would hope that they would very much impress upon the British that this type of war activities is out of date, totally out of date with modern society. It's selfperpetuating and—and unwelcome to the American government and unwelcome to the American people.

NEWMAN. Is that—is that not—would that not amount to an intervention in the domestic affairs of—of Great Britiain—of the United Kingdom?

HILLERY. I agree with this. Two years ago—two and a half years ago I was on this same mission. At that time we felt that friendly nations could say a friendly word. Now we feel that—that they should regard this as a problem—a problem in the free world which has to be solved. All the pressure will not be on the American people. I hope to visit European governments, too. But I think they should regard it as a problem of the free world where the aggressive policies of one government, which is a friendly government for them, is in danger of creating a situation of war which will go on and on until . . .

(Confusion of voices.)

NEWMAN. It will be a situation of civil war, though, would it not?

HILLERY. No. A war between us and Britain would not be a civil war.

NEWMAN. You are actually talking about the possibility of a war between the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom?

HILLERY. I think our people—as you know, the British Home Secretary said that they were declaring war on the IRA two years ago. And this was accepted in Britain because the IRA was a terrorist organization. But as time went on the IRA by definition became broader and broader to take in the—all Catholics, all nationalists, all that did not agree with the unionist government. And last Sunday was the brutal clarification of what the policy was. It's a war on that part of the Irish population who don't accept their domination.

NEWMAN. Well now I would like to . . .

HILLERY. So the British have declared war on a population—the weapons of war for disarmed—we are relatively disarmed—the weapons available are passive resistance at first, civil disobedience, there are many weapons. But before that I think the nations of the world should try to impress upon Britain that is not the way to do it.

NEWMAN. I just want to return to a point that we made before as to whether you are talking about the possibility of war between your government . . .

(Confusion of voices.)

HILLERY. . . . between Ireland and Britain, no. But the British will never be comfortable in the North of Ireland, you understand that—never allowed to remain comfortable.

WALTERS. Do you have another moment?

NEWMAN. Yes.

WALTERS. Yes. We spoke yesterday with Bernadette Devlin by—by telephone. Can you tell us what—what your own feeling is about her—her attitudes? Are they in—the attack in Parliament the day before yesterday and her statements yesterday, what are your own feelings?

HILLERY. Bernadette's attack in parliament, the full presence—she was present—about to address that meeting into which the paratroopers fired their shots and killed thirteen of the audience. And she's a member of Parliament, elected appropriately. She was not allowed to talk, too, was not allowed to make a point. She was not allowed to ask a question. And the representative of the British government responsible just sat across. He didn't say there was any reason for him to be sorry that thirteen people were shot and thirteen others wounded. And I think she just—what do you do when they sit there self-satisfied and smug killing your people? She did all that a woman can do and maybe a bit (words unintelligible). She—she made her point.

NEWMAN. Thank you Dr. Hillery. We'll have some more questions for you very shortly.

We'll be back after this message.

* * * * *

NEWMAN. Our guest is Dr.—Dr. Patrick Hillery who is the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Ireland.

Dr. Hillery, you obviously think that the only solution in Ireland is to reunify the country you now represent, and Northern Ireland. And the leader of the British opposition, Harold Wilson, has pretty much accepted that position provided it's carried out over a period of years and with sufficient preparation.

Now could—how would you see such—such a change taking place?

HILLERY. I trink the decision on the part of the British government to have it happen would immediately stop the—the great hostility that exists between Ireland and the British. The withdrawal of the British troops now from the ghetto areas where they're not wanted, where they spend their time harassing the populous, breaking down their doors, searching their houses, driving their children from their studies. Letting people out of internment. They were interned to prevent violence and violence has escalated. These things must stop for Ireland at once, then we could get down to talking about the type of Ireland in which the north—the Protestants—there are a million Protestants in the North—and the rest of Ireland could live together.

And this will take many years to work out. But if we get the first intent of the British to withdraw, and withdraw on the basis of having Ireland work out for themselves a way of governing Ireland—purist society—then I think it can be done.

NEWMAN. Well, would you—would you yourself be prepared to have a change in the Constitution of the Irish Republic? For example, no longer have a state religion, allow divorce . . .

HILLERY. We—we don't have a state religion. The Catholic Religion is the dominant one in Ireland and it's recognized in the Constitution. This article could go easily without any problem.

I think the divorce question would have to be changed by the public. I think it should be changed. I think when the public realize that it's not just forcing them into the position of divorce but allowing for purist society in Ireland, they would change the Constitution.

NEWMAN. And censorship . . .

HILLERY. Our Constitution can be changed only by the popular vote.

NEWMAN. Well, there are obviously—obviously there are many, many such constitutional issues. But as I understand it, the really big issue, even if the British government were willing to accept what you suggest—is that a great many people in Northern Ireland particularly Protestants, want to remain under British rule. They don't want to be part of Ireland. They want to be part of Britain.

HILLERY. I think this was based—regional division may have been based on economic reasons. And these economic reasons are disappearing. The trade now will be in the context of Europe, not the old context of part of Britain's British market. So the considerations have changed. And I think it would be possible for a big number of the unionists to—to change their thinking on that.

NEWMAN. This—this would be, would it not, a very—humiliation for—for the British government to do what you have suggested?

HILLERY. I don't think so. They've lost much bigger areas than these six counties.

NEWMAN. But none of them that are described as part of the United Kingdom.

HILLERY. Well, that's their description. It wouldn't be a humiliation. I think Algeria was very much part of France, and President De Gaulle was able to handle that one.

It takes a big statesmen-like movement and—and this is what we're waiting for, the man who can do this. I don't think the British public would find their government humiliated by doing it. They may be proud of the man who had the courage.

WALTERS. The man—you're saying you're waiting for the man—at this point the man is Prime Minister Heath. What do you think his—his major objections—I know Ed mentioned the humiliation. From your point of view, why do you think you are not able to appeal to him and have him see your point of view?

HILLERY. Well, Mr. Heath is a conservative. He—he has taken an area north of Ireland which is to his mind part of the United Kingdom—there's a problem there. He thinks in terms of solving that problem within the context of United Kingdom thinking. We've had two and a half years of this now, and it's quite obvious that the problem cannot be solved within that framework, except by military means. This is why he's so totally committed to military means, internment without trial, shooting people on the streets and so on, harassing the populace. It's not working. And when you go on and on and on suppressing a population and it's not working, then someday you must say we've got to look for a solution without any prior definition of the type of solution you want.

NEWMAN. There have been some concessions offered by the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, Brian Faulkner, and he has also offered to sit down with the opposition and try to work out a political settlement. As I understand it that doesn't go forward because the opposition says first you must end internment?

HILLERY. You see, it's internment without trial. And as they see it—as the minority sees it, it's internment of the main members of the population. Just lock them up and then you won't have violence. There were some rumors recently that they were going to lock up the women, too, because women in the population were not quite taking it from the unionist government.

But it's a lunatic situation where you go on locking up people and then if those on the street protest against locking up, you shoot the people on the street. They could finally have a peaceful situation but you can imagine . . .

NEWMAN. Are you—do you yourself accept that the British soldiers' open fire without provocation on . . .

(Confusion of voices.)

HILLERY. I've not doubt—I've not heard that description . . .

NEWMAN. . . . how—how . . .

HILLERY. The description was they went in three military vehicles and got into action at once. They fired into a crowd who were at a platform listening to—or beginning to listen to a speech. And the conflicting reports from the military showed—the people who were shot were armed, but the guns had disappeared when they got up to them. People shot in the back running away. You don't find a man running away from you, you shoot, and not call him an aggressor.

NEWMAN. Do you think that the British soldiers have been under great strain and provocation and that that had anything to do with it?

HILLERY. I think an army is either disciplined or should not be there. If the British Army has lost its control and is running amuck, then it's wrong to have them there among the population. Either that's what happened or else the British government took a decision to kill a certain number of people to frighten the others.

WALTERS. Dr. Hillery, do you—one position is reunification. And the other position we have just talked about. Short of those two extremes, or the continuation of the present condition, do you see any other solution? Any kind of compromise?

HILLERY. Perhaps they're not extremes. When you speak of reunification you think that we take all the six counties and fit it into our scheme of things. Now we're—we're quite satisfied that this cannot be done. We're quite satisfied that we have to change so totally as to make the new Ireland quite different from the one we live in at the moment. The political institutions in Ireland would not—probably not contain the members of the present government. You'd have a total change in the political situation and the—and the religious mix. We need those million Protestants in Ireland. We need them much more than they know.

So it's not a question of fitting them into the scheme of things we've arranged. It's a question of getting—sitting down with them and working out a scheme in which both of us can live at peace.

WALTERS. Free of England?

HILLERY. So we have no—free of England. (Words unintelligible.)

NEWMAN. Dr. Hillery, excuse me. A number of United States Senators have spoken about the situation in Northern Ireland—Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut—calling for British withdrawal. Do you think that that is a suitable thing for a United States Senator to do and what effect do you think it has?

HILLERY. Well, we spoke already about the stubborn reaction of the British government. I think this is particularly true of Mr. Heath.

NEWMAN. Well, you—you are—you are seeking, are you not, that the American government do something?

HILLERY. Yes.

NEWMAN. Rather then that individual Senators speak out?

HILLERY. I was answering your question about what reaction.

NEWMAN. Yes.

HILLERY. I think that reaction is the word for the British government. They won't like it. At the same time it does give courage to people in Ireland to find people in this country—we've always had help here, and fifty years ago when the whole country was suffering what the North is now, we did get support and courage from the U.S. I think it's welcome.

NEWMAN. Thank you, Dr. Hillery.

Dr. Patrick Hillery, the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Ireland.

GI HOUSING DIRECTOR JOHN M. DERVAN RETIRES FROM VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House, the retirement of Mr. John M. Dervan, for the last 10 years, the Director of the Veterans' Administration's GI loan program.

Mr. Dervan's retirement on January 22, 1972, culminated a career during which he discharged many complex responsibilities with high competence and diligence, leading to the growth and effectiveness of the GI loan program. Through keen foresight and tireless efforts, he sought and realized the translation of numerous long-range plans tailored to meet the changing needs of veterans in financing homes for their families.

In 1961, when Mr. Dervan assumed the directorship of the program, the VA guaranteed home loans for 134,327 veterans in that year. In 1971, over 284,000 veterans obtained GI loans, under a program now better than ever equipped to served the Nation's veterans.

Congress had made available to today's veterans a wider range of GI loan benefits than at any prior period in the history of the program—guaranteed loans for the purchase of condominium units, farms, mobile homes, for refinanc-

ing purposes, and for conventionally constructed housing and improvements. Mr. Dervan's dedication, direction, and professional stature during these past years contributed immeasurably to the success of the GI loan program of today.

He leaves a program replete with evidence of his capable administration and achievements which have distinguished him for his many years of loyal and dedicated service.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes many of us are discouraged by criticism by our own people of our own country.

There are those who are disillusioned because the world does not move as fast as they would have it move. There are those who believe there ought to be immediate substantial change in not only the social and cultural background of America, but political change for the sake of change, and there are those who simply believe that perhaps we are not progressing as fast as we should. And lastly there are those who would say there is nothing good about America—burn it down and start over again.

Perhaps a great deal of this arises from the fact that we live in the greatest and most influential country in the world with the highest standard of living, the greatest freedom in the world to live our lives as we wish, and also because many of us become wrapped up with over-expressed egos that we have the only solution for America. It is hard for older people, and even more difficult for young people who have experienced adversity, to realize what a great country we have built and what a great responsibility we carry in the world. I have traveled over a good part of the globe. There is never a journey without my talking to people everywhere who want to know of any way in which they could get to the United States. Millions of people have an American dream—a land of hope and opportunity.

Peter Peterson is a member of the West German Parliament representing Wurttemberg-Baden. He has written a serious but most interesting article for the New York Times, of January 21, 1972, titled, "The American Dream." He lives in a country that during his lifetime has experienced excruciating adversity. His country has been divided between the closed society on the one side and the free and open society on the other. Only the presence of the United States guarantees that his portion will remain a part of the free society. The next time I get a letter from one of those disillusioned Americans, I am going to send them Peter Peterson's, "The American Dream."

The article follows:

THE AMERICAN DREAM

(By Peter Petersen)

BONN.—I am prejudiced when writing about America.

America saved my people from starvation not so very long ago. No German called that U.S. imperialism. Thousands of American soldiers—225,000, to be exact—are stationed in my country and because of this commitment and their loaded guns, we are still a free people.

Where I come from, we still know what freedom means—because seventeen million of us are locked up behind barbed wire, walls and mine fields—behind what amounts to the ugliest and most inhuman border of the world. Some four hundred of my people have been shot and killed because they wanted to go from one part of our country to another.

The American commitment to freedom and the price Americans are paying for that every day saves us from the fate of our neighbors the Czechs who are the victims of imperialism.

Yes—I am prejudiced, and I don't apologize for the fact that I love America.

Yet, I am worried. Recently I talked to officers and soldiers on a big Air Force base in the deep South. I moved around in the most confusing of all American cities, Los Angeles. I had dinner with the president of a big corporation who laid off 80,000 people, and I spent an evening in the home of an old friend who is unemployed now. His two boys are at a university. He makes ends meet by fixing things up in neighboring homes (he is an engineer) and his wife got a job in a shop selling antiques the Americans like so much.

This friend considers himself lucky. A man driving my taxi was not so lucky—seventy dollars a week unemployment compensation. His savings are gone, and he is now cheating by driving a taxi for a few hours every day.

And then I looked at the headlines of the papers—there was a pitched battle in a jail somewhere—another city reports on the dope problem, and in many cities, parents protest busing their children from their neighborhood school to another part of the city to get integrated. No one has been able to explain to me yet this busing scheme.

When I was in this country twenty years ago, the people in whose homes I stayed never locked their doors. This time I was warned not to walk back to the hotel after a concert.

Americans are not very articulate—even though they might talk a great deal. So they leave the forming of their image as a nation to Madison Avenue and to Hollywood. Americans are probably the world's greatest salesmen of material goods, but they are very inept in selling ideas.

Of course, these ideas are all there—in the history of America there are the forces that made America a great country and inspired a dream to peoples all around the world.

There was a time twenty years ago when Americans often got on our nerves because they were so sure of themselves. Now we get nervous because Americans seem to be losing faith in their own destiny, and so a student—what Americans would call a "nice kid"—would in all sincerity talk about U.S. imperialism. That boy—a student in a seminar on current history—and many of his friends don't realize that the problem is exactly the other way around. We have a crisis in the Free World because Americans appear to us to shrink back from the responsibility that goes with being the strongest power in the world. It is clear to us that the Soviets don't have such qualms—and that is why they fill every vacuum America and its allies are leaving. Vietnam, I should think, proves my point. A truly imperialistic power as this "nice kid" believes America to be would have carefully calculated the risk and the price, and then if the price seemed right and the aim worthwhile, it would have gone in with no holds barred.

I know from many conversations in Communist countries that the people there understand that basically freedom is indivisible, and they dream the American dream—not of Coca Cola or two cars in every garage but of freedom as conceived in this country in 1776. Because it is not "American" freedom in a national sense, it is the basis of human dignity everywhere.

When I mingled in the crowd in the airport in San Francisco, I wished I had a way to shake these people to remind them of what they are and to convince them of what we expect from them. Not because they are better or more intelligent perhaps than the people who would crowd the airport in Düsseldorf or Berlin, but because they have in their own heritage the hope of the world. I believe it is the only hope we have—because if America fails, the world fails, and I hope I will not again meet an American who apologizes for the fact that he is American.

HIGHWAY SAFETY AND THE BIG BUS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the current controversy over passage of the "big bus bill" much has been said about safety. It has been my position that an increase in bus width would create a substantial safety hazard. To dramatically illustrate my position, I share with you two letters I recently received.

The first, from John de Lorenzi of the American Automobile Association, notes the receipt of a letter and accident statistics by Harry E. Uhler, president of the Automobile Club of Maryland, from Harry R. Hughes, Secretary of Transportation of Maryland. The American Automobile Association determined from these statistics that the "big bus"—102 inches wide—was involved in 25 percent more accidents than the 96 inch wide bus.

The second is the letter and enclosed statistical data from Secretary Hughes. I feel these accident statistics and their analysis clearly indicate that wider buses will pose a hazard for the motoring public.

The letters follow:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1972.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: In response to your letter of January 17, 1972, I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Maryland Secretary of Transportation Harry R. Hughes to Harry E. Uhler, President of the Automobile Club of Maryland. This letter formed the basis for the AAA comments concerning Baltimore in its testimony before Senator Bayh's subcommittee.

While Mr. Hughes disclaims comparison of 96 inch and 102 inch bus accident statistics in the second sentence of the third paragraph of his letter, we feel a valid compari-

son can be made on the basis of the vehicle miles travelled per accident in 1970.

Using the data supplied by Secretary Hughes, we determined that 102 inch buses (40 feet long) were involved in 70 accidents per million miles of travel and that 96 inch buses (40 feet long) were involved in 55 accidents per million miles. The 102 inch buses were involved in 25 percent more accidents than the 96 inch buses per million miles of travel.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN DE LORENZI,
Managing Director,
Public and Government Relations.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Baltimore, Md., October 4, 1971.

Mr. HARRY E. UHLER,
President, Automobile Club of Maryland,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. UHLER: Enclosed you will find the statistics which you requested concerning the accident records of 102 inch wide buses versus 96 inch wide buses.

The delay in answering this request resulted from the transitionary period of the last year in which the mileage for the 96 inch wide buses increased substantially with the retirement of older type of equipment and the corresponding reduction in mileage of the 102 inch wide buses. Therefore, any comparison on a mileage basis for the calendar year 1971 has been eliminated, and the enclosed information is based on 1970 accident statistics.

As you will notice, the tables indicate that the 102 inch wide vehicles were involved, on a percentage basis, in slightly more accidents than the 96 inch wide vehicles, especially when you compare the width of these two vehicles with the standard 40 foot length. However, since we are comparing the performance of 305 vehicles against that of 125 vehicles, the degree of accident frequency cannot be measured accurately.

It should also be noted that the operating performance of the two types of buses is not very different from a traffic standpoint. The 102 inch wide buses do provide, however, a better flow for the passengers inside the bus since it provides a wide aisle for their use.

If I can be of any further help to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Sincerely,

HARRY R. HUGHES,
Secretary.

---

1. During 1970 the Mass Transit Administration operated 792 vehicles in accordance with the table below:

Size	Vehicles	Miles operated	Percentage of miles operated per type of vehicle
96 in. by 40 ft.	125	5,921,465	25.6
102 in. by 40 ft.	305	10,823,934	46.7
96 in. by 35 ft.	362	6,411,785	27.7
Total	792	23,157,184	100.0

2. During this same period the Mass Transit Administration's operating fleet was involved in 1469 collisions as outlined below:

Size	Accidents	Percentage of accidents per type of vehicle
96 in. by 40 ft.	330	22.5
102 in. by 40 ft.	760	51.7
96 in. by 35 ft.	379	25.8
Total	1,469	100.0

REASSESSMENTS ON LIMITING OF PRESIDENTIAL WARMAKING POWERS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a lively public debate has finally emerged over how best to go about limiting the President's powers to commit American forces to hostilities in the absence of a congressional declaration of war. The debate currently centers around the implications of a bill conceived by Senators JAVITS and STENNIS, and recently ordered reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I have tried for some time to point out what I regard as serious weaknesses in the Javits-Stennis approach. An alternative approach, which provides a more influential role for the Congress, is contained in my bill H.R. 12645. I am hopeful that alternative will be seriously considered if and when the Javits-Stennis bill passes the Senate and is taken up by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I have inserted the text of H.R. 12645 previously in the RECORD (page 1559, January 27, 1972).

An enlightening series of articles, sparked by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has recently appeared in the New York Times and the New Republic. I am particularly pleased to note that in his most recent article—New Republic, February 5, 1972, Mr. Schlesinger expresses many of the same points I have made about the Javits-Stennis approach, and comments favorably on the plan I have recommended. The articles by Schlesinger, Eugene G. Windchy, and Prof. Alexander M. Bickel, follow:

FALLACIES OF THE WAR-POWERS BILL

(By Arthur Schlesinger Jr.)

The Indochina war has set in motion a wholesome and belated critique of the American Presidency. A direct product of this war is the proposed "War Powers Act of 1971," a bill designed to restrain the power of Presidents to carry the nation into undeclared hostilities. The bill's two particular architects are Senators Javits and Stennis. These two able men are not usually encountered as brothers in arms; and the collaboration of this odd couple suggests the range and weight of senatorial opinion behind the measure. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, after intensive hearings, has endorsed the bill. So, indeed, has The New York Times.

Nearly everyone agrees that Congressional control over the war power has faded dangerously in recent years. The war-powers bill realistically understands that emergencies may arise when Presidents must order military action without waiting for Congressional approval. But it would limit the authority of the President to act without a declaration of war to four specific categories of emergency. And it would stipulate that military action cannot continue for more than thirty days without express Congressional consent.

The bill's first fallacy is that it is possible to provide in advance for all foreseeable contingencies. By restricting the Presidential power to act without a declaration of war to four static categories, the Senators are trying today, as George Ball has put it, "to do what the Founding Fathers felt they were not wise enough to do." The result may well be to tie a future President's hands when some unforeseen crisis arises.

The 30-day authorization period raises equally difficult problems. The best way to illustrate these problems is to consider what would have happened if the War Powers Act of 1971 had been in force during other times of emergency in our recent history. Specifically, would it have prevented President Roosevelt from conducting the North Atlantic intervention in 1941 and would it have prevented President Johnson from increasing the Vietnam intervention in 1965?

The short answer to these questions is that the war-powers bill probably would have prevented President Roosevelt from protecting the British lifeline against Nazi submarines—and that it probably would not have prevented President Johnson from escalating the war in Vietnam. If all this is so, then the bill will serve neither the purpose for which it was drafted nor the national interest.

In 1941 Britain, fighting alone in the west against Hitler, depended on American aid for survival. The Roosevelt Administration felt that British collapse and Nazi victory would jeopardize the security of the United States. Accordingly, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox announced in September that the Navy had been "ordered to capture or destroy by every means at its disposal Axis-controlled submarines or surface raiders" in the western Atlantic. Now it is not at all clear that this action falls within the four categories of initiative permitted to Presidents by the war-powers bill. In any case, it is certainly not clear that Congress would have sustained the "shoot on sight" policy after thirty days. In August, 1941, the House of Representatives, confronted by a bill to extend the draft, passed this relatively innocuous measure by only a single vote.

As for the Vietnam war, President Johnson could unquestionably have got all the Congressional blessing he wanted at any point up to 1968, and perhaps even then. And this suggests the second fallacy of the bill: that it forgets the overwhelming short-run ability of Presidents—especially in times when, unlike 1939–41, opposition has not been aroused by a great national debate—to define emergencies and compel support. During the shock of crisis the President is the dominant source of information. Naturally he gives Congress the facts that seem to justify his action, as during the Tonkin Gulf affair, and naturally the country rallies to him.

It generally takes longer than thirty days for other facts to emerge and for serious debate to begin. By that time the war-powers bill will have locked Congress into the war policy. If we had had that bill in 1965, Congress, far from controlling American intervention in Vietnam, would have implicated itself far more deeply through the simple process of renewing the Presidential mandate month after month.

The war-powers bill does contain some valuable ideas. One provision requires the President to send Congress periodic written reports about the status and prospects of hostilities he may have initiated. Another enables Congress to terminate such hostilities by statute or joint resolution and provides that one-third of the members of either house can bring such proposals to the floor within 24 hours. These provisions deserve enactment on their own very considerable merits. They would go far by themselves to achieve the goal of restoring Congressional authority over the making of wars.

But in general this problem will not yield to neat structural solutions. It is more fundamental than that. It requires different states of mind—a new will to seek participation on the part of the executive, a new will to accept responsibility on the part of Congress. It requires much more systematic Congressional skepticism about information and forecasts handed them by the executive. It requires an end to the idea that foreign pol-

icy is too sacred for secular debate. Without these things the thirty-day authorization will only play into the hands of forceful Presidents. With them it will not be necessary.

THE NEED FOR A WAR-POWERS BILL

(By Alexander M. Bickel)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously approved, and the full Senate is very likely to pass, a bill "to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress." The bill is sponsored by Senators Javits, Eagleton, Spong and Stennis—a strikingly diverse group. But it has drawn the opposition of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in an Op-Ed article in *The New York Times*, and of George Ball before him, as probably also of the Nixon Administration—an equally diverse group.

The attempt to circumscribe the President's warmaking power, which the Founding Fathers were wise enough not to make, runs the risk, says Mr. Schlesinger, of tying the hands of some future President in an unforeseen crisis.

But the Founding Fathers knew less than we do. And they knew that we would know more. That was their wisdom. Writing a Constitution, they drew broad outlines and left much to be filled in from time to time by statute and court decision. Yet as the record of their deliberations, however scant, plainly shows, they did in this instance have a fairly clear idea in mind. Congress, they thought, should have power to declare war. The President as commander-in-chief would conduct wars, and would have the emergency power of a commander of troops and head of state—but only a reactive, emergency power.

We have slid away from this original scheme. The Senate war-powers bill aims to bring us back; not by an amendment substituting specific language for the broad generalization of the Constitution—for our posterity, we should realize, will also know more than we do—but by legislation that implements the Constitution for our time, and unlike a Constitutional provision, can be easily changed to accommodate later experience.

The bill would allow the President to act, as the Constitution intended him to do, in the event of an attack or of an imminent threat of attack against the United States or the armed forces of the United States. It would allow him also to protect and evacuate Americans caught in fighting that may have erupted suddenly in a foreign country. That, in light of the experience of nearly two centuries, including 25 nuclear years, describes the sort of emergencies in which a purpose to use force automatically and take the consequences can be imputed to our people without testing that purpose in the institution that reflects and represents the people in all their diversity, namely Congress. Other circumstances that anyone can now imagine either allow time for speedy congressional action, or do not present themselves as obviously calling for the use of force on our part. In the latter case, a democracy should not use force, if for no other reason than that it cannot do so effectively. Vietnam should have taught us that much.

The unimagined and unforeseen is possible, one supposes. It always is. But if this is why the warpowers bill is unwise, then so is virtually all legislation. To argue from the unforeseeable in this instance, as Mr. Schlesinger does, is to suppose the bankruptcy of the attempt to rule by law, and the necessity of submitting ourselves to the discretionary rule of the men we elect.

A law spelling out the limits of presidential warmaking power should not be necessary. Mr. Schlesinger is right to believe that we would be a whole lot better off if such a law were unnecessary, as it would be if Congress had exercised its undoubted powers in recent crisis situations, including Korea and Vietnam. A responsible Congress would have agreed to undertake the Korean action—there was time, if only a matter of days—and would have refused to allow the massive intervention in Vietnam. But Congress has stood by, until it was time either for carping or handwringing. The reason for this is that Congress has shared a general confusion about the division of war-making power between itself and the President.

When a Tonkin Gulf resolution or a Formosa resolution is put before Congress, it goes through like a dose of salts, because a substantial part of the membership is under the misapprehension that Congress is merely asked to stand patriotically beside the President, who is acting within the constitutional sphere of his own independent authority. The President for his part does not feel obliged to put his whole case before Congress, bare his mind, reveal his intentions and thus defend his proposal and persuade Congress and the country to accept it. For, after all, he is not proposing, he is merely asking Congress to stand patriotically in united ranks behind something he has authority to do anyway. There is no need for Congress to know everything, since it is not Congress that is assuming the responsibility, and there are always plausible reasons for maximum secrecy.

It is never said, and perhaps not even perceived in quite this clear-cut fashion, but there is at best a great deal of ambiguity about who has power to do what, even though under the Constitution properly understood there need not be. The upshot is that Congress does not answer responsibly even when asked to act, and certainly takes no responsible initiatives. A war-powers bill has proven necessary, therefore, because it is apparent that Congress must declare its own responsibilities to itself and assume them in principle before the country, if it is ever to exercise them in particular situations.

Mr. Schlesinger complains, in effect, that restoring the proper share of power and responsibility to Congress in matters of war and peace will not ensure wise action. Congress, says Mr. Schlesinger, would not have allowed FDR to shoot at German submarines and raiders in the Atlantic in 1941, which may be true. Congress might also have plunged into Vietnam, all gung-ho, in 1965, which, true or false, is not a conclusion that can be drawn from passage of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Mr. Schlesinger's complaint is reasonable, but it is a counsel of despair. There is no assurance of wisdom in Congress, and no such assurance in the presidency, on domestic problems or foreign. The only assurance there is lies in process, in the duty to explain, justify and persuade, to define the national interest by evoking it, and thus to act by consent. Congress will sometimes fail to give its consent to wisdom and hold out for foolishness. At such times, the President, who is differently constituted, has enormous leverage as a persuader, and great power as a brake. Singly, either the President or Congress can fall into bad errors, of commission or omission. So they can together, too, but that is somewhat less likely, and in any event, together they are all we've got. In emergencies requiring instant action, or for purposes of command decisions, the President alone is all we've got, as the war-powers bill fully recognizes, but that is true only in emergencies.

THE RIGHT TO MAKE WAR

(By Eugene G. Windchy)

Last week Alexander M. Bickel discussed the need to limit the President's ability to make war, and he remarked that the Senate is very likely to pass a War-Powers bill designed to do that. The bill, which recently was approved 13–0 by the Foreign Relations Committee, recognizes a presidential right to repel attack, and to forestall the imminent threat of attack, but it requires that the President obtain permission from Congress in order to continue hostilities longer than 30 days. The principal author of the War-Powers bill, Senator Jacob K. Javits, says that legislation of this kind might have prevented the incremental involvement that led to full-scale war in Indochina. The Nixon administration opposes the bill and, apparently, any attempt to limit its ability to make war. Its representatives complain that the proposed restrictions would "narrow the power given the President by the Constitution." A basic question, therefore, is whether the President does have a constitutional right to make war and, if so, under what circumstances.

During 16 of the last 23 years, American Presidents have been waging undeclared wars. In the case of the Korean War, President Harry S. Truman's decision appeared to be the product of emergency—the quick response to aggression. As we shall see later, it was more than that. In the case of the Indochina War, a gradual escalation was obscured by official secrecy, and then facilitated suddenly by the Tonkin Gulf resolution. That resolution has been repealed for more than a year, but the same war continues, hanging legally in mid-air, supported by an extrapolation of the Constitution known as the President's "inherent" power to commit armed forces to conflict. But even before the Tonkin resolution came under heavy fire, the State Department was busy refurbishing the executive branch's claim to an independent, constitutional right to make war. In a memorandum of March 4, 1966, that claim was stated concisely by Leonard C. Meeker, legal adviser to the State Department:

"Under the Constitution, the President, in addition to being Chief Executive, is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He holds the prime responsibility for the conduct of United States foreign relations. These duties carry very broad powers, including the power to deploy American forces abroad and commit them to military operations when the President deems such action necessary to maintain the security and defense of the United States."

To prove his point, the legal adviser appealed to precedents back to the earliest days of the Republic:

"Since the Constitution was adopted there have been at least 125 instances in which the President has ordered the armed forces to take action or maintain positions abroad without obtaining prior congressional authorization, starting with the 'undeclared war' with France (1798–1800). For example, President Truman ordered 250,000 troops to Korea during the Korean war of the early 1950s. President Eisenhower dispatched 14,000 troops to Lebanon in 1958."

The present Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, adds that the "constitutional process so wisely conceived by the Founding Fathers has worked well throughout our history." The secretary met with the Foreign Relations Committee to testify against war-powers legislation; he preferred to delay any new arrangements until "after the passions of Vietnam have faded into the past. . . ." He reminded senators that the judicial system does not like to entertain a challenge to the President's ability to make war. Indeed, the Supreme Court has refused to do so, in the case of Indochina, even when prodded by the Massachusetts legislature.

"America is in the midst of a grave constitutional crisis," the committee was warned by Alpheus T. Mason, an eminent authority on constitutional law. Mason favored trying to rein in the Chief Executive. Another scholar on that side of the fence was Henry Steele Commager, the distinguished professor of American history. In the 1950s

Professor Commager defended President Truman's war as sanctioned by law and history. He now feels that the abuse of executive power subverts political institutions at home and threatens the peace abroad. "We find ourselves turning into a military society," Commager told the committee. However, the legal scholar John Norton Moore argued that the proposed restrictions were of doubtful constitutionality.

According to Secretary Rogers, the "electorate is the ultimate restraint." The individual citizen might be able to decide the issue at the ballot box, if he ever gets a clear choice. But what kind of guidance will the citizens receive? The nation's political leaders are divided, and so is the academic community. For at least 20 years the doctrine of the President's inherent war-making power has been supported by many scholars specializing in constitutional law, American history, international relations, and political science. This has been the sophisticated, modern view, reflecting a deeply held belief that the President needed extraordinary powers on the international scene and should have them. Because of the war in Indochina and its attendant domestic evils, however, some of our political and intellectual leaders are beginning to reexamine their position. It is my contention that the executive branch's appeal to historical precedent is not so valid as it has seemed.

When the Secretary of State appealed to the memory of the Founding Fathers, he raised a question that scholars testifying in favor of legislation were eager to deal with: what did the writers of the Constitution mean to do when they designated the President commander-in-chief but gave Congress the power to declare war? An abundance of 18th century documents, including the *Federalist* and James Madison's *Journal of the Constitutional Convention*, reflect the Founding Fathers' abhorrence of giving the war power to any individual person. One of the most oppressive of kingly customs had been the arbitrary, even frivolous, use of armed force, followed by the demand that everybody support the conflict as his patriotic duty. Power itself was a corrupting influence, the Founding Fathers agreed. They decided that one way to prevent harm would be to separate powers. Thus the government was established in three branches: legislative, executive and judicial. The executive, true to the spirit of his office, was to be commander-in-chief of the armed forces; but he was not to initiate war. That was to be the prerogative of the legislative branch, which, hopefully, might debate the matter until the source of conflict would fade away. Quite seriously, in part the arrangement was intended to "clog" the process of going to war.

According to Madison's *Journal*, delegates to the Constitutional Convention discussed giving Congress the power to "make" war, but finally settled on the term "declare" war. That left the President power to repel sudden attack. It was assumed that, as soon as possible, the President would obtain congressional authorization for further hostilities, if such were needed.

Now what about the problem of undeclared war? That came up during the administration of the second President, John Adams. France, because of a grudge against the United States, set privateers to raiding American commerce on the oceans; and so in 1798—contrary to what Leonard Meeker said in his memorandum—the Congress authorized President Adams to protect American shipping. The Navy Department was founded at the same time. It is true that no formal war was declared. Deliberately, conflict was limited to naval hostilities, and it became known as the Quasi-War. A peace treaty was signed in 1800. In the same year, by the way, the Supreme Court held that a state of war could exist in the absence of its declaration. Justice Samuel Chase used the term "limited war." He said, "Congress is empowered to declare a general war, or Congress may wage a limited war: limited in place, in objects, and in time." In short, there is nothing new about undeclared wars or limited wars, except the President's claim to authority for initiating them.

But what about the many other armed actions that are said to have been ordered by the President? An extremely important element in the war-power controversy is a series of studies that show American Presidents making use of armed force on as many as 197 occasions. It will be recalled that Leonard Meeker told of 125 instances in which Presidents used armed force without obtaining prior congressional authorization. We already have dealt with one of Meeker's precedents, the Quasi-War. In a recent television debate, law professor Eugene Rostow, brother of economist Walt, told of 150 uses of armed force; and he declared that the war-making relationship between the President and the Congress had remained "constant" since 1789. Professor Commager, though he was testifying in favor of restrictive legislation, mentioned to the Foreign Relations Committee "100 to 110" uses of military power to "intervene outside the United States."

In examining various claims, I notice that there have been two principal sources of information: the State Department and, oddly enough, the World Peace Foundation.

In 1912, the days of rampant gunboat diplomacy, the State Department's legal office began publishing a series of memoranda titled *Right to Protect Citizens in Foreign Countries by Landing Forces*. From the beginning these publications listed many instances of the President's making use of armed force. Apparently the chief purpose of the memoranda was to justify the American position internationally; they are touchy about accusations of intervening in local political affairs. However, the State Department also gave consideration to domestic law. Its lawyers decided that the President was acting within his rights, and that Congress had only "doubtful" authority to control such uses of armed force since they did not amount to "acts of war." In 1941 somebody culled from the most recent memorandum 85 uses of armed force for "protection purposes," and certain pro-administration senators found the list helpful in justifying short-of-war measures to aid Britain; principally lend-lease and the dispatch of American troops to Iceland. Of course, the American citizens to be protected in Iceland were our own troops! Not only the logic of the argument but its scholarship was nothing to boast of. The initial use of armed force was given as President James Monroe's expelling of pirates from Spanish Florida in 1812, although James Madison was President in 1812 and the Florida expedition of that year did not have as its objective the expelling of pirates. (The seed of this confusion can be found in the 1912 study.)

The World Peace Foundation made its historiographic contribution in 1945. At that time some advocates of establishing world peace were anxious about whether the United States could participate in United Nations peacekeeping actions without having to refer every decision to Congress for a declaration of war. A legal scholar and former Assistant Secretary of State, James Grafton Rogers, set these fears to rest. Rogers looked into the State Department's files and some standard academic histories, and came up with 149 "Military Operations of the United States Abroad." Only five of the 149, said Rogers, represented "fully declared" wars. The World Peace Foundation published the Rogers study in a book titled *World Policing and the Constitution*.

Upon scrutiny, most of the military operations cited by James Grafton Rogers and the State Department are seen to have been minor peacekeeping jobs in primitive and war-torn areas. But some of the operations were formidable. In 1933 more than 3000 armed Americans were stationed in China, under the sanction of treaties dating back to 1858. Still other uses of armed force could be described as inconsequential and even fatuous. James Grafton Rogers lists, for example, the 1842 landing in Mexico of Commodore T.A.C. Jones, who mistakenly thought war had come. The Commodore "discovered peace, withdrew and saluted." In 1870, according to Rogers, the US Navy forced the US Consulate in Honolulu to lower its flag to half-staff in recognition of a royal death.

James Grafton Rogers' book was one of seminal significance. Professor Edward S. Corwin, a well known authority on constitutional law, found it useful in defending the constitutionality of the Atlantic Pact which committed the United States to the defense of western Europe. In an article for *The New York Times Magazine* of July 31, 1949, Professor Corwin referred to the James Grafton Rogers list of armed actions and said of it:

"While inviting some pruning, the list demonstrates beyond peradventure the power of the President, as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, to judge whether a situation requires the use of available forces to support American rights abroad and take action in accordance with that decision."

A year later President Truman took action in Korea, a nation with which we had no defense treaty, and the *State Department Bulletin* published an article in support of the President's legal position. The article quoted from James Grafton Rogers and other authorities. It also enumerated 85 previous "landings of American forces." This list had been taken from the *Congressional Record* of 1941; it omitted Iceland and again told of President Monroe expelling free-booters in 1812. The *Bulletin* article justified the Korean intervention by saying that the United States "throughout its history" had "without congressional authorization, acted to prevent violent and unlawful acts in other states from depriving the United States and its nationals of the benefits of peace and security." The State Department now was justifying the legality of a full-scale war, and it was appealing to precedents which, according to its previous argument, did not amount to "acts of war." Perhaps the ordinary citizen can be forgiven for seeing that as a contradiction. (It could be argued that in 1950 neither the President nor the State Department used the term "war." The Korean intervention was called the "Korean Case," the "Korean Police Action," and the "Korean Conflict." However, it *was* a war, as the State Department acknowledged in Meeker's 1966 memorandum.)

Both Professor Corwin's article and the State Department list published in 1950 carried a great deal of weight. A few years ago they still were being cited to me by students of political science as proof that President Johnson did not need any congressional resolution to fight in Indochina. Any writer who said otherwise, I heard, would "just get torn to pieces." Ruhl J. Bartlett, professor of history and political science at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, shared my impression that the historians were somewhat less convinced than the political scientists. Bartlett himself favored the legislative prerogative.

As the Indochina war became the source of increasing anxiety, the State Department in 1967 bolstered the legal position of President Johnson by preparing a new, Texas-sized list of military precedents. The expanded study told of 137 "Armed Actions Taken by the United States Without a Declaration of War, 1789–1967." It plucked from James Grafton Rogers the abortive landing of Commodore Jones in Mexico, but carefully pruned out the Navy's lowering of the Amer-

ican flag in Hawaii. The new list was prepared not by the State Department's legal office but its Historical Studies Division. The document admitted that Presidents "occasionally" had sought congressional authorization for the use of armed force and that was an improvement; but it still exaggerated the degree of initiative exercised by the presidency, especially during the time the Founding Fathers served in that office. Let us take a look at the earliest military actions cited by the 1967 study.

The newest official list begins with the Quasi-War of 1789–1800. Correctly, it notes that the American naval operations were authorized by Congress.

The second precedent is the struggle with Mediterranean raiders known as the War with Tripoli (1801–1805). The official list says Congress passed "enabling acts during the conflict" but never declared war. What happened was that the piratical state of Tripoli declared war on the United States in order to loot our maritime shipping; President Thomas Jefferson dispatched naval vessels to protect the ships and their crews; and the American naval vessels refrained from conducting offensive operations until permission was received from Congress. Whether war was declared is a minor point. However, in looking up the legislation, I discovered that an act of the 7th Congress mentioned "warfare" and a "state of war." The word "declare" was not used, for what that omission might be worth.

The State Department's third precedent:

"1806: Mexico. Captain Z. M. Pike, with a platoon of troops and on the orders of General James Wilkinson, invaded Spanish territory at the headwaters of the Rio Grande. Pike was imprisoned and later released."

If for many years the executive branch of our government could say that the Korean War was not a war, I suppose one should not be surprised to see it now referring to the expedition of Zebulon M. Pike as an invasion. Pike, who thought he was a lieutenant at the time, staggered into Spanish territory, half-starved and half-frozen, while exploring the southwestern reaches of the Louisiana Territory. Pike's Spanish captors believed his purpose to be espionage. However, the exhausted little band of Americans had made impressive detours, finding Pike's Peak; and President Jefferson later vouched for the innocence of their orders. Among some writers the suspicion of espionage has been inspired largely by the devious nature of Pike's superior officer, General Wilkinson, who was an associate of Aaron Burr.

The fourth precedent concerns the years 1806–1810 when "American gunboats operated from New Orleans against Spanish and French privateers." The quoted sentence was taken by the State Department from James Grafton Rogers' book. But Rogers gave as his source Dudley W. Knox's *A History of the U.S. Navy*, and Knox said that the gunboats operated "against freebooters *under the guise* [italics added] of French, Spanish, and English privateers." The ultimate source of this precedent has been the false colors employed by Jean Lafitte *et al.*

In 1810 President James Madison ordered the occupation of part of West Florida, which he claimed as belonging to the Louisiana Territory. American settlers had rebelled against Spanish rule, and so the occupying forces met no resistance. President Madison said that his action was authorized by Congress; various laws had been passed concerning the annexation and administration of the very roughly defined Louisiana Territory, including one that authorized the seizure of Mobile Bay in the present state of Alabama. In 1810, however, President Madison did not press the American claim so far east as Mobile. The State Department now calls West Florida "Spanish Territory" and says nothing about congressional support for the President.

In 1811 Congress authorized the occupation of eastern Florida under certain conditions, including the danger of seizure by a third power (meaning England). Part of eastern Florida, Amelia island, was occupied temporarily beginning in 1812, but President Madison disavowed the army's action. The State Department's new list mentions the congressional authorization and President Madison's disavowal.

During the War of 1812 American forces occupied temporarily one of the Marquesas islands in the southern Pacific. According to the State Department, the island was "claimed by Spain." The island also was claimed by the occupying Americans, whose claim was better than the Spanish one since the Spanish explorer never had seen this particular island, Nukahiva. No solid claim to the Marquesas was established until the French took possession in 1842.

In 1813 Congress again authorized the seizure of Mobile Bay, and a bloodless occupation was effected. The authorization is noted by the official list.

In 1815, as mentioned by the State Department, Congress authorized the renewed conflict with Mediterranean raiders: the War with Barbary Pirates.

From 1814 to 1825 American forces fought pirates and Indians in the Caribbean and the southeastern portion of the continent. Sometimes the hostilities spilled into Spanish territory, chiefly Florida and Cuba. The problem of Florida was solved with the territory's purchase in 1821. As late as 1825 pirates were being captured on offshore Cuban islands. The State Department says nothing about whether these activities were authorized by Congress. A pro-executive study prepared by Senator Barry M. Goldwater, who most recently has claimed 197 armed actions, admits that nearly all were "arguably" authorized by legislation. Omitted from Goldwater's list was an 1825 landing on Puerto Rico. In that case, as the State Department neglected to mention, the American commander later faced a court-martial and resigned from the Navy.

The above history takes us up to the administration of President Andrew Jackson, who is not described as a Founding Father. It is clear, I think, that the early Presidents stayed within the bounds of the Constitution as it originally was understood. Their actions do not support the view that Congress, unless it wishes to "declare" a war, has no say in whether hostilities should be initiated with a foreign state.

As for the remaining portion of the 19th century, the State Department offers a proliferation of incidents that I hardly have bothered to invesitgate. Many involve landings in Latin America, or shows of force there, during times of civil disturbance. A truly major event listed is Commodore Matthew Perry's opening of relations with Japan. This was an "armed action" in that it involved the use of armed ships and the apparent threat of force, but it was not an "armed action" in the sense that fighting occurred. Congress declared the Mexican war of 1846–1848, and the Spanish-American War of 1898. In the case of the Mexican War, the conflict was made almost inevitable by President James K. Polk's dispatch of troops into disputed territory. By placing a military force in danger of attack, President Polk set the pattern for some future involvements, including the present one in Indochina. However, President Polk did find it necessary to seek a declaration of war.

Foreshadowing the trend of the 20th century, a dramatic departure from legality occurred in 1900 when, during the Boxer Rebellion in China, President William McKinley ordered 5,000 American troops to help an international force rescue the legations under siege at Peking. Congress was not in session at the time, and it never did approve or disapprove McKinley's action, which not only was politically popular but took place during an election year. Successive Presidents took more and more liberties with the use of armed force—which is why the State Department began issuing its apologia in 1912. The eloquent Woodrow Wilson, a former professor of political science, twice invaded Mexico without a valid congressional authorization; and he dominated the Caribbean through the Navy Department. In 1917 President Wilson returned to constitutionalism by seeking declarations of war against the Central Powers. In 1941 President Roosevelt requested declarations of war against the Axis Powers; by that time events had gone so far that Congress had no choice. Congress's slowness to deal with World War II resulted in a sense of inferiority that Sen. Fulbright sees as the cause of its present disinclination to challenge the executive's use of power.

By 1950 a considerable erosion of congressional power already had occurred; yet, from the constitutional standpoint, it still was an extraordinary event when President Truman undertook a major war without any authorization from the legislative branch of the government. Truman acted during a time of emergency, and his decision was applauded by lawmakers and public alike. The legal aspect he disposed of by calling the enemy "bandits" and saying, "We are not at war." However, the need for quick action does not fully explain the President's motives. At his leisure Truman could have obtained authorizing legislation from Congress. But he chose not to. Why? An authority on that was the late Dean Acheson, Truman's Secretary of State. In his book of political memoirs, *Present at the Creation*, Acheson said, "There has never, I believe, been any serious doubt—in the sense of nonpolitically inspired doubt—of the President's constitutional authority to do what he did." Acheson admitted that "congressional approval would have done no harm." But the process of obtaining it, he thought, might have hurt the morale of the men already fighting in Korea. There was yet another consideration. Acheson said of Truman:

"The President agreed, moved also, I think, by another passionately held conviction. His great office was to him a sacred and temporary trust, which he was determined to pass on unimpaired by the slightest loss of power or prestige. This attitude would incline him strongly against any attempt to divert criticism from himself by action that might establish a precedent in derogation of presidential power and to send our forces into battle. The memorandum that we prepared listed eighty-seven instances in the past century in which his predecessors had done this. And thus yet another decision was made."

The office of the President had become excessively powerful, and even "sacred," through an historical fiction, though legal legerdemain, and through an era of crisis. It is important to bear in mind that this development is relatively recent. It is not what the Founding Fathers "so wisely conceived." It is what they wished to prevent.

Not This War-Powered Bill

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

Since readers of The New Republic may not have seen the piece in The New York Times that provoked Alexander M. Bickel's rejoinder in these pages ("The Need for a War-Powers Bill," January 22), perhaps I may be permitted a few words of response. I recognize that Professor Bickel, McGeorge Bundy, Henry Steele Commager, George Reedy and other weighty fellows have testified for the Javits-Stennis bill and that most liberal, as well as many conservative, senators have endorsed it. And of course I entirely share the objective of the sponsors of the bill. I too want to end presidential invasion of the congressional power to de-

clare war and to reclaim for Congress the role assigned to it by the Constitution. But I continue to doubt—along with Benjamin V. Cohen, George W. Ball, Jonathan B. Bingham and others equally devoted to this objective—that the war-powers bill in its present form is the way to go about it.

The bill limits the President's power to order military action in the absence of a congressional declaration of war to four and only four static categories (and further provides that action taken within these categories must be brought to an end after 30 days unless Congress enacts positive legislation to authorize its continuance). Mr. Bickel, invoking the "experience of two centuries," assets that the four categories embrace "the sort of emergencies in which a purpose to use force automatically and take the consequences can be imputed to our people" and adds that any "other circumstances that anyone can now imagine either allow time for speedy congressional action, or do not present themselves as obviously calling for the use of force." Should some unforeseen contingency arise, then, he consolingly suggests, the law could be "easily changed to accommodate later experience."

Professor Bickel knows infinitely more law than I do, but perhaps less history. The "experience of two centuries" hardly justifies his claim that the four categories in the war-powers bill embrace all relevant emergencies. Let us look at only the more recent examples. The situation that led Franklin D. Roosevelt to order military action in the North Atlantic in 1941 is not covered by the bill; and Professor Bickel himself concedes that, had the bill then been in effect, it "may be true" that Congress would not have sustained the shoot-on-sight policy. Nor, as Congressman Bingham pointed out, would President Truman's response to the invasion of South Korea in 1950 have been permitted by this bill. Nor, as Professor Bickel's colleague, Eugene V. Rostow, has reminded me, would President Kennedy have been able under this bill to place a quarantine around Cuba in 1962. Nor, as Congressman Bingham has further suggested, would the bill allow a quick presidential response to a sudden Soviet-Arab attack on Israel. And I do not imagine any President confronted by emergencies for which the war-powers bill makes no provision would be greatly consoled by Professor Bickel's assurance that Congress might at some later time modify the restrictive clauses.

Not only would the war-powers bill have thus prevented what I at least would consider the wise exercise of presidential powers in emergencies it neglects to provide for; but it would not in my judgment, have prevented the foolish exercise of presidential power in the case which it is presumably above all designed to meet—that is, the Vietnam War. Professor Bickel rather loftily dismisses the proposition that, because the Senate passed the Tonkin Gulf resolution with two dissenting votes, one might conclude that Congress would have endorsed the continuation of hostilities at 30-day intervals under the terms of the war-powers bill. I can only suggest that he has forgotten what Congress was like in 1964, or in 1965, or in 1966, or in 1967; again he is perhaps a better lawyer than an historian. He might refresh his memory by reading the useful piece by John Rothchild, "Cooing Down the War: The Senate's Lame Doves" in the *Washington Monthly*, August 1971. The notion that members of Congress in these years would have defied Lyndon Johnson, the then revered General Westmoreland, the press (including, then, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*), patriotism and the flag by refusing to authorize the continuation of hostilities boggles the imagination. It is about as conceivable to suppose that, hand in hand, they would have jumped off the Capitol. Had the war-powers bill been in effect, which thank heaven it wasn't, all it would have done would have been to dig Congress in deeper, ratify indelibly its complicity in the escalation policy and make it harder for it to reverse itself today. And even today, after the war has lost its magic, Congress has not taken the action Professor Bickel seems to think it might have taken when the hawks were flying high.

The war-powers bill in its present form, so far as I can see, would have prevented Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy from serving the national interest and would not have prevented President Johnson from wrecking the national interest. This hardly seems a sensible result; nor can one be much moved by Professor Bickel's uncharacteristic hyperbole that "to argue from the unforeseeable in this instance, as Mr. Schlesinger does, is to suppose the bankruptcy of the attempt to rule by law, and the necessity of submitting ourselves to the discretionary rule of the men we elect." Really! Did no one at the Harvard Law School ever tell Professor Bickel about Reed Powell and the "parade of horribles"?

Obviously I am not against the attempt to deal with this situation by law. I am only against the attempt to deal with it by bad law—by law that will not achieve its alleged purpose and will, along the way, create trouble and risk. The restriction of presidential action in the absence of a congressional declaration of war to four categories that would have stopped aid to England in 1941 and to South Korea in 1950 and would have tied our hands before Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba is only one folly the bill commits. Another is its reliance on a 30-day theory of congressional veto. Thirty days introduces a comforting note of precision; but, if one applies the theory to historical circumstance, its efficacy becomes doubtful. When, after all, do hostilities begin? To be specific, what was the date marking the end of the first 30 days of our military action in Vietnam? In addition, when the date on which action begins can be clearly identified, the first 30 days thereafter are inevitably the period when the President who orders the action overwhelms Congress and the press with his own rendition of the facts and his own interpretation of the crisis (especially when emergency deprives the country of the opportunity for prolonged and intensive debate of the sort that took place in 1939–41). It generally takes more than 30 days for other facts to emerge and other interpretations to gain a hearing.

Suppose one dropped the misbegotten effort to limit in advance occasions in which the President can act without a declaration of war, and suppose one dropped the 30-day rule, would we not be better off? The war-powers bill, divested of these excrescences, contains some usable ideas. It provides, for example, for periodic written reports from the President about the status and prospects of the hostilities he has initiated. It provides for congressional authority to terminate such hostilities by joint resolution or statute. Building on these ideas, Congressman Bingham, in intelligent though evidently unavailing testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has proposed what would seem a much simpler and more effective approach to the problem.

Congressman Bingham suggests that the authority to carry on hostilities without a declaration of war should continue only as long as the President has at least tacit approval of both houses of Congress. Citing the Executive Reorganization Act as a precedent, he would give either house of Congress power by resolution to terminate hostilities. Any resolution of disapproval, if sponsored by one-third of the members of the body in which it originates, would go to the floor in 24 hours, become the pending business and be voted upon within three days.

If something like this had been in effect in 1848, it would have terminated the Mexican War (unless it would have brought enough administration supporters to the floor to defeat the resolution, passed by four votes in the House of Representatives, that pronounced the war "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States"). If it were in effect now, it could be a means of terminating the Indochina War without requiring Congress to regurgitate the repeated authorizations it would surely have made under the war-powers bill. Will Senator Javits or Professor Bickel or someone not tell us why this approach would not do everything their bill promises to do without creating the hopeless rigidities their bill must inevitably create?

Professor Bickel replies in the Correspondence section in this issue.

CORRESPONDENCE: REPLY TO SCHLESINGER

Sirs: I suppose I do know too little history to be as certain of its might-have-beens as Mr. Schlesinger, or to be willing to predict as much of it. I do believe that a reallocation by law of the war power, redefining the responsibilities of Congress, will affect the behavior of Congress in future circumstances. I believe, in other words, that it is worth trying to affect through institutional arrangements the course of the history Mr. Schlesinger predicts. That is why I suggested—not, so help me, loftily—that no conclusions are to be drawn from passage of the Tonkin Gulf resolution about the actions of a future Congress under the Javits bill.

I can imagine Presidents dealing with the crises Mr. Schlesinger recalls and projects in a way he would disapprove of, and I can imagine Congresses doing so. With or without a Javits bill, there can be no guarantee that Congresses or Presidents will always do what Mr. Schlesinger or I think wise. But if Mr. Schlesinger shares the objective of reclaiming for Congress the war role assigned to it by the Constitution, he ought not resist a statute that would make it impossible for a President to exercise an independent initiative for war, in the Middle East or elsewhere, however worthy his purpose. The Cuban quarantine of 1962 was in my judgment a borderline case. An air strike would not have been.

The answer to Mr. Schlesinger's final question is a question. If we do not trust Congress to act responsibly under the Javits bill, which requires it to act affirmatively one way or the other, why should we suppose that Congress will act responsibly under the Bingham proposal, which permits it to take refuge in noncommittal, non-action?

One more word. Mr. Schlesinger knows how to wound, or at least to try. He knew what pain could be inflicted by the charge that I am untrue to the teachings of Thomas Reed Howell. But he missed. A parade of horribles is something else. What I committed was hyperbole, as Mr. Schlesinger also says. That is fair enough.

ALEXANDER M. BICKEL.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON. AIME J. FORAND

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this means of joining the delegation from Rhode Island and other

Members in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late beloved colleague and friend, Representative Aime J. Forand.

Congressman Forand served with great distinction and honor as a Member of Congress from the State of Rhode Island, and although he was a quiet, gentle, and self-effacing colleague, he was also a most determined and dedicated champion of the people and the public interest.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means he worked tirelessly for many years to secure legislation to assure older Americans the right to medical care, and largely as the result of his efforts—his contributions—the medicare program was passed by the Congress.

For 18 years Representative Forand served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and contributed much toward the passage of vital and important legislation, including medicare for the benefit of people of this Nation.

Congressman Forand represented his district, State, and the Nation faithfully and well, and his indelible imprint will always remain in his legislative achievements and the great goals and objectives which he sought while serving in the House.

I extend to Mrs. Forand and other members of his family an expression of my deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

THE OVERPOPULATION CRISIS

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, not enough has been said before this Congress about the crisis we face in overpopulation. It is truly frightening to realize that the world's population is doubling in the short span of every 35 years.

We have barely begun to look for the ultimate answer to this crisis. Our early considerations make it very clear indeed that the solution will not be easily reached. Moral obstacles are too often irreconcilable, and the more basic biological considerations can only be met with an impossible mission of worldwide education.

While demographic experts point to a stabilization of population in the United States before the end of this century, it is all too clear that no such hopeful prospect can be seen in the undeveloped nations of the world. Here a national economic growth rate of 4 or 5 percent per year is hailed a great advance, while on the other side the population is growing at nine or 10 percent per year. The inevitable result is that more and more people are living in worse and worse poverty.

It becomes obvious that it is in these areas of the world that population control is the international problem. It is equally clear, however, that population controls cannot limit population growth to economic growth for the foreseeable future. I think it is also clear that there is more likelihood of being able to increase the economic growth rather than there is in reducing the rate of growth of the population. While we grope for answers in stabilizing population rates, let us apply known solutions to economic growth.

Recently, my convictions were reinforced by a thought-provoking article from the American Economic Foundation which I would like to share with you at this point:

THE FALLACIES WE LIVE BY: THAT PEOPLE ARE SMARTER THAN ANIMALS

People are the "great brains" of all living creatures. Their knowledge and reasoning power are immeasurably superior—except in two areas of vital importance: 1) people have not learned how to live together without killing each other; and 2) people have no instinctive realization of the dreadful results of overpopulation.

This ignorance, hopefully, results from the extreme youthfulness of Homo sapiens. Compared to the animal species that have learned these lessons, man is a newborn babe. Our history is measured in thousands of years, while that of the well-oriented animal groups is measured in millions. Perhaps, in their infancy, these species had the same blind spots. But they did learn and man should be able to learn much more quickly.

Population control in the animal kingdom is, compared to the people kingdom, truly amazing. For one example we are indebted to anthropologist Robert Ardrey, author of one of the most fascinating and significant books of our times, "The Social Contract." On September 21, 1971, The New York Times published a short Ardrey piece entitled "Birth Control in the Wilds."

The passage that follows refers to two African elephant herds separated only by the crocodile-infested Victoria Nile. One herd has a chronic food problem; the other does not. Referring to the former, Ardrey writes, "And here the elephant is reducing his numbers. Normal spacing of calves is four years. On the south bank it has risen to nine. The onset of female fertility occurs usually at eleven or twelve years. Here it has risen to eighteen.

"The elephant remains a mystery: Do females fail to come into heat? Is there copulation without fertilization? If she becomes pregnant, does she spontaneously abort? We do not know."

But we do know that they solved their problem in a way beyond human intelligence and will power. Our unimaginative reliance upon the gradual spread of birth control is irrational. The world already has 3½ billion mouths to feed, and faces a 100% increase every 35 years; yet we act as if there were nothing to do but hope for the impossible.

But there is something that could at least delay the tragedy. The countries facing mass starvation all have two things in common: 1) they have not substituted tool power for muscle power; and 2) they lack both the needed capital to buy the tools and the needed respect for private property to attract adequate foreign investment. Nothing can save them except increased productivity. *Nothing.*

So the question is: Will these nations become smart enough, soon enough, to avert disaster? And if they don't, will the wave of their self-destruction engulf the entire human race?

This may sound like science fiction, but can we happily assume that our survival is certain? This is really the first stern test of our young life.

NATIONAL CANCER ATTACK

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the national cancer attack legislation passed during the first session of the 92d Congress is one of the most important measures concerning health ever enacted by this body. I hope and believe that this legislation will result in an expansion of the type of cancer research described in the following recent news release from Duke University:

DURHAM, N.C.—Physicians at Duke University Medical Center are using a tuberculosis vaccine to promote immunity to a certain type of highly malignant skin cancer.

In a 32-month study, the Duke doctors have been able to retard growth of melanoma—which usually begins with a malignant mole—in 18 per cent of their research cases, most of them considered terminal.

Melanoma may spread to various parts of the body and is usually fatal. Duke doctors believe their research experience offers significant hope of recovery for patients in very early stages of the disease.

According to Dr. Hilliard Seigler, associate professor of surgery and immunology, and Dr. William Shingleton, professor of surgery, 22 patients in the terminal stages of melanoma were evaluated to determine their ability to produce antibodies against cancer cells. Only half of them showed evidence of an intact immune system.

The physicians believe that a functioning immune system would afford patients a margin of protection against melanoma.

It has long been recognized that a tuberculosis bacteria vaccine, BCG, is a potent protector against TB and a variety of other diseases. Because of this, it was reasoned that BCG might be an effective stimulant in boosting the immune system to fight cancer cells. The patients here received injections of BCG. Then they were placed on an IBM blood cell separator which isolated and collected cells directly responsible for producing antibodies.

The cells were additionally stimulated, under laboratory conditions, with cancer cells that had been bombarded with X-rays to prevent them from dividing once they were reintroduced into the patient.

The progress of the patients who showed marked regression of melanoma tumors demonstrated that stimulation of the immune system does provide some defense against melanoma, the Duke doctors said.

Of the original 22 who participated in the study, 10 died but four demonstrated complete tumor regression and in the remaining eight the disease was stabilized. The four also showed evidence of detectable antibodies.

The clinical significance here, said Seigler, is not so much that there was visible and lasting evidence of improvement in 18 per cent of the patients treated at Duke.

"What is important," he said, "is the fact that we believe this figure can be improved by treating patients in early stages of melanoma.

"We were seeing the worst kind of melanoma. These patients had undergone surgery and the other available treatment known to medical science. You could normally say that they would all die, but now we have reason to believe that some can be helped."

Seigler cited the 325,000 people who die from cancer each year in this country and de-

cleared that an 18 per cent regression rate among all melanoma patients would be highly significant.

In experiments with mice, this type of treatment also has proven effective against malignancy of soft tissues, leukemia and mammary tumors.

Now that the Duke physicians believe that BCG enhances the immune system and augments the body's ability to produce cancer-fighting antibodies, they hope to determine the necessary frequency of booster immunizations.

"Theoretically we could continue to immunize melanoma patients and thereby prevent tumor recurrence indefinitely, but first we must determine the interval between boosters," Seigler said.

He said that in Quebec, Canada, a physician immunized all the children in one town against tuberculosis and as a result the expected incidence of acute leukemia was reduced by 60 per cent.

"Something apparently interferes with the anti-body-producing mechanism once cancer invades the body. We think that by stimulating the immune system some cancer patients will benefit," he said.

EV BOWMAN—LAWNDALE MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives the naming of Everett Bowman as Lawndale's Man of the Year. Ev Bowman was accorded this honor in recognition of his years of unselfish service to the community of Lawndale. Besides his active participation in business associations, church groups, and other civic organizations, it was noted that Ev Bowman was most deserving for this award for his day-to-day willingness to lend a helping hand to all his neighbors. Letter after letter supporting Mr. Bowman's candidacy mentioned that he was always available to judge contests, play Santa Claus or perform any other task that might make life a little nicer for his fellow man.

Mr. Bowman has participated in numerous community activities which I would like to mention here for the RECORD. He was a charter member of the Mount Zion Primitive Baptist Church of Inglewood, and is presently serving as deacon and treasurer. He is a member of the Lawndale Chamber of Commerce and the Lawndale Rotary Club, serving on various committees. He is a charter member and founder of the South Bay 25 Club, and a member of the United Oil Distributors Association. He is also a committee member of the local YMCA and participates in the training program for the hard-core unemployed. These are but a few of the civic activities to which Ev Bowman gives unselfishly of his time and energy.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in wishing Ev Bowman a hardy congratulation on a job well done.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES PENSION REFORM BILL

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Employee Benefit Security Act. This act will insure some pension benefits to a worker who remains under his company's plan for a reasonable period of time. It will insure that the assets to pay the worker's pension are there when he retires. It will protect his rights to a pension if the company goes out of business. Furthermore, it will protect the assets of his pension fund against mismanagement.

Our Nation's private retirement system has come a long way since its humble beginning in 1875. It was then that the American Express Co. established the first industrial pension plan.

Widespread growth was late in coming in the United States. However, today there are over 43,000 plans covering 30 million workers. These plans have assets valued at over $138 billion.

We have all heard too many stories of workers losing out on a pension for one reason or another. Furthermore, we all know that many of our Nation's older citizens suffer greatly because of inadequate retirement income.

Since the 1965 Presidential Cabinet Committee report on private pensions, extensive debate has focused on the desirability of enacting legislation to impose certain minimum vesting, funding, fiduciary standards, and insurance requirements with respect to private plans. Numerous studies and legislative proposals have emerged. Now is the time to act.

My proposal, which is identical to the proposal of Congressman DENT of Pennsylvania, reflects the prior studies, the public debate, and the obvious need for reform. Specifically, the Employee Benefit Security Act would establish minimum standards of fiduciary conduct for plan trustees and administrators, to provide for their enforcement through civil and criminal means, and to require expanded reporting of the details of a plan's administrative and financial affairs.

The proposed Employee Benefit Security Act would improve the equitable character and soundness of private pension plans by requiring them to make irrevocable—or to vest—the accrued benefits of employees with significant periods of service with an employer. My proposal would permit vesting requirements to phase in under one of several alternatives—all of which would ultimately result in 100 percent vesting after 10 years of service.

Every pension plan subject to this act would be required to provide for contributions to the plan in amounts necessary to meet the normal costs of the plan, plus interest on any unfunded past service cost. Past service costs primarily arise through the practice of granting credit for past services of employees when new pension plans are established, or when the benefits under existing ones are increased. Vested liabilities would have to be funded according to a prescribed schedule which will systematically fund these costs in 25 years. Special transitional provisions are included for plans already in existence.

The Employee Benefit Security Act would protect the vested rights of participants against losses due to essentially involuntary plan terminations. This would be accomplished through the establishment of a Pension Benefit Insurance Corporation within the Department of Labor. Each plan would pay a premium for insurance at rates prescribed by the Pension Benefit Insurance Corporation based upon the amount of unfunded vested liabilities which is to be insured, and upon such other factors as the Corporation determines to be appropriate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I also believe it is important that we all recognize the fine efforts of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, has pioneered to protect the pension rights of this Nation's workers. Without hesitation, I would say that the most significant contributions in Congress have come from him, and I extend to him my sincerest congratulations. His efforts in this area have resulted in much greater public awareness of the problems that are involved.

THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here in the Congress, our fellow Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and freedom-loving people throughout the universe in tribute to the 47 million people of the Ukraine who celebrated the 54th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian Independence on January 22, 1972.

The Ukraine, a Soviet Republic of southeastern Europe, is presently the largest "captive" non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. The gallant struggle of this proud nation for freedom and independence has spanned a period of 11 centuries. Only three distinct eras of national statehood and independence have emerged during this time and the last, born with the fall of the Russian Empire in 1917, was the most agonizing to lose in March 1921, when the Treaty of Riga put an end to the Ukrainian National Republic.

The valor and dedication of the heroic people of the Ukraine in their constant and noble quest for independence and sovereignty are legendary. We salute the valiant Ukrainians who have been in the vanguard of the fight for freedom against

Communist oppression and solemnly acknowledge the many sacrifices and hardships they have endured in their desire and resolve to regain their national independence.

We, as Americans, wish to extend our moral encouragement for their commitment to the principles of freedom and liberty that they have so undeniably demonstrated throughout their history. In addition to our encouragement, they deserve from us a restatement of our own historic commitment to the principles of self-determination in a free world and to this and I request the support of my colleagues here in the House in joining President Lev E. Dobriansky of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—UCCA—Mr. John Chomko of Passaic, N.J., who is a resident of my congressional district and a member of their executive board, and all of the other members of the UCCA in commemorating the 54th anniversary of the Independence of the Ukraine and their continuing courageous struggle to achieve national integrity and sovereignty for the Ukraine and other captive nations of the world.

DEATH OF ALEXANDER T. KERR

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the very sad news of the death of a very fine American, Alexander T. Kerr, who passed away suddenly Wednesday, January 26, 1972, at the age of 51. Mr. Kerr was the secretary-treasurer of the Seafarers International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, a position which he had held since 1965.

It was my privilege to know Mr. Kerr for many years, the headquarters for the Seafarers International Union being located in my district in Brooklyn. From very difficult, humble beginnings, Mr. Kerr, by determination, hard work and devotion to the ideals and principles upon which our country was founded, achieved respect and honor among trade unionists everywhere.

Al Kerr came from a coal mining family in the town of Weaver, in the southern part of Illinois. His father was a coal miner. Al Kerr became a seaman as a young man and sailed during World War II aboard merchant ships carrying supplies to our troops in combat zones throughout the world. Two of the vessels on which he sailed were torpedoed and sunk. Mr. Kerr received several citations for valorous service during the war.

I think it is fitting and proper that we pay our respects to the memory of Al Kerr who was a decent and effective trade union representative, a very devoted husband, and an American who served his country with loyalty and courage in the critical period of World War II. In conclusion, I should like to offer to his wife, Mildred, his son, Robert, and his two daughters, Susan Kerr and Mrs. Elaine Harm, my deepest sympathy.

THE AIR WAR IN INDOCHINA

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, while U.S. combat deaths are down to less than 10 a week and troop levels have declined to 136,500 Americans, it is important to remember that a devastating air war still goes on in Indochina.

Earlier this week American B–52's pounded the western border of South Vietnam from the DMZ to the Central Highlands with the heaviest bombing raids in 4 months.

Air Force and Navy fighter bombers made at least 12 more strikes this week on North Vietnam itself with bombs and air-to-ground missiles in the heaviest action north of the DMZ this year.

Last year, U.S. planes dropped 800,000 tons of aerial munitions on South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, considerably more than was dropped when the air war against North Vietnam was at its height. United States planes dropped 124,000 tons of bombs on North Vietnam in 1966, and 200,000 tons in 1967. It is almost impossible to appreciate the enormity and destructive impact of the quantity of explosives unleashed in Vietnam.

We can only begin to imagine the dimensions of the bombing war when we realize that the 6,200,000 tons of bombs rained on Indochina so far is more than three times the bomb tonnage dropped by the United States in World War II. Most of it has been directed on South Vietnam, a country less than half the size of California.

There is no end in sight of this thundering rain of bombs and missiles.

In November, President Nixon declared that American air power would continue to support South Vietnamese combat forces "until there is a negotiated settlement or . . . until the South Vietnamese have developed the capacity to handle the situation themselves."

The air war has destroyed more than the enemy. It has contributed its share to the nightmare of 325,000 civilian deaths and more than a million civilian casualties in Vietnam. It is partly responsible for the refugee situation—about one-third of the population of South Vietnam has become refugees.

The bombing is making areas of the country wasteland. A typical mission of 6 huge B–52 bombers each carrying 30 tons of bombs and flying in close formation, can saturate a square mile with explosives demolishing everything in sight.

An estimated 23 million craters have been carved out by the 500-pound bombs dropped by our B–52's. Most of them are now filled with water—sometimes 20-feet deep—making an ideal breeding ground for malaria-carrying mosquitoes.

One more index of the magnitude of the bombing is that the shrapnel in the trees has become a serious problem to the lumber industry in Vietnam. One recent report claimed that 4 out of 5 logs being processed by Vietnamese sawmills have metal fragments in them which have to be removed. The cost of extricating the metal was forcing Vietnamese entrepreneurs to use Cambodian timber. But now metal fragments are also showing up in the Cambodian logs.

We are destroying the land and people to save them.

Will the bombing force the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to agree to our peace terms? It had no effect in 1967 at the most intense level of the bombing. Why should it have that effect now?

Even William P. Bundy who was Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Asian affairs for President Johnson, and at that time a strong advocate of American involvement in Vietnam, has recently stated his opposition to a continuation of bombing raids over North Vietnam: "I would doubt their usefulness very much indeed," he said.

Supposedly, one of the reasons for continuing the bombing is to protect our ground troops. But, notice the vicious circle in our policy: We are keeping a residual force of ground combat troops in Vietnam until North Vietnam releases our POW's. And to protect the ground troops we fly bombing raids. More flyers are shot down and become POW's thereby increasing the need for the residual force of ground troops. In fact, most of the POW's are pilots and crews of our planes.

Even if we were to withdraw all American troops from Vietnam, if we continue bombing to support South Vietnamese forces, the North Vietnamese will never release our POW's.

Thus, a way must be found not only to withdraw American troops from Vietnam but to end American involvement in the air war. The situation cries out for a settlement. A way must be found before the country is completely in ruin.

Since President Nixon took office more than 19,900 Americans have died in Vietnam. Over 100,000 have been wounded. The ground is soaked with American and Vietnamese blood. It is scarred with bomb craters and its forests have been defoliated with poisonous herbicides. Instead land is seeded with the metal of bombs, bullets, grenades, and helicopter parts.

For what purpose?

I would like to conclude by quoting from a resolution adopted by the American Catholic bishops:

> At this point in history it seems clear to us that whatever good we hope to achieve through continued involvement in this war is now outweighed by the destruction of human life and human values which it inflicts. It is our firm conviction, therefore, that the speedy ending of this war is a moral imperative of the highest priority. Hence we feel a moral obligation to appeal urgently to our nation's leaders and indeed to the leaders of all the nations involved in this tragic conflict to bring the war to an end without further delay.

A NEW YEAR'S LETTER PRAISING GOD AND COUNTRY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot today from some segments of our society about what is wrong with the "system" and how the poor have no chance to make it because of the transgressions of the so-called Establishment. I do not mean to imply that our Nation is without faults, but it was indeed a pleasure to read the following letter to Uncle Sam from Mr. Alton S. Newell, the president of the Newell Manufacturing Co. The son of a sharecropper and migrant farmer, Mr. Newell knew extreme poverty and deprivation as a child and yet was able, through his own hard work and determination and the kind assistance and concern of many individuals along the way, to reach the top in his field. We should all make a New Year's resolution to say thank you to Uncle Sam for the many blessings of our great country and I hope my House colleagues will take the time to read Mr. Newell's letter carefully:

[Advertisement from the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 29, 1971]

A NEW YEAR'S LETTER PRAISING GOD AND COUNTRY

DEAR UNCLE SAM: Since you have been the object of much criticism lately, both from within and without your borders, I would like to write you a few words of praise to brighten your New Year.

In the past two years I have travelled in most all the countries of the world. In most all the places I visited I saw irrefutable evidence of your deep concern for the welfare of all the people of the globe. Your men in uniform are scattered throughout the world. Not a one of them is there to conquer any space or subdue a human being. They are at their assigned places to insure that free men will remain free. Many white crosses there give evidence to the sacrifice made by those who never returned to their homeland.

Twice in my lifetime you have joined other nations to put down those who would enslave their fellow man. You beat your enemies to the ground only to pick them up again and dust them off, bind up their wounds and tenderly nurse them back to health again. In many cases you provided them with more modern and sophisticated equipment than we have at home. Your scientists, engineers and technicians are busy all over the world today to help people obtain a more abundant life. Your doctors, nurses and many helpers are fighting the effects of disease and poverty in underdeveloped and, in some cases, overpopulated countries of the world. Most of the people of the free world appreciate this and praise you for it and pray that you will not become discouraged enough to cease your endeavor. I pray for you and thank God for you, dear Uncle, because you have done so much for me.

I was born in a tent in Oklahoma and grew up in poverty. My parents were sharecroppers and moved from farm to farm. In the fall of 1922 they took their six children and headed west and became migrant workers. Seven or eight months later we reached California in time for the fruit harvest and became known, along with others, as "fruit tramps." The next year my parents separated when I was ten years of age. All the children, ranging in age from two to fourteen, went with my father and for several years went back and forth from Texas to California working our way along. We went to school when we were in one place long enough for the truant officers to find us. Getting an education under these conditions was difficult, but with the help of many others we all made it to high school . . . Our father's health was not good and he also developed a serious drinking problem. The two youngest children had to be sent to their grandparents for a while, but we soon got back together again. We finally settled down out west and began our slow climb out of poverty. Many people helped us along the way. Thank you, dear Uncle, for allowing God to bless us through you.

I sit today at the top of eight companies one which is doing business all over the world. I do not claim even a small amount of genius for myself, but would like to tell the world that our system of government gives a better chance to the individual to have a good life than any system known to man. I do not belittle those who have been unable to reach their goal but offer my experience for their encouragement and also to encourage those who have it made to help those who don't. I could never go back and find and thank all those whose lives touched and enriched mine, so to make up for it, I will try to help and encourage others. I count it a privilege to support my church and other worthwhile causes. I don't mind paying income taxes because they are an indication of material blessings. So dear Uncle Sam, don't let anyone tamper with your system of government unless they first show you a better one. Thanks for listening and Happy New Year.

Sincerely yours,

ALTON S. NEWELL,
President, Newell Manufacturing Co.

INTERNATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY YEAR

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a matter of great interest to this body that the nations of the world have become aroused to the need for international cooperation in the field of highway safety, an area with which the Committee on Public Works has concerned itself actively for many years. There is today widespread recognition that all countries, developed and underdeveloped alike, have a common cause in reducing the appalling toll of death and injury that occurs daily on their roads.

In that connection, I call to the attention of the House a proclamation that has just been issued by His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, designating 1973 as International Highway Safety Year.

His proclamation was issued at the request of the Ethiopian Road Federation, of which he is a patron, and which is a member of the International Road Federation in Washington, D.C.

His Imperial Majesty has called upon all national and international organizations to give full support to the cause of road safety on a worldwide basis, and particularly in 1973. He noted that highway construction in Ethiopia has done much in recent years to expand economic and social progress in his country and that this progress can and should be accompanied by equal strides in highway safety.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that all individuals and organizations interested in highway safety will endorse His Imperial Majesty's proclamation and join in plans and preparations to make 1973 one of the safest highway years in history.

AID TO EDUCATION PROPOSALS

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education is a matter of great concern to every Member of Congress.

Michael W. Butler, professor of economics at the University of Arkansas, and David L. Scott, associate professor of economics at Florida Southern College, have recently authored a timely article on the economics of Federal aid to education programs. They cite the present surplus of teachers, remedial education, and education for the handicapped as particular problem areas.

I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues.

THE MISALLOCATION IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(By David L. Scott and Michael W. Butler)

Over the past two decades one of the main educational problems was a shortage of teachers. To eliminate this shortage several government aid programs were put into effect. In 1958 President Eisenhower signed into law the National Defense Education Act, the purpose of which was to eliminate the shortage of teachers and scientists. The Higher Education Act of 1965 provided for teacher training programs, established a National Teachers Corps. and provided for graduate teacher training fellowships. The Education Professions Development Act of 1967 established programs to eliminate shortages of adequately trained educational personnel and to attract a greater number of qualified persons into the teaching profession. These acts and other federal aid programs are currently providing over $250,000,000 to train new teachers and to increase the educational attainment level of existing teachers.

The problem of a teacher shortage has been resolved. Today we are faced with a teacher surplus, and this surplus is projected by most sources to increase in the coming years. Table I shows a recent projection by the Office of Education.

TABLE I.—*Supply conditions for teachers in secondary and elementary schools*

Year, Supply Condition, and Number	
1968–69, Undersupply	61,000
1969–70, Undersupply	2,000
1970–71, Oversupply	20,000
1971–72, Oversupply	33,000
1972–73, Oversupply	44,000
1975–76, Oversupply	72,000
1978–79, Oversupply	93,000

Source—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, The Education Profession, 1969–70, p. 78.

TABLE II.—OFFICE OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT ATTEMPT TO DIRECTLY INCREASE THE SUPPLY OF TEACHERS

[In millions of dollars]

	1967	1968	1968	1970[1]	1971
National Defense Education Act: Title IV, college teacher fellowships	52.6	60.7	70.3	79.0	82.8
Education Professions Development Act: Higher education training program	.9	1.9	5.5	2.0	5.2
Preschool, elementary and secondary training programs	55.4	58.4	42.0	83.0	83.3
Preschool, elementary and secondary grants to States			2.1	17.6	15.3
Higher Education Act: National teachers corps	15.5	16.0	19.4	24.2	29.8
Educational Improvement for Handicapped: Teacher education and recruitment	21.9	24.2	21.7	27.8	31.0
Total	146.3	161.2	161.0	234.6	247.4

[1] Estimated expenditures.

Source: K. A. Simon and W. V. Grant, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education National Center for Educational Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics 1970. pp. 112–113.

While many factors affect the supply of teachers, federal subsidies are among the more significant.[1] Some examples of federal programs that have as their objective an increase in the supply of teachers are listed in Table II.[2]

Although we continue to spend money to solve a problem of teacher shortages that no longer exists, other problem area programs are inadequately funded. If money is to be spent in the area of education it should be diverted from the subsidization of teachers (which aggravates the problem of a teacher surplus) to programs that might offer greater benefit to our society. There are many areas of education that require additional aid in order to carry out their objectives such as programs which attempt to educate illiterate adults, handicapped persons, the economic disadvantaged and racial minority groups.

In 1969 $303,000 was spent under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for dropout prevention. The amounts spent for 1970 and 1971, $6.9 million and $10.2 million respectively, although considerably more, were still insufficient.[3] The number of 16–17 year olds not in school in October 1970 was 772,000 or ten percent of this age group. There were over 1,200,000 children ages 7 through 17 not in school during the same time period.[4] Moset of these, especially in the higher age groups, are considered dropouts. Furthermore, increased federal aid through the dropout prevention program with the primary objective of retaining these children in school could have benefits other than simply increasing the educational attainment of these children. Crime rates are high among 16–17 year olds not in school, especially in large cities, and welfare roles are crowded by people with low levels of educational attainment.[5] Both crime rates and welfare roles would probably be lowered by having fewer elementary and secondary school dropouts.

The number of illiterates in the United States 14 years of age and over is 1,433,000. The number between 14 and 24 years of age is 97,000 or about .3 percent of this age group. For the 16–24 year age group the illiteracy rate for whites is .2 percent and for Negroes it is .6 percent.[6] Many of these people could be helped by a properly funded program in remedial education. Under Title VI of the Higher Education Act, Office of Education expenditures for Special Programs for the disadvantaged-Talent Search and Remedial Assistance, for 1970 and 1971 are $1.8 million and $6.2 million respectively.[7] Expenditures for these years on a "per-person" basis amount to about $1.25 in 1970 and $4.33 in 1971, an insignificant amount considering the magnitude of the problem. The Committee on Economic Development recently wrote:

"A general equality in basic student skills and understanding is both possible and mandatory. Nearly everyone can learn to read and write and develop the skills necessary to secure equality of minimal achievement in the basic literary skills of reading, writing and computation. These skills are essential to every person. . . ."[8]

Day care centers provide a means by which the illiteracy rate might be lowered in the long run. Providing preschool education in day care centers could have a profound effect in raising the educational attainment level of young children.

"The most effective point at which to influence the cumulative process of education is in the early preschool years, when the child has a large capacity for acquiring skills and cultivating expectancies. Only a massive effort to establish both public and private preschool educational programs will provide the preparation in motivation, intellectual capacities, and physical skills essential to success in achieving total basic literary."[9]

As more and more women begin to work full-time, especially those considered economically disadvantaged, an increasing number of children are being put in preschool day care centers.[10] Both the number of children and the percent of children enrolled in preschool programs have been increasing since 1964. Table III shows the number of children enrolled in such programs during 1969. A further funding for preschool programs could have a significant long run impact in reducing the illiteracy rate and in reducing the dropout rate among disadvantaged youth. "Disadvantaged children who reach school age without preschooling soon fall behind in reading and writing. This results in retardation in all tasks requiring basic literacy" leading to failure and early dropouts.[11] The Headstart Program has had some success in providing early childhood education for disadvantaged preschool children. Since 1964, 3,300,000 children have benefited under this program. Even though the average assistance per child is currently about $1,050 per year, both a greater effort and a larger budget is necessary to solve the problems of the economically disadvantaged child.

TABLE III.—*Children under 6 years of age enrolled in prekindergarten programs October 1969*

Age and number of students	
3 years	29,395
4 years	484,880
5 years	79,895

Source.—Alvin Renetzky and J. S. Green (eds.), Standard Education Almanac (Los Angeles: Academic Media Publishers, 1971), p. 64.

Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 established the Followthrough Program which is intended "to help children from low income families sustain in the primary grades the educational gains made in Headstart or other similar preschool programs."[12] Followthrough could be a very significant program if it were properly funded but it is estimated that in 1970 the program was able to serve only about 35,000 children, a totally inadequate number.[13]

Despite the magnitude of the problem many programs designed to aid the disadvantaged, handicapped and minority groups are not successful simply because the programs lack money. Table IV illustrates some of the expenditures of the Office of Education for 1970. In comparing the expenditures on these programs to expenditures for teacher training in Table II, it is obvious that there exists a misallocation of Office of Education funds.

TABLE IV.—*Partial listing of expenditures, Office of Education, 1970*

(In millions of dollars)

Programs and expenditures*	
Educationally deprived children (Indian)	$9.0
Early childhood education for handicapped	3.0
Programs for disadvantaged—Talent Search	5.0
Adult basic education—Special projects	8.0
Adult education courses (American Indian)	1.1
Program for disadvantaged—Upward Bound)	30.0
Dropout prevention	10.0

*Estimated

Source.—List of Operating Federal Assistance Programs Compiled during the Roth Study, Prepared by the Staff of Representative William V. Roth, Jr. (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

We think it is necessary that the programs of the Office of Education be reviewed and programs that are no longer serving the public be eliminated. Money needs to be allocated to programs that are attempting to solve current problems, not problems of the past. More specifically, the programs whose purpose it is to increase the supply of teachers should be eliminated and the money used to fund programs which aid disadvantaged and handicapped students. This would accomplish two goals: the elimination or reduction of the projected surplus of teachers and the elevation of the education level of a large number of students, especially the handicapped and disadvantaged.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Some other factors affecting teacher supply are higher salaries, job security, improved working conditions, greater job prestige, *etc.* Both demand and supply are significant in determining the surplus of teachers.

[2] For a complete summary of Office of Education expenditures by legislative program for fiscal years 1960 through 1971 see K. A. Simon and W. V. Grant, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Digest of Educational Statistics 1970* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 112–13.

[3] Estimated amounts.

[4] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, *Current Population Reports—Population Characteristics*, series P–20, no. 222, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 28, 1971), p. 12.

[5] In 1969 30.5 percent of total arrests occurred in the age group of 18 years old and under. Juvenile delinquents tend to be concentrated in the inner city area. See the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports–1969, *Crime in the United States* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 56 and p. 122. Also see the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Task Force Report: *Crime and Its Impact—An Assessment* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 60–72.

[6] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, *Current Population Reports—Population Characteristics*, series P–20, no. 217 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 10, 1971), p. 8.

[7] Estimates by the Office of Education.

[8] Committee for Economic Development, *Education for the Urban Disadvantaged—From Preschool to Employment* (New York:

Committee for Economic Development, 1971), p. 17.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] The probability of being poor is about three times as great for a Negro family as it is for a white family, a fact which probably accounts for there being a larger percentage of Negro children age 3 to 4 years enrolled in nursery school than white children of the same age group. See U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports—Population Characteristics*, series P–20, no. 215 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 5, 1971), p. 2.

[11] CED Report, *loc. cit.*, p. 35.

[12] List of Operating Federal Assistance Programs Compiled during the Roth Study, Prepared by the Staff of Representative William V. Roth, Jr. (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 394.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 395.

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, twice in the past 2 weeks the President has asked—even pleaded—with Congress to act promptly and decisively to end the crippling west coast dock strike.

His message yesterday reflected his frustration at the reluctance of the Congress to face up to its responsibilities in this regard. The Congress should act and it must act. Eventually it will have to act. There are really no two ways about it.

For 15 months now, the collective bargaining process has been underway. And in those 15 months, little if anything has been accomplished other than to point up the hopelessness of the situation.

And for the better part of the time since last July 1, the American public has been dealt a crippling blow, and our best efforts to restore health to our national economy have been hindered. The cost to the west coast States alone has been estimated at $23 million a day for each day of the strike.

The parties to the negotiations can foresee no end to the impasse. Millions of Americans are suffering needlessly. The President has exhausted every remedy available to him in trying to resolve this matter. And the Congress is seemingly unconcerned or reluctant to act or deliberately not acting. Some had hoped that the mere threats of congressional intervention would spur a voluntary settlement. Yet Congress does not even appear to be threatening action.

Clearly, no one—not the President nor any Member of the Congress—relishes interference with the venerable American tradition of free, collective bargaining, last of all in an election year. But the Congress cannot look the other way and hope the problem will disappear, because it will not. It will only get worse.

It is high time that we face up to our responsibility and move to end this calamity, either as the President has requested or in some other manner that the wisdom of this body should decide. But the important thing is that Congress act and act swiftly.

BIG SCORE FOR NIXON

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Daily World on January 17, 1972, entitled, "Big Score for Nixon."

I think this represents the most accurate analysis of the efforts that President Nixon has continually made to bring an end to the Vietnam war and to effectuate the safe return of our prisoners of war. The article follows:

BIG SCORE FOR NIXON

President Nixon's speech Tuesday night may not end the war in Vietnam any sooner, but it has effectively cut the ground out from under his antiwar political opponents at home.

Hanoi and the Viet Cong have responded in their automatic fashion. Sneering rejection has become so routine after every offer of an American President that it would be a major shock if they answered in any other way. There is nothing Mr. Nixon could say—short of all-out capitulation—that the Communist enemy would accept.

But the fact is that the eight-point plan he has offered this time is so reasonable and so fair that Americans must find it hard to understand why the North Vietnamese would not quickly latch onto if they are genuinely interested in ending the war.

Why that doesn't happen, only the Communists can explain. Something in their psychology, perhaps, makes them bound *not* to budge an inch from their own peace plan, which amounts to a unilateral backout—surrender—by the Americans.

No plan can be acceptable to them unless it guarantees them a takeover of the Government in Saigon. That Mr. Nixon cannot offer or agree to.

But in American eyes the offer of President Nguyen Van Thieu to step down from office and have the Government elected under international supervision is as fair as anything could be. And the requirement for a cease-fire and release of American prisoners of war is a minimum demand that could not harm the enemy in any way.

But Hanoi is not buying it. So what good is the Nixon proposal?

Simply this: The President has let the world know how far this country already has gone and is willing to go to bring peace to Southeast Asia. And he has shown once again how dangerous it is for political opponents to jump on an American Chief Executive in foreign affairs.

The political claque demanding that every last American in Vietnam be withdrawn in the next five minutes is of course rejecting Mr. Nixon's proposal as predictably as the Communists. The McGoverns and Hartkes can no more look at this issue honestly and objectively than they can endorse a Republican President for re-election.

But the American people as a whole will not listen to these homegrown parrots of the Hanoi line. Anyone with the slightest sense of fairness must know the President has bent over as far as he can go—and we now know *he has been doing it for 30 months.*

Beyond this his only alternative is to run up the white flag and swallow the enemy's terms—abandoning American prisoners to the mercy of their captors. Such a course can be acceptable only to the faintest of hearts and the fuzziest of heads, some of whom are running for President.

CHILD CARE CARAVAN PROGRAM

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the creative efforts we make now to broaden the world of our pre-schoolchildren will surely reap future dividends.

Innovative programs designed to reach parents with information about and for young children are being initiated as a mean of providing preschoolers with interesting, stimulating activities in the world of imagination, nature and art. Such a program will be instituted in northwestern Connecticut through the efforts of Joan-Gayle Harrison who teaches at Northwestern Community College and coordinates Northwestern's child-care program.

A $3,900 grant from the Connecticut Commission on Aid to Higher Education together with about $2,000 in "in-kind" matching funds from the college will help establish a child care caravan to serve at least eight communities. The child care caravan will help inform parents about ways in which they can engage their youngsters in activities that develop interests and skills and provide wholesome recreation.

Northwestern Community College and Miss Harrison are to be commended for their industry and foresight in planning such a program. For the interest of my colleagues, an article further describing this much needed program which appeared in the Winsted Evening Citizen follows:

LOCAL COLLEGE TEACHER GETS GRANT FOR CHILD CARE CARAVAN PROGRAM

Joan-Gayle Harrison of Northwestern Community College faculty has received a $3,900 grant from the Connecticut Commission on Aid to Higher Education.

The college will contribute about $2,000 in "in-kind" matching funds.

The grant funds will be used to institute a child-care caravan program designed to serve the parents of pre-school children in northwestern Connecticut. This program seeks to reach parents with information about and for young children. It will demonstrate to parents means of providing stimulating, interesting, and fun activities for young children.

The areas stressed will be imagination, art, and nature. Additionally the program will provide actual materials for parents to work with, and to take home for their children. Developmental needs of young children will be stressed. All activities will be based on inexpensive or free materials.

Child Care Caravan will be a three evening program given in specified target areas. The three-hour sessions will be scheduled on consecutive Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday nights.

Each session will begin with a discussion. Participants will be encouraged to express their ideas. The activity period will follow; all of the activities will be done simultaneously. The participants will move from activity to activity as their interests determine.

Each activity will be set up by a student helper who will explain the procedures.

The focal point of the first session will be activities for the young child in the world of imagination. Topics to be covered include importance of role play, water play, encouraging imagination, and stimulating imagination. The second session will deal with activities for the young child in the world of art.

Topics to be covered include development of small muscles, development of sensory skills, development of eye-hand coordination and importance of experiences on development of skills. The third session will cover young children in the world of nature. Topics for discussion will be the role of ecology in the child's future, significance of nature in leisure activities, development of vocabulary, learning about one's natural inheritance, and development of observational skills. The activities covered each evening will be designed to emphasize these concepts.

At present, the Child Care Caravan is planning to conduct programs in Canaan, Sharon, Washington, Litchfield, Colebrook, New Hartford, Woodbury and Thomaston.

Speaking about the program Miss Harrison said, "The caravan concept has succeeded in both urban and rural areas with medical teams, dramatic groups, art exhibits, and libraries. Its major advantages are that the program goes out to the people, rather than the people coming to the program. Also, one presentation can be used for many situations."

Miss Harrison is Coordinator of Child Care Program at Northwestern. She has a Master's degree in Child Development and Family Relations from the University of Tennessee. Prior to her coming to Northwestern, she was an early childhood specialist at Progress for Providence, a community action agency in Providence, R.I. In that capacity she was instrumental in forming the Rhode Island 4C's (Community Coordinated Child Care).

While she was doing her graduate work at Tennessee she was involvd with Focus, an organization that works in Appalachia. Also she taught a class in Child Care for New Careers.

Prior to her graduate work Miss Harrison taught kindergarten in North Branford, Connecticut. She also codirected and taught a prekindergarten summer program for two summers in North Branford.

As Coordinator of the Department of Child Care at Northwestern she has worked on the development of the curriculum. Miss Harrison also initiated the formation of the Connecticut Counsel of Community College Child Care Coordinators. She also initiated a liaison among the college, the Early Childhood Section of the Department of Education and the Department of Health.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

PARLIAMENTARIANS ASK CEASE-FIRE IN VIETNAM

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, experienced observers throughout the world are not at all satisfied that the hostilities in Vietnam are ending as they should. Below I am appending an appeal from 115 parliamentarians of many nations for a cease-fire in Vietnam that shall extend from Christmas to the Tet holiday. Their appeal follows one issued by the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam, containing thinkers of many countries.

As a U.S. parliamentarian, I am happy to join these concerned legislators, because I agree so deeply with their wish for more positive steps toward peace in Vietnam.

The material follows:

AN APPEAL TO ALL COMBATANTS IN INDOCHINA: IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY STOP THE KILLING NOW

We speak for millions who are sickened beyond endurance by the continued bloodletting in Vietnam and its neighbor countries. The bombing. The My Lais. The War against civilians by both sides. The search-and-destroy missions. The ambushes and the terror and the torture. The young men, ripped apart, crying for their mothers. The children, burned and wounded, fatherless and motherless. The widows, the cripples, the farmers whose land has been made sterile by defoliants and fire. Negotiations, protests, cries against the horror, make no headway against one harsh fact. The killing goes on.

It must be stopped! Not only for the sake of the Vietnamese and Laotians and the Cambodians and the young American soldiers, but for all our sakes. Our sense of humanity cannot survive these inhuman indecencies.

Political settlements are necessary, we know, and both sides have stated positions that make them possible. Their proposals have been so hedged about with unacceptable conditions as to make agreements almost impossible, as all the parties continue to seek victory or advantage on the battlefield. But the statements have been made, and world opinion must force them out of the realm of partisan rhetoric and into the framework of political reality. Then the Paris talks can become something more than the bitter farce they now are. Finding ultimate solutions will be a long hard process, but the only alternative is continued slaughter.

All the more reason to stop the killing now. Political settlement made over a wasteland of corpses is anathema.

CEASE-FIRE NOW

The United States must take the first move. It is American firepower that accounts for most of the deaths and almost all of the destruction. It is Americans who are fighting half the world away from their own shores. They must take the initiative:

To declare unilaterally an immediate cease-fire, stopping the bombing and ground missions, not firing unless fired upon, taking positions of self-defense;

To pursue vigorously an agreement by which that cease-fire can be made permanent;

To specify an early date by which its military withdrawal will be complete—perhaps six months after the cease-fire becomes effective.

The South Vietnamese Government must join fully in the cease-fire, and in the negotiations required to make it permanent. They must also accept such safeguards as are necessary for the National Liberation Front forces to pursue their goals politically after the cease-fire.

For all the killing to end the National Liberation Front-Provisional Revolutionary Government and the North Vietnamese must respond in kind. We call on them to react positively to such a cease-fire initiative when it is made; and to join, under such safeguards, in ending the killing and in the negotiations for a permanent cease-fire.

A cease-fire now would help create the conditions in which a general settlement of the conflict would be possible. Such a settlement, which would move the conflict from the military to the political arena, requires a free and open political process which excludes no candidate or party.

But that can happen only when the shooting has stopped.

We appeal to all three Great Powers, whose own contest for power and influence is being fought in Southeast Asia to use their influence on the warring parties to bring about a permanent cease-fire. Not only the United States, but the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China must join to bring this holocaust to an end, for the sake of the humanity whose welfare they profess to protect. It is they who must in some manner agree upon a neutral commission to supervise the cease-fire and to assure that neither side takes military advantage of it.

We are one people, all of us. They are our brothers whom we kill—and our sisters and our children! We cannot let this slaughter go on. We appeal to the consciences of men—and women throughout the world, whatever their personal political loyalties, to join us in this demand:

End the killing now! Demand an Immediate, Total Cease-Fire With Absolute Commitment to Complete Withdrawal.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF CONSCIENCE ON VIETNAM

We, members of the Parliaments of our respective nations, join in the appeal issued by the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam to Stop-the-Killing in Indo-China through the immediate institution of a cease-fire, unilaterally announced by the United States and joined in by the other three parties to the war. We believe that as the moves toward political settlement are being made, it is intolerable that the killing and bombing should continue in these countries that have suffered so much already. We join with the 150 original sponsors of this appeal wholeheartedly to call on the governments involved to take immediate action.

Specifically, we propose that the usual Christmas truce be combined with the usual brief cease-fire at Tet to make a Christmas-to-Tet cease-fire. We ask that both sides announce their willingness to do this, and to welcome an international team of observers, including if possible Vietnamese of all parties, to supervise the cease-fire in order to make sure that neither side takes military advantage of it.

We ask each side in the war also to declare that it will not be the first to resume hostilities after Tet.

We believe that the conscience of the world combine with the dictates of political good sense to insist that this slaughter be stopped.

We send this appeal to all parties in the dispute, and particularly to our fellow Parlimentarians in the United States Congress.

W. Albeda, M.P., Netherlands.

Kristian Albertsen, M.P., Denmark.

Frank Allaun, M.P., United Kingdom.
Norman Atkinson, M.P., United Kingdom.
Svend Auken, M.P., Denmark.
Rt. Hon. Philip Noel Baker, M.P., United Kingdom.
Mr. Meizoz Bernanrd, M.P., Switzerland.
Sidney Bidnell, M.P., United Kingdom.
Albert Booth, M.P., United Kingdom.
Mr. P. J. Boukema, M.P., Netherlands .
Andrew Brewin, M.P., Canada.
Mrs. G. Brautigam, M.P., Netherlands.
Mr. Albert Bussey, M.P., Switzerland.
Lord Ritchie Calder, M.P., United Kingdom.
Mogens Camre, M.P., Denmark.
W. du Chatinier, M.P., Netherlands.
Mr. Andre Chavannes, M.P., Switzerland.
Poul Dalsager, M.P., Denmark.
Stanley Clinton Davis, M.P., United Kingdom.
Helle Degn, M.P., Denmark.
Tran Ngoc Diao, M.P., South Vietnam.
Huynh Ngoc Dieu, M.P., South Vietnam.
Meta Ditzel, M.P., Denmark.
Mai Ngoc Duog, M.P., South Vietnam.
Mr. Pierre Duvanel, M.P., Switzerland.
C. Egas, M.P., Netherlands.
D. Eisma, M.P., Netherlands.
Hans E. Erenbjerg, M.P., Denmark.
Reidar Faurbye, M.P., Denmark.
Ted Fletcher, M.P., United Kingdom.
Mr. Armand Forel, M.P., Switzerland.
Dr. Mr. B. de Gaay Fortman, M.P., Netherlands.
M. Gardeniers-Berendsen, M.P., Netherlands.
M. Gargar, Senator, France.
Mr. Pierre Gassman, M.P., Switzerland.
Nguyen Van Han, M.P., South Vietnam.
Ove Hansen, M.P., Denmark.
Svend Haugaard, M.P., Denmark.
Kristine Heitberg, M.P., Denmark.
Kart Hjortnes, M.P., Denmark.
Ta Thanh Hoi, M.P., South Vietnam.
Nguyen Cong Hoan, M.P., South Vietnam.
Robert Hughes, M.P., United Kingdom.
Dr. M. van Hulten, M.P., Netherlands.
Phan Xuan Huy, M.P., South Vietnam.
Frode Jakobsen, M.P., Denmark.
Svend Jakobsen, M.P., Denmark.
Mr. Ziegler Jean, M.P., Switzerland.
Hugh Jenkins, M.P., United Kingdom.
Anker Jorgensen, M.P., Denmark.
Rudolf Kaffka, M.P., West Germany.
Russell Kerr, M.P., United Kingdom.
Arne Kielland, M.P., Norway.
Ds. J. Knot, M.P., Netherlands.
H. Koekoek, M.P., Netherlands.
Edele Kruchow, M.P., Denmark.
C. Laban, M.P., Netherlands.
Aksel Larsen, M.P., Denmark.
Arne Larsen, M.P., Denmark.
Drs. A. J. Lems, M.P., Netherlands.
The Rt. Rev. Lord MacLeod, M.P., United Kingdom.
Doan Mai, M.P., South Vietnam.
A. Martini, M.P., Netherlands.
Mr. J. W. Masman, M.P., Netherlands.
A. Mater, M.P., Netherlands.
John Mendelson, M.P., United Kingdom.
Ian Mikardo, M.P., United Kingdom.
To Do Minh, M.P., South Vietnam.
Orla Moller, M.P., Denmark.
G. Monnerville, Senator, France.
Mrs. Gabrielle Nanchen, M.P., Switzerland.
Poul Overgaard Nielsen, M.P., Denmark.
Preben Steen Nielsen, M.P., Denmark.
Ho Ngoc Nhuan, M.P., South Vietnam.
A. T. Oele, M.P., Netherlands.
D. A. Th. van Oijen, M.P., Netherlands.
Stanley Orme, M.P., United Kingdom.
Laurie Pavitt, M.P., United Kingdom.
Carl Bertel Pedersen, M.P., Denmark.
Nguyen Van Phung, M.P., South Vietnam.
Nguyen Van Phuoc, M.P., South Vietnam.
S. P. Pronte, M.P., Netherlands.
John Rankin, M.P., United Kingdom.
Prof. Dr. L. M. de Rijk, M.P., Netherlands.
Else-Merete Ross, M.P., Denmark.
Hon. Jovito Salonga, M.P., Philippines.
J. Schaefer, M.P., Netherlands.
A. Schouten, M.P., Netherlands.
Renee Short, M.P., United Kingdom.
Dennis Skinner, M.P., United Kingdom.
The Rt. Rev. Lord Soper, United Kingdom.
Poul Sogaard, M.P., Denmark.
A. G. van der Spek, M.P., Netherlands.
Bernhardt Tastesen, M.P., Denmark.
Huynh Trung Thanh, M.P., South Vietnam.
Tieu Mong Thu, M.P., South Vietnam.
Ly Truong Tran, M.P., South Vietnam.
Le Tran Trang, M.P., South Vietnam.
Ir. D. S. Tuijnman, M.P., Netherlands.
Nguyen Phuoc Vinh Tung, M.P., South Vietnam.
Age Valbak, M.P., Denmark.
Mr. Arthur Villard, M.P., Switzerland.
Holger Viveke, M.P., Denmark.
J. J. Voogd, M.P., Netherlands.
H. Wiebenga, M.P., Netherlands.
E. R. Wieldraaijer, M.P., Netherlands.
Drs. W. A. F. Wilbers, M.P., Netherlands.
Mr. J. H. van Wijk, M.P., Netherlands.
D. de Zeezuw, M.P., Netherlands.
Dr. J. H. Zoon, M.P., Netherlands.

ADDITIONAL NAMES RECEIVED TODAY, DECEMBER 15, 1971

Italy

Carlos Fracanzani, Deputy.
Ugo Bartosaghe, Deputy.
Antonello Trombadori, Deputy.
Luigi Anderlini, Senator.
Carlos Levi, Senator.

Denmark

Tove Lindbo Larsen, M.P.
Birthe Weiss, M.P.
Niels Helveg Petersen, M.P.
Poul Dam, M.P.

AIME FORAND

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of former Congressman Aime Forand on January 18, the American people lost a good friend and effective ally.

Aime Forand represented the First District of Rhode Island from 1937 to 1939 and from 1941 to 1960. In truth, his constituency was the American people, and he served them loyally and well both as a Member of this body and as a private citizen.

It was my privilege to serve with Aime Forand on the Committee on Ways and Means for almost 15 years. During that time he emerged as the principal spokesman and advocate of social security, unemployment insurance, and most importantly, medicare.

In 1960, because of failing health, Aime Forand retired from the House but not from the battle. In that year he founded the National Council of Senior Citizens to lead the fight for medicare. Five years later, when the battle was won, Aime Forand was rightfully called the father of medicare.

Those of us who worked with him know how very much the title—"Father of Medicare"—is his.

Even more important than medicare is the example of public service which Aime Forand leaves us. He taught us what a Congressman can be and should be, and that is Aime Forand's real legacy.

POLLUTION, A EUROPEAN PROBLEM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are too often apt in our necessary concern over the spread of pollution to hurl verbal abuse at our government institutions and business corporations as if pollution were purely an American problem. More specifically, American manufacturers are pictured as major villains with the implication being that in our country more than anywhere else in the globe pollution has surpassed controls.

A very timely article in the New York Times of Friday, January 21, on the problems of European pollution has come to my attention, and I insert it into the RECORD to properly make the point that pollution is a problem in all continents.

The article follows:

POLLUTION, A EUROPEAN PROBLEM

ROME.—Nearly everybody here seems to be talking about foul air, dirty water, adulterated food, forest fires or the massacre of birds and animals by throngs of weekend hunters, but only the lower echelons of the Italian judiciary are doing anything about it.

A 29-year-old Rome magistrate, Gianfranco Amendola, kept a local industrialist in jail for six days until he promised to buy new equipment to purify wastes from his oilseed plant that had been fouling the Tiber River and the nearby sea.

Italian magistrates have impounded tankers found to have leaked oil into already-polluted coastal waters, forced refineries to clean up, and ordered Rome's international Fiumicino Airport to filter fuel and lubricants from the flow into the sea.

PROBLEM HELD VAST

These cases are symptomatic of the vast Italian ecological problem, recognized by Italian and international experts as having deteriorated so much in the last two decades that the country faces menaces worse than most any other part of Europe.

Not that the rest of Europe is not greatly concerned about pollution. For example, West Germany is pressing for controls on the fouling of the Ruhr and Saarland areas; last May, millions of fish died in the pollution of the Necker and Sieg, tributaries of the Rhine by a combination of a dry spell and the outflow from a wood-processing plant.

Paris, whose air is noxious from the unending flow of street-clogging automobiles, as well as ordinary urban pollution, is testing the filtering of air through 16.5-foot-high towers that are basically oversized vacuum cleaners.

Britain, with beaches fouled several times from spilled tanker cargoes, has said she will sink or seize any oil carrier—inside or outside territorial waters—that threatens to dirty her shores.

The problem of the Mediterranean Sea was the subject of an international Pacem in Maribus conference in Malta in July, which called for a Mediterranean council to curb pollution of the sea, and controls on such things as the design of oil tankers, or sewage disposal into the sea.

In Italy, the generally over-cautious state radio and television system have done a good job the last few years in alerting the people to the ecological dangers facing their beautiful country.

The reasons for the environmental crisis facing Italy are many. The country, densely populated, has had spectacular industrial development, including an inflow of millions from rural areas into the cities, during the last generation. One of five Italians now owns an automobile. And Italy refines much more crude oil for export than is needed for home consumption.

The magistrates that have taken up the cudgels for striking out against the polluters have substituted themselves for a Parliament and a Government that are engrossed in partisan politics. They have stirred the nation by taking the place of the inefficient state and municipal bureaucracies.

One 31-year-old judge, Ettore Maresia, caused an enormous impression when he jailed for 30 hours the Mayor, Pietro Guglielmini, of the seaport city of Civitavecchia as an alleged polluter, for ignoring urgings to curb the flow of raw sewage into the Tyrrhenian Sea.

Judicial proceedings in the landmark cases involving the Mayor and the Rome industrialist are pending, and hundreds of industrial concerns are fighting court orders to install antipollution equipment. But other companies have paid fines and have mended their ways, as well as sewage pipes.

So there has been progress. Only 10 years ago, it would have been considered almost high treason to suggest that the tumultuous motorization and the string of new refineries along the 5,000 miles of Italian coastline were ruining the country that was once praised as "the garden of Europe."

Only when ecology became a household word in the United States did Italians realize that they, too, had to worry about their environment. A few politicians in search for a cause did some well-publicized public worrying about the environment. But so far Italy lacks comprehensive legislation seeking clean air and water.

The only major study about the environmental perils and the cost of ending it was, ironically, undertaken by Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi, the Government oil and gas combine, which operates many of the coastal refineries.

The study estimated it would cost $14.4-billion over a 15-year period to clean up Italy; nobody knows where such funds can be raised.

An international banking consortium has made available $400-million to save Venice from its worst ecological enemies. But even there, much more will be needed to preserve the unique lagoon city from decay.

DOLLARS FOR HANOI—A RENEWED BRIBE FOR "PEACE"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent announcement of his $2.5 billion in foreign aid to rebuild and reconstruct North Vietnam is but another attempt at international bribery—the U.S. Government is simply trying to buy Communist agreement to accept American surrender.

This is not a new attempt to buy peace; it was first proposed by President Lyndon Johnson, April 7, 1965, when he announced in a speech at Johns Hopkins University that the U.S. stood ready to participate in "unconditional discussions" toward a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. He urged the Southeast Asia nations, including North Vietnam, to undertake a massive, cooperative economic development program that he hoped would be initiated by U.N. Secretary U Thant and financed by the United States and all other industrialized countries, including the Soviet Union.

President Johnson promised, April 7, 1965, to ask Congress "to join in a billion-dollar American investment in this effort as soon as it is under way."

Nothing really seems to have changed. The bribe offer has gone up $1.5 billion yet the Communists continue to refuse the offer, knowing that the American Government will continue to up the offer and will eventually yield to whatever the Communists demand, including total and unconditional U.S. surrender and financial terms which they specify.

The President fails to appreciate that the Communists will not be bought off short of their avowed goal—total and completed domination in that area and eventually the world.

What is most shocking is that the American Government continues to talk while American men continue to die; the administration continues to consider every possible alternative to end the war in Southeast Asia, short of victory—the only honorable means and the only one available short of total, absolute, and unconditional surrender of the American people for the first time in their history.

I ask that related material follow and urge our colleagues to pay particular note to the material concerned with the institution of the Asian Development Bank, the organization designed to provide such aid and assistance as promised by both Presidents.

The little publicized truth is that the House only yesterday approved continued American funding of the Asian Development Bank, thus giving President Nixon the opportunity to carry out his proposal of rebuilding and reconstructing North Vietnam.

The materials follow:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 28, 1972]

U.S. AID OFFER IS $7.5 BILLION

(By Garnett D. Horner and George Sherman)

Hanoi representatives were told in two secret meetings last summer that North Vietnam could expect post-war reconstruction aid from the United States of around $2.5 billion, administration officials have disclosed.

Henry A. Kissinger, President Nixon's supersecret negotiator, used the $2.5 billion figure for North Vietnam—out of a total of $7.5 billion in U.S. aid for Indochina over a five-year period—as illustrating what kind of postwar aid Nixon had in mind.

It was emphasized by officials here yesterday and today that the figures mentioned to the North Vietnamese in the secret Paris talks were not firm, but merely illustrative of the range of aid that might be developed.

The promise of reconstruction aid after peaceful settlement of the Indochina war was outlined to the Hanoi representatives after they had demanded reparations from the United States.

State Department officials said that no detailed planning has begun inside the administration to carry out the offer. They added, however, that should Hanoi accept, it could be cranked into the aid machinery "very quickly."

Yesterday, John Hannah, administrator of the Agency for International Development, confirmed that his agency could carry out the operation.

But he told a conference of editors and broadcasters at the State Department that the program would take special congressional approval, since all Communist countries are now excluded from the 40-nation aid program.

Administration officials explained later that they would simply have to ask Congress, following any over-all settlement with Hanoi, to exempt North Vietnam from the foreign aid legislation.

THE INDEX OF WORLD EVENTS

VOLUME XXV

[From Facts on File Yearbook 1965]

VIETNAM CRISIS

L. B. J. Offers Talks & Aid

Pres. Johnson announced Apr. 7 that the U.S. stood ready to participate in "unconditional discussions" toward a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. He urged Southeast Asian nations, including North Vietnam, to undertake a massive, cooperative economic development program that he hoped would be initiated by UN Secy. Gen. U Thant and financed by the U.S. and all other industrialized countries, including the Soviet Union. He said he would ask Congress "to join in a billion dollar American investment in this effort as soon as it is under way."

Mr. Johnson made the proposals in a speech delivered at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md.

Regarding negotiations, the President said: "We will never be 2d in the search for . . . a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. There may be many ways to this kind of peace: in discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned, in large groups or in small ones, in the reaffirmation of old agreements or their strengthening with new ones . . . We remain ready, with this purpose, for unconditional discussions."

Mr. Johnson said that the "essentials of any final settlement" were: "An independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no country."

In reaffirming the U.S. commitment in Vietnam, the President said: "We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny . . . we must deal with the world as it is, if it is ever to be as we wish. . . . The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked . . . South Vietnam; its object is total conquest." Although some South Vietnamese were fighting their own government, the flow of men, supplies and orders "from north to south" was "the heartbeat of the war."

"Over this war and all Asia is another reality: the deepening shadow of Communist China," Mr. Johnson said. "The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping," a régime which was guilty of aggression in Tibet, India and Korea and which "is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent."

A "national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence" had been made by every American President since 1954, Mr. Johnson said. "To dishonor that pledge . . . would be an unforgivable wrong." He cited these additional reasons for the U.S. presence in Vietnam: (a) "To strengthen world order. Around the globe . . . are people whose well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked." (b) "Because there are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to conflict. . . . The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied." (c) After World War II the U.S. found itself "with continued responsibility for the defense of freedom" in both

Europe and Asia, and "our objective" in Asia "is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack."

Discussing the "stepped up" attacks in Vietnam, Mr. Johnson said: "We will do only what is absolutely necessary." The U.S. air attacks were "not a change of purpose" but "a change in what we believe that purpose requires" in order to "slow down aggression," "increase the confidence" of the South Vietnamese and "convince the leaders of North Vietnam, and all who seek to share their conquest, of a very simple fact: We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement. We know that air attacks alone will not accomplish all of these purposes. But it is our best and prayerful judgment that they are a necessary part of the surest road to peace." Although "armed hostility is futile," the U.S. "patience and our determination are unending."

Mr. Johnson appealed for Thant to "use the prestige of his great office and his deep knowledge of Asia" to start his proposed Southeast Asian aid plan. The President said that he himself would name a "special team" of Americans, headed by ex-World Bank Pres. Eugene Black, "to inaugurate our participation in these programs." "Peace will be necessary for final success," he said, "but we cannot and must not wait for peace to begin this job."

The President said: The U.S. must "expect that nations will on occasion be in dispute with us." However, "no nation need ever fear that we desire their land or to impose our will or to dictate their institutions." "Our generation has a dream" of "a world where disputes are settled by law and reason," of "an end to war" and of "a world where all are fed and charged with hope. And we will help to make it so." The "ordinary" people of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, China, India, Russia and America shared such goals. "Man now has the knowledge . . . to make this planet serve the real needs of the people who live on it."

The President had begun his speech with a reference to an appeal Apr. 1 by 17 nonaligned nations for negotiations on Vietnam without conditions. "We are joining those 17 countries," he declared, in stating policy "which we believe will contribute toward peace in this area." Administration sources told reporters later that the U.S.' readiness for "unconditional discussions" included willingness for talks with Red China or North Vietnam even while the fighting, not excluding air strikes, continued, but did not include engaging in talks with the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Viet Cong.

U.S. political reaction to the President's proposals varied widely. Democrats Apr. 7 largely lauded Mr. Johnson's plans but Republicans attacked them as an effort to "buy" peace. Senate GOP leader Everett M. Dirksen (Ill.) said: "Do you buy freedom for a humble people with a billion-dollar package? I doubt it, and I doubt also that we can preserve face and prestige with such an approach." House GOP leader Gerald R. Ford (Mich.) agreed that "peace with security cannot be purchased with a billion American tax dollars." But House Speaker John W. McCormack (D., Mass.) said Mr. Johnson had "offered to all the brotherhood of man and the recognition of human dignity." Senate Democratic leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.) said the President had revealed "both the great strength" of his "resolve and his deep concern for the welfare of all people." [See p. 106D–F2]

Peace Moves

Increasing pressures and pleas for a negotiated solution of the Vietnam war had been reported in world capitals Mar. 31–Apr. 6. [See pp. 100F3–101F1]

A report from Moscow Mar. 31 said that diplomats from a non-aligned country that day had disclosed that in private conversations with North Vietnamese officials in Moscow the Communists had indicated Hanoi's willingness to participate in a new Geneva conference on Indochina. The North Vietnamese officials' position was described as more flexible than Hanoi's public insistence that U.S. troops must withdraw from South Vietnam before peace talks could start.

British leftwing Laborite Parliament member William Warbey said in a letter to the London *Times* Apr. 1 that the withdrawal of U.S. troops was not North Vietnam's precondition for negotiations. Warbey, who had conferred in Hanoi with Pres. Ho Chi Minh and Premier Pham Van Dong, said the 2 officials had told him: "the only precondition is a cease-fire; the Americans and the South Vietnamese must stop their attacks on North Vietnam"; a U.S. military pull-out could be taken up at a peace conference. . . .

L. B. J. vs. Halting Raids

Pres. Johnson asserted Apr. 17 that the U.S. would continue its air strikes against North Vietnam despite appeals for a halt in the raids in the hope that discontinuing the attacks might increase the prospects of peace negotiations. In a statement made at his LBJ Ranch near Johnson City, Tex., the President reaffirmed his policy of U.S. willingness to participate in "unconditional discussion" with "any government willing to talk," "next week, tomorrow or tonight." [See pp. 129F3–130F1]

Deploring Communist rejection of his peace offers, Mr. Johnson said: "It has been a week of disappointment, because we tried to open a window to peace, only to be met, with tired names and slogans—and a refusal to talk."

The President insisted that the U.S.' aims in Vietnam "remain the same; an independent South Vietnam, tied to no alliance, free to shape its relation and association with all other nations." He warned that until Saigon's independence was guaranteed, "there is no human power capable of forcing us from Vietnam. We will remain as long as necessary, . . . whatever the risk . . . If the price of ending aggression is blood and men, we are ready to pay that price."

The President expressed sympathy with "those who regret that we must undertake air attacks" against North Vietnam. But he pointed out that "the compassion of this country, and the world must go out to" the South Vietnamese "who are killed and crippled by the Viet Cong every day." The South Vietnamese "and the Americans who share their struggle, suffer because they are attacked—not because they are the attackers," Mr. Johnson said.

Citing the "progress around the world in understanding" the U.S. "peaceful aims" in South Vietnam and Washington's "unyielding determination" to protect that country, Mr. Johnson said that "as a result, news from the battle front is improving."

The President defended his proposal for U.S. participation in a $1 billion development program for Southeast Asia. "We do not want to buy peace," he said. He disclosed that Britain, Japan and Canada had "shown their willingness to take a share in this enterprise" and that UN Secy. Gen. U Thant had "firmly taken the lead" in helping develop the program.

(Thant Apr. 13 had discussed the President's proposals with U.S. Amb-to-UN Adlai Stevenson and ex-Pres. Eugene Black of the International Bank for Reconstruction & Development. Black said after the meeting that Thant had shown "very keen interest" in the development plan.)

State Secy. Dean Rusk Apr. 17 also opposed suspending U.S. air attacks on North Vietnam. He said the U.S. "had tried publicly and privately to find out if" a suspension would "end aggression from the north," "but there has been no response." "Our best judgment tells us" a halt in the aerial strikes "would only encourage the aggressor and dishearten our friends who bear the brunt of battle," Rusk said.

Defense Secy. Robert S. McNamara said Apr. 18 that "we have no indications that a cessation of the bombing would move the North Vietnamese to discussion leading to termination of their aggression in the south." He supported Rusk's view that suspending the raids "would discourage and dishearten" the South Vietnamese.

Administration opposition to halting the air attacks was challenged Apr. 18 by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chrmn. J. W. Fulbright (D., Ark.). Fulbright said: If a truce in the Vietnam fighting could not be achieved, "then I believe there might be some value in stopping the bombings temporarily. I don't know if it would work, but it seems to be worth trying." The current raids were "inclined to keep the atmosphere very tense," encourage the North Vietnamese to "dig in" and discourage Soviet participation in peace talks, Fulbright said.

U.S. bombing of North Vietnam and the U.S. general policy in South Vietnam were assailed by more than 15,000 demonstrators in Washington Apr. 17. The demonstration was sponsored by Students for a Democratic Society, a leftwing non-Communist group with chapters at 63 universities. The rally was supported by such groups as Women Strike for Peace and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee. The demonstrators first picketed the White House and later marched to the Washington Monument for a series of addresses. One of the speakers, Sen. Ernest Gruening (D., Alaska), called for "the immediate cessation of our bombing in North Vietnam."

(A petition protesting U.S. actions in South Vietnam was accepted by a Presidential aide at Pres. Johnson's Texas ranch Apr. 18; the petition was submitted by a group of demonstrators after they had been denied permission to hand it to the President personally. Washington police Apr. 20 arrested 17 youths who had sat down in the driveway of the White House; the youths said they sought to present to Pres. Johnson a petition demanding U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam.)

Reds reject peace plans

Proposals by Pres. Johnson and 17 nonaligned nations for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war were rejected anew by the Soviet Union, North Vietnam and Communist China. [See p. 129A1]

Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin Apr. 19 described Pres. Johnson's Apr. 7 offer of "unconditional discussions" as a "forced maneuver" and "vague promises" that would "deceive no one." Speaking at a reception for visiting Mongolian Premier Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal in Moscow, Kosykin asked: "What is the use of promises if at the same time they [the U.S. and South Vietnam] keep bombing North Vietnam and say they are determined to carry the war to a victorious end?" Kosygin insisted that the raids must stop before talks could be held.

Kosygin asserted that Washington's "reckless policy" of increasing its military efforts in Vietnam was moving the U.S. closer to "a very dangerous brink." He said the U.S.' claim that "poison gas" had been used in Vietnam "without sanction of the White House" only increased general concern. The premier warned: "The use by the aggressors of these and other means of warfare invite retaliation

in kind." [1] He added: "One should not forget that the United States does not have a monopoly of modern weapons." [1a]

North Vietnam Apr. 20 spurned the nonaligned nations' Apr. 1 appeal for a peaceful solution of the Vietnam crisis through negotiations. Hanoi's statement also rejected Pres. Johnson's offer of talks, charging that his proposals were designed only to disguise U.S. plans to extend and intensify the war. North Vietnam instead urged acceptance of Premier Phan Van Dong's Apr. 8 4-point formula as "the only correct way" to "settle the Vietnam problem at present" Dong's plan had called for withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam and for settling South Vietnam's "internal affairs" on the basis of the Viet Cong's National Liberation Front plans for the country.

Stressing the plight of developing countries, the report said: Developing nations "could effectively use" foreign aid and investment totaling $3–$4 billion more in each of the next 5 years than they had been receiving. Poor nations had contracted so much debt that the return to wealthy nations in interest, dividends and profits used up a large part of the outside capital coming to the poor nations. Of the $9½ billion given, invested or lent in 1964 to poor nations by the combined activities of governments, international institutions and private investors, an estimated 40% was returned in the form of interest payments on previous loans.

Asian Bank Drafted

Representatives of 31 nations, including the U.S. and the USSR, met in Bangkok Oct. 21–Nov. 1 and reached agreement Nov. 1 on a draft charter for a projected $1 billion Asian Development Bank (ADB). Final approval of the charter was scheduled to take place at a ministerial conference of the UN Economic Commission for Asia & the Far East (ECAFE) [2]

Under the terms of the projected charter, the ADB would provide funds and guarantees for investment, and its staff would advise participating countries on development plans. The ADB would have a board of 10 directors—7 from the Asian members of ECAFE and 3 from non-Asian members.[2]

Voting rights in the bank would be based on a formula whereby 80% (of the voting rights) would be allotted on the basis of bank shares held by each member and 20% would be divided equally among the members of the ADB. (The U.S. and Japan had each pledged 20% [$200 million] toward ADB's basic capital; the U.S. had also pledged an additional $100 million for regional development loans.)

U.S. support for the ADB first became apparent Apr. 7 when Pres. Johnson announced the appointment of ex-World Bank Pres. Eugene R. Black to head a "special team" to "inaugurate" U.S. participation in a multilateral aid program to Southeast Asian countries [see p. 113A1–C2]. Black met with the ECAFE's 9-nation consultative committee in Bangkok during a June–July tour of Asian capitals in which he sought support for the ADB in Thailand, Laos, South Vietnam and Japan. Black then toured European capitals. In Paris July 19 he outlined plans for the ADB before the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development's Development Assistance Committee and also met with French Foreign Min. Maurice Couve de Murville. (The French government July 30 informed a delegation of Asian countries, in Paris to obtain support for the ADB, that France would not participate in the venture.) Black also visited West Germany, Britain, Portugal and the Netherlands during his tour. The Dutch government July 20 gave him a pledge of $300,000 for a Mekong River development plan. Black July 29 explained the ADB at a closed session of the House Banking Committee. It was indicated that the U.S. invitation to the USSR to participate in the ADB was intended as another means of inflaming the antagonism between the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Other events

Among other international finance and trade developments:

The British pound rose Nov. 2 to a 2½-year high of $2.8047 on the London exchange. The pound Sept. 29 had risen above parity ($2.80) for the first time since May 1964. The Sept. 29 closing: $2.8003.

Britain's reserves of gold and convertible currencies rose by $170,800,000 in September and $117,600,000 in October, bringing total reserves at the end of October to $2,872,800,000, the highest level since May 1963. The gains in reserves followed losses of $67,200,000 in June, of $1.40 million in July and of $67,200,000 in August.

Britain maintained a balance-of-payments surplus of $78,400,000 for the 2d quarter of 1965 but experienced deficits of $140 million in July, $263,200,000 in August and $204,400,000 in September.

Soviet Union gold sales, according to the Wall St. Journal Oct. 14, had amounted to 300 tons, valued at $340 million, in the preceding 3 months. The sales were made to the London gold pool, managed for 8 countries by the Bank of England. According to the Wall St. Journal, the sales reflected the USSR's need for foreign exchange to pay for Canadian wheat. [See p. 293B2; Vol XXIV, p. 104A2].

The Federal Reserve Board reported Sept. 29 that U.S. gold losses in August totaled $54 million, the lowest figure since Nov. 1964. [See p. 319F3].

Asian bank charter signed

Representatives of 21 nations met in Manila and signed Dec. 4 a charter formally establishing a $1 billion Asian Development Bank. [See p. 399B1–B2]

The nations signing the charter were the U.S. and Japan, which each had pledged $200 million to the new bank, and Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, Ceylon, Nationalist China, India, Iran, South Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the Netherlands, West Germany, Britain, and Canada. Delegates of 5 other nations—South Vietnam, Singapore, Belgium, Denmark and Italy—were present but said they were not yet empowered by their governments to sign.

The Soviet Union, which had participated in the Bangkok meeting (Oct. 21–Nov. 1) that had drafted the charter, did not send a representative to the Manila conference. *Izvestia*, the Soviet government newspaper, charged Dec. 2 that the "United States and Japan have more votes . . . in the bank than all the developing countries . . . taken together." The USSR, the newspaper said, would not "participate . . . in international organizations built on a basis of inequality which enable economically stronger countries to impose their decisions on weaker countries."

The U.S. delegation to Manila was headed by Eugene R. Black, a Presidential adviser on Asian development, and included Senators and as well as 14 members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and officials of the Treasury and State Departments and the Agency for International Development. Pres. Johnson, announcing Nov. 26 the appointment of Black to head the delegation, had declared: The bank "has been put together by Asians. They are contributing the greater part of its capital. They will direct its lending for development."

OECD meets

The fifth annual ministerial meeting of the 21-nation Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation was held Nov. 25–26 in Paris. (OECD membership included the U.S., Canada, Japan and 18 Western European nations.) The ministers' Nov. 26 communiqué stated that the problems of the underdeveloped countries had been the principal subject of discussion and that participants recognized the need to "increase the export proceeds of developing countries." Olivier Wormser, director of economic affairs in the French Foreign Ministry, said Nov. 25 that the best way to aid the developing countries was to give them preferential tariff treatment such as the Common Market had granted to African nations. U.S. State Undersecy. Thomas C. Mann opposed Wormser's view Nov. 25 in favor of multilateral trade between developed and developing nations. OECD Secy. Gen. Thorkil Kristensen said at the meeting Nov. 26 that the U.S. balance-of-payments problem could be eased by nar-

---

[1] Speaking at ceremonies marking the signing Apr. 8 of a new treaty of friendship between the USSR and Poland, Soviet CP First Secy. Leonid I. Brezhnev had attacked the U.S. for "waging undeclared criminal" war against the Vietnamese people. "Even the Fascists did not dare use poison gas in war, and the American imperialists have decided in cold blood to do it," Brezhnev charged. Repeating a pledge made by Kosygin in Wroclaw, Poland Apr. 7, Brezhnev promised that the USSR would always be "prepared to supply the Democratic Republic of Vietnam with every assistance in the strengthening of its means of defense that will be necessary for our Vietnamese friends to repel the aggression of the American imperialists." (Brezhnev simultaneously assailed the West German Bundestag meeting in West Berlin, which, he declared "has never been and will never be part of West Germany." Brezhnev and Kosygin were on a state visit to Poland to mark the 20th anniversary of the Soviet-Polish amity treaty of 1945 and to celebrate the signing of the new treaty replacing it.) (See pp. 115E3, 58D1).

[1a] Adm. Sergei G. Gorshkov, commander-in-chief of the Soviet navy and a Soviet deputy defense minister, had warned Jan. 28 in an article in the magazine Za Rubezhom (Life Abroad) that the Soviet navy knew where U.S. Polaris submarines were stationed and had missiles trained on them "capable of turning them into common graves for American seamen."

[2] The original proposal of the ADB dated from a Sept. 1963 report of an ECAFE working committee, which recommended a regional bank for Southeast Asia. The ECAFE, at its annual meeting Mar. 25, 1965 in Wellington, New Zealand, adopted a resolution calling for creation of the ADB, and it set up a 9-nation consultative committee to work out the details of the ADB and to seek out contributions of capital from Asian countries and industrialized states. The 9 nations: Ceylon, India, Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, South Vietnam and Thailand. Cornelio Balmaceda, commerce minister of the Philippines was appointed chairman of the committee.

[3] ECAFE membership included 26 full members and 2 associate members. Full members: Afghanistan, Australia, Britain, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Nationalist China, France, India, Iran, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, the USSR, the U.S., South Vietnam and Western Samoa. Associate members: Brunei and Hong Kong. The Oct. 21–Nov. 1 Bangkok meeting was attended by delegates from all the full members of ECAFE with the exception of Afghanistan, Burma, France, Mongolia and Western Samoa. In addition, representatives of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and West Germany participated.

rowing the gap between high European interest rates and the lower U.S. rates.

[From the Department of State Bulletin, July 26, 1965]

MR. BLACK REPORTS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Eugene Black, consultant to President Johnson on economic development of Southeast Asia, telephoned the President this morning at the LBJ Ranch and gave him a full and encouraging report on his trip to Southeast Asia and the Far East. During his trip Mr. Black participated in the consultative committee meetings of the U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East on the Asian Development Bank. He discussed with the leaders of Thailand, Laos, South Viet-Nam, and Japan the ways and means of accelerating economic and social development in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Black told the President that the consultative committee meetings went very well and that the Bank could be in business by early next year.

At the meeting Mr. Black indicated on behalf of the President, that—subject to congressional approval—the United States is prepared to provide 20 percent of the Bank's capital, up to $200 million, and also to contribute—if other countries will join—up to $100 million to the multilateral Southeast Asia Development Fund. The Fund would be administered by the Asian Bank and would finance regional projects in Southeast Asia.

The President was happy to learn from Mr. Black that the Japanese Government also intends to take a 20-percent share in the Bank's capital.

The President expressed to Mr. Black his hope that other nations, too, would make generous pledges soon, in order to give the Bank a flying start in the difficult, long-range task of building a more prosperous Southeast Asia.

The President also expressed a hope that other developed countries would join the United States in contributing to the multilateral Southeast Asia Development Fund.

In each of the countries he visited Mr. Black talked with prime ministers and other high-ranking officials and was gratified to learn that there is a strong desire to quicken the pace of economic and social development and to expand and strengthen regional cooperation. Mr. Black also had fruitful discussions with ECAFE officials and the staff of the Mekong committee on current programs and future plans for regional development.

Mr. Black's schedule was limited; he did not have the opportunity to visit all of the countries in the region. He hopes to be able to visit these countries in the future.

The President asked Mr. Black to go to Europe next week to meet with the members of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] to review the results of his trip, and to enlist their support in this cooperative effort to accelerate economic and social progress in Southeast Asia.

[From the Department of State Bulletin, Oct. 31, 1966]

EUGENE BLACK ON 10-NATION TRIP TO DISCUSS ASIAN DEVELOPMENT

At the request of President Johnson, Mr. Eugene R. Black is leaving October 26 on a visit to Asia, during which he will attend the inaugural meeting of the Asian Development Bank in Tokyo. He returns to Asia in his capacity as the President's special adviser on regional economic development.

The trip is part of the continuing consultation between Asians and ourselves. It was planned in advance of the invitation by Philippine President [Ferdinand E.] Marcos for the Chiefs of State conference in Manila, but it relates closely to those aspects of the Manila conference which focus on broad questions of long-range development and betterment throughout Asia. Mr. Black represents the President's keen interest in concrete proposals which can advance Asian living standards.

During his visit to more than 10 nations Mr. Black will discuss with Asian leaders and heads of international and regional organizations those policies and programs they consider most promising for rapid economic development and regional cooperation.

As the President's eyes and ears he will seek new and more effective ways for the United States to support Asian initiatives and efforts to promote their common welfare.

Dr. Henry T. Heald, former President of the Ford Foundation, and Mr. Austin J. Tobin, Executive Director, the Port of New York Authority, will accompany Mr. Black and advise him on questions of education and transportation. Experts on Asian regional economic development from U.S. Government agencies will also accompany Mr. Black.

On his return he will report his findings to the President and to congressional leaders.

THE HYPODERMIC NEEDLE AND SYRINGE CONTROL ACT OF 1972

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the heroin epidemic is continuing to spread across the United States. The suburbs and rural areas of our country, once considered immune to drug addiction, are being ravaged by heroin in the same way our cities have been for decades. The Armed Forces, once believed to be invulnerable, are now battling their most insidious enemy in American history—heroin.

The international trafficking in dangerous drugs—from the poppy fields to the clandestine processing laboratories—has been well documented.

Less well known, however, is the critical importance of heroin paraphernalia to the spread of addiction. Hearings held by the House Select Committee on Crime in 1970 revealed how "legitimate" businessmen were reaping huge profits through the sale of glassine envelopes, empty gelatin capsules, quinine, mannite, and other materials used in the cutting and packaging of heroin.

Of all heroin paraphernalia, it is the hypodermic needle which has been primarily responsible for the mushrooming of addiction. The medical innovation of the disposable syringe has only worsened the situation. In the words of one agent of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs:

> The disposable needle and syringe (has) caused untold grief in New York.

An addict in need of a fix is both desperate and ingenious. With items easily available at the corner pharmacy—a dime eye dropper, a baby pacifier, a baby's ear syringe, a rectal tube and an elastic band—he can put together his own "works" all ready for use in the intravenous injection of heroin. All he needs is the hypodermic needle itself.

Dr. Milton Helpern, chief medical examiner of New York City has described an even simpler way.

> The injection apparatus is usually improvised from an easily obtainable medicine dropper, its tip fitted tightly with a paper flange into the hub of a hypodermic needle, the latter usually obtained by theft or illegal purchase.

For these reasons, I decided to investigate exactly how easy it is to obtain hypodermic needles and syringes without a prescription or need to specify ultimate use.

On January 17, I sent two money orders for $6.15 and $4.60 to the Omaha Vaccine Co., Inc., at 2900 O Street, Union Stock Yards, Omaha, Nebr. 68107.

Two days later, January 19, my orders were sent from Omaha through the U.S. mails. The first arrived at my Washington office on Tuesday, January 25.

The order was filed in the name of: C. B. RANGEL, 226 Cannon House, Washington, D.C., 20515.

My second order arrived later, addressed to my New York City office: CHARLES RANGEL, 144 West 125th Street, New York, N.Y.

I gave no indication of my purpose in ordering the needles and syringes. I gave no indication that I am a Member of Congress.

The result: Five disposable plastic syringes of 3cc with 1-inch needles; 10 disposable plastic syringes of 5cc with 1-inch needles; four disposable plastic syringes of 10cc with 1-inch needles; 12 hypodermic needles, 25 gage, 1-inch long; and 12 hypodermic needles, assorted sizes.

The company asked me no questions. Was I a physician? A veterinarian? A diabetic? Or was I an addict? Did I plan to use the hypodermic needles and syringes to administer an illegal drug to myself? Did I plan to sell them for a profit or to support my own addiction?

And why two mail orders the same day, both with money orders, both in the name of RANGEL?

Was it not at all suspicious to the company that a resident of New York City or Washington, D.C., who was not a farmer or medical practitioner was ordering hypodermic needles and syringes by mail from a veterinary supply house?

Apparently, this company was more interested in making a few dollars profit than in the use—lawful or illegal—to which I intended to put these needles and syringes.

I am talking today about mail-order abuse. I am talking about the random, callous, mercenary sale of the implements of drug abuse. I am talking about the legal profiteers who grow wealthy on the pain and suffering of the drug addict, thereby contributing directly to the growing rate of narcotics-related crimes.

To put it bluntly, firms such as this one are engaged in the systematic trafficking of the accessories of death.

Some might label such businessmen partners in this terrible disease. Our society calls them respectable businessmen.

These individuals are just as guilty in the eyes of humanity as those who actually grow the opium poppies, process the morphine base and smuggle the heroin to our shores. Like so many other American corporate success stories, this "legitimate" business leaves a very bitter

taste in our mouths. And congressional failure to act is inexcusable.

This afternoon I am introducing into the House of Representatives the Hypodermic Needle and Syringe Control Act of 1972 to regulate the interstate sale of these instruments. The bill will not trespass on the prerogatives of the medical professions. It is not an unreasonable imposition on the lawful operations of pharmacists. It will not interfere with the lawful use of hypodermic needles and syringes in this country.

What it will do is sharply cut into the profits of those who have grown fat from manufacturing or selling hypodermic needles and syringes to those who have no lawful purpose in possessing or using them.

Federal regulation is clearly called for. We know that State laws dealing with hypodermic needles and syringes are a confusing hodgepodge of inconsistencies. Some States prohibit their unauthorized possession or sale and require that records be kept regarding lawful transfers. Others simply prohibit their unauthorized possession or sale. Still others prohibit possession with the intent to violate the narcotics laws. Many States have not even acted with respect to any aspect of this paraphernalia problem.

According to information provided to me by the American Pharmaceutical Association and other sources, there are well over a dozen firms which manufacture these syringes and needles in the United States. They are located in at least 12 States. In addition, there are countless distributors, wholesalers, and nonpharmacy retailers who are engaged in the interstate transfer of these items every day.

There is indeed money to be made at the present time by those dealing in hypodermic needles and syringes. One New Jersey firm, Jelco Laboratories, a division of Johnson & Johnson, revealed that, in the first 6 months of 1970 alone, it had sold $55,822 worth of needles and syringes in Virginia, $270,528 worth in Pennsylvania, $26,338 worth in the District of Columbia, and $43,096 worth in Maryland. On September 24, 1970, a memo from the Narcotics Branch of the Metropolitan Police Department advised that "a plastic disposable syringe and needle will sell on the street for between 25 cents to $1." That is the figure for the District of Columbia. In New York, the price is even higher.

There is no excuse for further inaction. We can no longer ignore this critical aspect of the exploding narcotics situation in the United States.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the Cost of Living Council, the Pay Board, and the Price Commission published freedom of information regulations in the Federal Register and said "good cause exists" for making them effective immediately instead of following the 30-day public notification and comment procedure.

It seems to me highly inappropriate to issue regulations on public access to information and then suspend the standard procedure for public access and comment on the regulations themselves. I have written Donald Rumsfeld, Director of the Council, urging that it solicit public comment on the regulations before making them final and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

Since public confidence is the key to the economic stabilization program, and confidence in government generally is at a very low ebb, I think the Council would do well to submit its regulations for public scrutiny. To do otherwise smacks of ruling by decree.

Mr. Speaker, here is the text of my letter to Mr. Rumsfeld:

FEBRUARY 2, 1972.

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Director, Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUMSFELD: With respect to the economic stabilization rules and regulations published in the Federal Register on February 1st, I urge the Cost of Living Council to solicit public comment on its freedom of information regulations before making them final.

The Council, the Pay Board and the Price Commission all said "good cause exists" for making the regulations effective immediately instead of following the 30-day public notification and comment procedure.

It seems to me highly inappropriate to issue regulations on public access to information and then suspend the standard procedure for public access and comment on the regulations themselves. I cannot accept the Council's claim that there is a need for "immediate implementation" of the economic stabilization program which justifies skipping the usual rule-making procedure.

Furthermore, the Council's announcement today makes no mention of the regulation it published just 10 days ago—on January 21—which declared the Council "will accept written comments from members of the public on its regulations or on its published rulings at any time." That means it commits the double error of foreclosing advance comment and discouraging follow-up comment, and I don't believe that squares with President Nixon's executive order last Thursday directing the Council to "inform the public, agriculture, industry, and labor" concerning the need for voluntary action to control inflation.

Further, both the Council and the Commission appear to favor the old government policy—which was reversed by the Freedom of Information Act of 1966—that persons must show they are "properly and directly concerned" with information in order to receive it.

Today's regulations say if a person is denied information and wants to appeal, the Director of the Council may require him "to present additional evidence or information in support of his request for review." And they say the Chairman of the Commission "reserves the right" to require the same thing.

This provision flouts the language and intent of the Freedom of Information Act—a Law which established that any person could request access to government records without having to say why he wanted to see them.

I also believe that public comment on these regulations would guard against use of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971—which extended confidentiality to trade secrets—as a statutory shield for withholding most wage and price control information.

In the interests of improved public access to government records, I urge you and the Council to consider soliciting public comment on these regulations before making them final.

Sincerely,

DAVID R. OBEY,
Member of Congress.

PAUL RINGLER ENDS DISTINGUISHED CAREER WITH MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for 45 years, Paul Ringler contributed mightily toward earning the Milwaukee Journal its national reputation for excellence. Twenty-five of those years he spent as an editorial writer, the last 11 as chief of the editorial page. Last week, Mr. Ringler retired from the newspaper he has served—and through which he has served the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin—so long and so well.

I add my good wishes on his retirement, and insert at this point an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 31, which carries the deserved tribute of his colleagues:

HAPPY RETIREMENT, PAUL

This public tribute to an exceptionally fine newspaperman, with 45 years of service to Journal readers under his belt, could not have been published until he had actually retired, which he did last week at 65—because he was the editorial editor himself, in charge of this column, and a modest gentleman, though he had nothing to be modest about.

H. (for Hazelton) Paul Ringler—always Paul or Ring—is in the true mold of the small town boy from South Dakota and Iowa who matured at the University of Wisconsin and grew in his profession and in wisdom to become an internationally distinguished journalist. He has been an insatiable world traveler both for The Journal and on his own time, and is still a director of the prestigious International Press Institute.

Paul thus contributed an extraordinarily rich and ever expanding background to his work as an editorial writer since 1946 and as chief for the last 11 years. He has also contributed valuably to The Journal Company as a director and as a trustee of its employe ownership plan.

The great benefits to Journal readers and to Milwaukee and Wisconsin from Ringler's career in editorial writing may be realized only by reading between the lines, of course, because that work is properly anonymous, speaking for the newspaper as an institution, not for the individual. So we who have been his colleagues and friends now have to delineate him as a personality.

As one prime mark of the instinctive reporter, Ringler's mind is inquisitive, intrigued by and curious about almost everything and everybody. On every return from his travels about this country and the world, his pockets bulged with oddities clipped from the local press.

Not as a participant, of course, but as a professional observer and critic, Ringler has been fascinated by politics, from Elm Grove

to Peking, and has given readers a vast store of shrewd understanding over the years. His utter sense of fairness and justice, and his steadfastness for principle, served brilliantly in this field. He did not hate Joe McCarthy, for instance, but he hated McCarthyism and composed editorials that did much to expose and eventually to expunge that blot on the national integrity. He wrote with vim, never with malice.

Ringler has a strong sense of history—a precious quality that is in short enough supply these days without losing his, too. This gives him perspective and patience in what may seem like lost causes. In both his enthusiasms and his indignations he is equally unflappable. As the most conscientious of newsmen he guarded his detachment, never made personally entangling alliances. He kept the editorial policy of this newspaper shining with its traditional independence.

Paul is a gentle man, kindly and considerate in human relations. His retirement leaves a void among us, and in the life of Wisconsin. But if we know our man he will not cease to be a Marco Polo, still seeking new insights into the world and the people around him.

THE DRAWBACKS OF A MILITARY MEDICAL SCHOOL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House last November passed H.R. 2, a bill that would have medical students trained under the auspices of the Secretary of Defense. The bill passed with relative ease and it now awaits action by the Senate.

Dr. Richard M. Magraw has dealt with what he sees as the drawbacks of a military medical school in an editorial in the December 9, 1971, issue of the New England Journal of Medicine. Dr. Magraw essentially raises two questions about H.R. 2. One is whether the characteristics of military training are compatible with the central tenets of civilian higher education. A second question raised by Dr. Magraw is whether we are letting the military extend its influence in society past the point of necessity. Dr. Magraw's editorial follows:

A MILITARY MEDICAL SCHOOL

Do most physicians or most Americans want medical students trained under military auspices? HR 2, "a bill to establish a Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences," is apparently soon to be enacted into law by the Congress. The salient features of the proposal include the development of a medical school within a 25-mile radius of Washington, D.C., the armed forces and other federal hospitals in the area being used as a clinical base. Expenditures of $100 million are authorized (approximately $30 million of new construction for offices, laboratories and basic-science departments) by the time the school is required to graduate its first class of no fewer than 100 medical students at the end of 10 years. After graduation, the students will be required to serve on active duty for not less than seven years, although up to 20 per cent of any one class graduating may "agree in writing to perform civilian-federal duty (the nature of this to be determined by the Secretary of Defense) during that time, in lieu of active duty in a Uniformed Service." This section of the Bill also anticipates the development of additional similar schools since the Secretary of Defense is required within five years to make a report to the Armed Services Committees of Congress on the feasibility of establishing "similar or identical educational institutions at any other locations he deems appropriate."

A second section of the Bill establishes an Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program, which will subsidize professional education for a large number of medical students in established schools. This part of the Program is to be funded at the rate of $50 million annually ($20 million in the first year, when an estimated 1500 medical students and 500 dental students would be commissioned on active duty and "detailed" as student officers to accredited civilian institutions in the United States or Puerto Rico). In addition to being accepted to admission to an appropriate school, such a "student officer" would be required to sign an agreement to complete his education, accept reappointment in the military service and, "because of his sincere motivation and dedication to a career in the Uniformed Services, participate in military training while he is in the Program." Those in the Program incur an active-duty obligation for a period to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, but for not less than one year for each year in the Program.

The reason given for this proposed legislation is the failure, despite many inducements, of the military services to attract physicians to military careers in sufficient numbers to meet self-determined quotas for medical manpower. Testimony at the hearings on the Bill, September 21–23, 1971 (the source for the following data) indicated that currently 14,899 physicians are in the medical corps of the Department of Defense. Of these, 8738 had two years or less of service (i.e., were primarily draftees), and the remaining 6161 were distributed along a gradually diminishing curve over a range of length of service from just over two to more than 30 years. With these 15,000 physicians the Department of Defense estimates that it provides care to approximately 10 million persons, of whom approximately ¼ (2,500,000) are actually serving in the armed forces. (One wonders what will occur about coverage of the other ¾ if a National Health Insurance Program comes into being.)

The scope of this proposal, which may soon encompass up to 10 per cent of all undergraduate medical students, and the suddenness with which it has come to final consideration, will probably catch many physicians and medical educators by surprise. However, aside from the provision that anticipates the development of additional similar schools, it is hard to regard the Bill as a sleeper since this is the 17th version of the proposal introduced in as many sessions of Congress. Representative F. Edward Hébert (D., Louisiana), who became chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on the death of Mr. Mendel Rivers, in his opening statement at the hearings tells of his 25-year-long efforts to bring such a "West Point of Medicine" into being. In its earlier versions the Bill did not come to public attention apparently because it was generally regarded as having no chance of passage. Perhaps it has attracted little notice now because professional associations hesitate to antagonize its powerful sponsor. Outcry and organized opposition have been strangely muted or have been intimidated.

During most of the Bill's history it appeared that the majority of the medical officers in the armed forces were strongly opposed to such a military medical school. However, some physicians in the military and in civilian life as well have promoted it, believing that it would give the health professions in the Department of Defense access to the many benefits of academic medicine and encourage professional self-improvement and continuing education throughout the medical corps of the various services. For this reason, the present version of the Bill comes closer to civilian medical education than earlier versions. It is anticipated that if the Department of Defense had its own medical school, retention of career physicians in the armed forces would be enhanced, and it would be possible to obtain needed physicians without the draft.

The sponsors can have no certainty that these hoped-for effects will be realized. Opponents point out that the above goals are mutually contradictory in that whereas the academic properties that the Department of Defense seeks to capture are those of civilian medical education, it is precisely not a civilian school that is sought. Military medical institutions tend to have at their core a hierarchical and authoritarian ordering of things and ideas that is the antithesis of civilian higher education.

Whether or not anticipated benefits are realized, they need be weighed against offsetting disadvantages such as the consideration that, at a time of limited federal support for medical education when every medical school in the country is stretching to expand enrollments, and when some have seriously overextended their resources in doing so, the anticipated expenditure for one Health Sciences University of $100 million in start-up costs over a 10-year period, leading to an annual federal appropriation of $20 to $30 million for operating costs (exclusive of clinical facilities), would appear to be a serious drain on scarce federal funds. In comparison, total direct institutional support for all the 108 existing United States medical schools under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Program during 1971 was $97.3 million (including $20.3 million in loans and scholarships, but excluding $75 million construction for teaching and related facilities).

Furthermore, although not every physician believes that the missions of medicine and those of the armed forces are basically incompatible (and most of those who do believe that to be true recognize that military medicine has made substantial contributions to medical science), I doubt whether many would support the idea that basic professionalization of physicians be carried out in a milieu in which these missions are mixed and in which, in any real showdown, military consderations would have to come first. No amount of political muscle or federal financing should lead us, as a profession, to an acquiescence in an educational scheme that tends to give or appears to give Mars equal status with Aesculapius in the aspirations of nascent physicians. Perhaps the principal objection to a military medical school is that it declares as a public policy that the professional novitiate of one of the most civilized of the professions, embodying what many still believe to be a sacred trust, can be carried out within a military framework without losing something of its professional essence.

Finally, we must ask how far we want the military segments of society to penetrate the institutional fabric of national life. The principal argument advanced for founding the school is the need of a special kind of experience or indoctrination during the training of physicians to include them toward voluntary choice of military careers. But is such a departure really without risk to society? Perhaps an extension of the proposition to absurdity will pose this question most effectively. For example, if we were willing to modify our system of education, no doubt we could make military service more attractive to all our young men. We could condition them as children in grade school and high school as were the youths of Sparta, but the real cost might prove more than our society could afford. It is fundamentally to avoid any such control of higher education

that the national associations of higher education have strongly opposed the granting of degrees by the federal government.

The tone of the published hearings in the House Committee and the extremely rapid progression of the Bill through committees and to vote bespeak a managed action rather than deliberative legislative process about a matter of great importance to the medical profession and to all Americans. Opposition was stated in such subdued and conciliatory terms that the issues involved in permanently institutionalizing military medical education (as opposed to more temporary incentives to meet transitory needs) were not clearly defined, much less publicly examined. I believe the medical profession collectively and individually should oppose as rigorously as possible a military medical school. If the profession immediately finds its voice in the matter, the Senate may yet oppose the Bill.

DRINAN CRACKS MEDIA'S VENEER

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, "Fighting Bob" Drinan has, in the year he has been a Congressman, made his presence felt in this Chamber. He is forthright, outspoken, and as his nickname implies, his words carry a great deal of punch. You may not always agree with what he says, but there is no doubt you will be made aware of his position. Recently, "Fighting Bob" presented an example of his outspokenness in a speech before the New England Broadcasting Association. The issues "Fighting Bob" raised are being discussed and that will be fruitful, both for those who agree and for those who disagree. At this time, I wish to insert a column from the Boston Globe by David Nyhan on the speech.

The article follows:

Drinan Cracks Media's Veneer

(By David Nyhan)

We shall henceforth refer to him as "Fighting Bob Drinan after the way the priestly congressman took on the local broadcasting barons.

While they were serving up the ice cream and strawberries, the liberal Democrat rose with a smile, told a couple of pretty good jokes ("We don't allow our priests to become Republicans") and then wiped the floor with the Federal Communications Commission in general, the television industry in particular—and even had a saucy word left over local newspapers, charging them with ignoring obituaries of distinguished black citizens.

It all took place Friday afternoon at a downtown restaurant, where Fighting Bob spoiled lunch for 100 members of the New England Broadcasting Assn.

The speech lambasted the FCC for never lifting a broadcasting license—not even one of 7200—for inadequate programming; repeated what we all know about the frequently flatulent fare offered on prime time TV; castigated broadcasters for allegedly ignoring the blacks, the Spanish-speaking, the antiwar people and other protesters; and talked about greed and the sham of regulation.

The real dessert was not the ice cream and strawberries—it was the exchange between Drinan and Perry Ury, general manager of Boston radio station WRKO.

Ury, whose station has a reputation for making some public service efforts despite the relentless quality of its top-40 pop music format ("and the hits just keep on coming"), arose to defend his industry.

He began by saying Drinan should tell the young man who does his research to check his facts more carefully. Ka-boom. What followed was enough to send a newsboy rushing down Tremont street, shouting, "Extry! Extry! Read all about it—congressman claims he writes his own speech!"

"I wrote that myself," exploded Drinan, who demanded—and got—a retraction from Ury on the correctness of the statistics used to figure the average profit (18 percent) or the amount of time spent on selling soap and spaghetti.

Drinan proceeded to take on the crowd, at one point almost taunting the audience into challenging him, rocking back and forth on his toes and saying, "Go ahead, it's good for the soul."

The former dean of the Boston College Law School, no mealy-mouthed cleric when confronting the broadcasters, does not draw the line at bawling out those who invite him to dinner.

Ury was unhappy, as were others (one ad salesman blessed himself as Drinan spoke), with what they claimed was Drinan's blanket indictment of the broadcasting scene.

Drinan countered he was only trying to raise some legitimate issues about how blacks and peace people get jabbed routinely in the media. It is a fact that the adversary process, is the basis of American justice, American politics, and, it seems, even American marriages. But not until very recently has anything approaching the adversary process reached the media with opposition views.

If you happened to catch a WBZ-TV premier during the weekend, the black-produced "Sixteen-72" show, with Lovell Dyett as host, you saw that maiden effort conclude on a piece of television dynamite.

Dyett's crew was out Thursday, hardly 24 hours before Drinan spoke, asking blacks at Washington street and Massachusetts avenue to talk about what they liked about TV.

"I don't like anything about TV," shot back a young mother who lives nearby. They didn't use her name, but she had on a gorgeous slouch hat—and she unloaded a bombshell.

The rest of the show had been sort of predictable—how many times will Malik Hakim be aired locally?—but this girl at the end talked about what it's like to be black and watch television.

She treated the token "Julia" show the way it deserves to be treated; she said she's tired of the token black in commercials. "We come in pairs," she said; she talked about coming home from work, tired, and not finding anything on TV to make her treat her child or her husband in a more loving fashion; she said TV ignores the pimps and drug pushers and knife-fighters that clog her street.

She lives under the elevated, the El, and that one brief sketch howled out of the tube, as a beautiful black girl with dynamite in her mouth talked about how TV had gone away from her and left her. TV is the train that doesn't stop here.

If we get a few more people like Fighting Bob and this black woman in the slouch hat, we'll be getting somewhere in this media game.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed approriate for us to recognize the Youth for Understanding program. By providing young people with the personal experience of living in a family environment abroad, the organization makes invaluable contributions to international understanding, and thus to world peace.

These teenage exchange students are engaged in the business of diplomacy. And today the world needs a new diplomacy which involves all of us. Diplomacy in the nuclear/jet age is too important to be left to diplomats, much less to the sovereigns who employ them. It is people's work, and these young people will do it well.

WELFARE: SEPARATING MYTH AND FACT

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, the January 27 edition of the Wall Street Journal carried a feature article, "Welfare: Separating Myth and Fact," which cogently analyzes a current HEW pamphlet, "Welfare Myths vs. Facts."

As I have mentioned in previous statements—September 14–15, 1971—we Americans are openhanded and generous people, but it is questionable how long our people will continue to fund an ever-increasing welfare load on the dubious data undergirding its official justification.

Welfare, like any other social service, should be subject to more rigorous accountability so that we can assure that the truly needy and unemployable are adequately provided for. The demands for social services are so great that we as elected officials cannot permit the available tax dollars to be wasted on those for whom they were not intended or misspent on illusory programs.

I insert the Journal's article for the information of my colleagues:

Welfare: Separating Myth and Fact

(By Richard A. Snyder)

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, apparently stung by taxpayer criticism of ever-more-costly welfare programs, has published a booklet in its own defense. Like any piece of propaganda, it may tell us something about its creator. It certainly doesn't contribute much clarity to the confusion surrounding welfare and its dilemmas.

The booklet, "Welfare Myths vs. Facts," has been widely circulated by the department and has served as the basis for a number of newspaper articles. It purports to explode "popular misconceptions" about welfare and welfare recipients.

Such misconceptions "not only malign the victims of poverty but the social workers who labor with dedication to make the present inadequate welfare system work," says John D. Twiname, HEW's Social and Rehabilitation Service administrator, in the pamphlet.

While conceding that the current system is indeed inadequate (and putting in a plug for the Nixon welfare reform legislation), the booklet nonetheless argues that the present system is being unfairly criticized by those who suggest, for example, that many welfare recipients are lazy or unethical.

Or, as HEW frames the proposition:

"Myth: The welfare rolls are full of able-bodied loafers!"

"Fact: Less than 1% of welfare recipients are able-bodied unemployed males."

ARE STATISTICS ACCURATE?

Even if that statistic is accurate it is deceptive, for it implies that finding jobs for these men would have a negligible effect on welfare. The fact is that there is an average 3.7 persons per family on relief, which means that this percentage, rather than 1%, would move off the rolls if the breadwinner went to work.

But is the figure accurate? Or has HEW been too generous in interpreting who is "able-bodied"? For example, it recently came to light that the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare had entered into a formal plan with HEW's regional office in Philadelphia to permit any physical impairment of either parent—however trivial—to qualify the family for federal and state funds under the federal work incentive program. Those with no more impairment than the need for eyeglasses qualify the family for cash, food stamps and free medical aid.

Emphasis on males alone is also misleading. It ignores the mothers, a huge and largely untapped work force. As Blanche Bernstein of the New School for Social Research in New York City has pointed out, about 25% of the welfare mothers in New York City, for example, have at least a high school education, making them eligible for many jobs advertised. Half of all mothers have only one or two children, making day-care arrangements feasible.

As part of its denial that many welfare recipients are employable, HEW makes the point that mothers and children get most of the money spent for welfare.

This is true in the sense that Mother cashes the check. However, the indirect but actual beneficiary is more often the absent father. If he leaves his family and lives alone he can spend all his wages on himself, a comfortable equivalent of bachelorhood. If he lives with a woman who is not his wife, he is similarly favored in an economic sense, especially if she is on welfare or employed and their incomes are merged. If he makes clandestine visits to his own home, his paycheck and his wife's welfare check in combination give the outwardly separated family a double income.

There are cases, of course, where the mother is widowed, or the father is ill, imprisoned or otherwise incapacitated. But these do not explain why deserted families on welfare increased from 12,000 to 80,000 in New York City within seven years. Responsible sociological opinion, typified by Nathan Glazer of Harvard, points out that there is a cash incentive to break up the family, or not to form it. For example, the unwed mother on welfare and the putative father on wages would lose her income if they marry.

For years welfare apologists prefaced any discussion of relief with references to the "aged, blind and disabled," which made any criticism of welfare seem hard-hearted. Now that these have become a bare quarter of the whole cost, the stress has been on children and mothers, with discrete avoidance of the men whose escape brought about the situation.

Another straw man from the HEW booklet:

"Myth: Give them more money and they'll spend it on drink and big cars."

"Fact: Most welfare families report (in an HEW survey) that if they received any extra money it would go for essentials."

One can hardly imagine a recipient testifying otherwise, at least in any inquiry conducted by the department. Other random surveys, however, have disclosed push-button telephones, stereos, new and expensive furniture in homes receiving public assistance, and other luxuries purchased with public assistance grants. Credit is often readily available to public assistance recipients because merchants have confidence in the flow of funds.

HEW has special difficulty in encouraging good judgment in spending because the current thrust in welfare is to separate the computing of eligibility from the rendering of social services, such as advice on budgeting, family management, child care, homemaking and employment. It is a tenet that the recipient should not be submitted to the "indignity" of having such advice thrust upon him.

"Myth: Once on welfare, always on welface."

"Fact: The average welfare family has been on the rolls for 23 months. . . . The number of long-term cases is relatively small."

The department's own figures don't wholly confirm its position. By its charts, more than a third of those on welfare have been there three years or more. HEW personnel admit, moreover, that this does not take into account "repeaters" who have been on for varying periods previously.

In fact, "on-again, off-again" welfare is the case with many recipients, as local administrators acknowledge. For these families, welfare becomes the quickest port of call in any emergency. The easy availability diminishes the likelihood that the recipient will be resourceful, take part-time or overtime work to bridge the gap, or solicit help from relatives.

UNTO THE THIRD GENERATION

The most familiar situation in which welfare has become a way of life is the young unwed mother and her child. And when the child in turn becomes an adolescent and becomes pregnant, a third welfare generation has begun.

According to HEW's pamphlet, 32% of the more than 7 million children in welfare families were born out of wedlock, and these demonstrably constitute much of the caseload that is either on relief on a long-term basis or at recurring intervals.

HEW puts the average length of time a family is on welfare at 23 months, but information in the files of Chairman Wilbur Mills' House Ways and Means Committee establishes the figure at 42 months; this figure would be even greater if welfare rolls weren't growing so fast.

There is an astonishing lack of data in HEW with respect to how long the closed cases had been on welfare (the Department says no studies have ever been made in this area), and data on this group is needed for an accurate index. Any figure based on those on relief at any given point in time also obviously doesn't include the prospective remaining period each case will be on the rolls, nor does it include any period present recipients may have been on the rolls prior to that point in time.

A more immediate question involves the 14.5 million on welfare: To what extent are their incomes accurately measured?

Dr. Bernstein and others have pointed out that figures on poverty and low incomes aren't reliable. Many families are prone to report net rather than gross figures and to be inexact about part-time earnings and teenagers' income. Or the wife is frequently the source of information about her husband's income but is ill-informed about it. In other words, many families commendably have income from assorted sources, which brings them slightly above the poverty line, although the statistics provided show they are below it.

This also serves to explain in part why many in rural and small-town America would be shocked to be told that they are in poverty. They live frugally but to their own satisfaction on limited resources, or sometimes on help from kin. Census figures are thrown out of kilter by the Amish farmers, for example, who would classify as underprivileged if measured by the absence of radios, TV's or cars, but who manage to earn sufficient income to buy expensive farms for their sons.

Bismarck is reputed to have said that people are happiest if they know little about how their laws and sausages are made. He might have included welfare administration. What is everyone's business has become no one's business except the social scientists', and they haven't given satisfying answers.

BURGEONING DEMANDS

Legislators, at the state level particularly, are becoming frustrated by the burgeoning demands of welfare, which drains educational and other parts of the state budget. And they bear the lament of taxpayers who feel the pinch of welfare and other costs. States, responding to grass-root pressure, cut back on grants. HEW, with its pamphlets, seeks to justify its system.

Welfare is an enormously complex issue, and one that tends to arouse strong emotions in all concerned—from the needy recipient to the taxpayer who foots the bill. Any progess toward a solution of what society can and should do to care for its destitute—a solution that has evaded man since the beginning of history—will be made only through cool rationality.

It is natural that HEW react defensively to criticism and state its case positively. It would be unrealistic to expect it to quote Edward C. Banfield of Harvard, for example, to the effect that current welfare policies encourage idleness, dishonesty and reduced production.

The public has, however, a right to accuracy and objectivity, and HEW propaganda broadsides such as "Welfare Myths vs. Facts" are no help at all.

OBSERVATIONS ON PRESIDENT'S PEACE PROPOSAL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the President's new peace proposals were dramatically revealed on nationwide television, disclosing a series of secret negotiations in Paris between Henry Kissinger, the President's national security adviser, and North Vietnam's chief negotiators.

THE PROPOSAL

The President's proposal includes a total cease-fire throughout Indochina, the withdrawal of all United States and allied forces from Vietnam within 6 months of North Vietnam's acceptance of the proposal and a political solution which includes three elements: a new presidential election in South Vietnam; an agreement by President Thieu to resign his office 1 month before the new election; and the creation of an independent body representing all political forces in South Vietnam, including the National Liberation Front, to organize and run the election.

Under the proposal, North Vietnam and South Vietnam would agree to release all prisoners of war captured throughout Indochina, with the exchange of prisoners carried out in tandem with the troop withdrawals.

This new proposal, now placed before the Paris Conference for discussion, is the first new proposal for a general settlement submitted to the Conference by the United States since October 8, 1969.

THE REACTION

Although North Vietnam's statement did not formally reject the proposals, it did denounce them and made plain that the new proposals are unacceptable.

Most observers believe the North Vietnamese will not accept the President's proposal because of their deep suspicions of the electoral process and their belief that the existing South Vietnamese Government would influence the outcome despite any safeguards the allies offered to assure an independent election.

Although it is doubtful that the President has succeeded in shoving Vietnam into the background as a campaign issue, he probably made some political points with his new proposal. The disclosure makes the Nixon record on negotiations clearer and better. The plan, at least for Americans, is fair and just, with free elections, international supervision, Thieu stepping down, and a cease-fire. As expected, the Republican leadership in Congress strongly endorsed the President's position and even some of the aspiring Democratic presidential candidates declined to attack him. Nonetheless, if the proposal is not accepted by North Vietnam, and it does not appear as if it will be, and the war drags on, it will undoubtedly be a political issue in November.

ISSUE CLARIFIED

More than anything else, the disclosures surrounding the proposal illustrate that the critical barrier to settlement of the Vietnamese war is: Who will eventually control South Vietnam? This political issue has caused the deadlock in the secret negotiations. The military questions, including a date for U.S. troop withdrawals and the release of American prisoners, apparently are negotiable on both sides, but the political issue is not.

The Vietnamese have reiterated their insistence that the two basic conditions for settlement are fixing a date for total U.S. military pullout and the withdrawal of all support for the Thieu regime.

WHY WERE SECRET NEGOTIATIONS DISCLOSED?

One question after the President's speech was why he revealed the secret proposals at this time. Such a move will, after all, cut off, at least temporarily, the President's most productive channel of communication with North Vietnam. Apparently it was done at this time: First, to end, or at least reduce, domestic disharmony by demonstrating the administration's good faith; second, to try to end criticism at home, especially from the President's political critics, who have intensified their attacks recently; third, to shift the onus of the stalemate to North Vietnam; fourth, to create a climate at home that would accept stiff retaliatory attacks to any North Vietnamese offensive; fifth, because the U.S. negotiators feel that the private contacts had reached a point of diminishing returns; and sixth, because the hope that the public disclosures might force North Vietnam to consider the plan on a more urgent basis.

The President's proposal may also help his China trip now that he has made a public offer to withdraw all American troops from Indochina, and even though the offer may not be accepted, it will help create a better atmosphere for successful discussions with the Chinese. The very prompt denunciation of the President's proposals by the North Vietnamese, however, suggests that the President will not find the solution to Vietnam in Peking. Dr. Kissinger said:

We expect to settle this war with Hanoi, not with Moscow and not with Peking.

As mentioned, the President's proposal also puts him in a stronger position to counter the expected enemy offensive, which is expected soon. Having put forth a comprehensive peace proposal and apparently created a climate at home that will permit stiff retaliatory action, he is now in a position to strike back at any enemy offensive in the next few weeks and blame the North Vietnamese for choosing war instead of peace.

HANOI'S RECORD

Hanoi's record in these negotiations looks bad. They agreed to secret talks, and then made a public proposal. Their proposal separated political and military issues, and later were linked in another proposal. They accused President Nixon of not responding to their proposal, when he had done so in private, and then they refused to respond to his proposal. Their terms hardened as the negotiations progressed, insisting that the United States overthrow the Thieu government. They come off as tough, determined negotiators, willing to exploit every opportunity, including the American prisoners of war, and willing to play skillfully to their advantage the sentiments for peace in this country.

The lesson from this record is clear. Hanoi is not interested in either a fair settlement or "looking good." They want a unified Vietnam under their control.

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS CRITICS

After the President's disclosure, the principal complaint of his critics was that he failed to make a straightforward offer of a withdrawal date in exchange solely for the release of prisoners. The President did disclose a proposal made to the North Vietnamese on May 31, 1971, under which the United States would agree to a deadline for the withdrawal of all American forces in exchange for the release of all prisoners of war and a cease-fire.

At the next meeting on June 26, the North Vietnamese rejected the American offer, insisting that any settlement had to include political elements.

The President, thus, has not offered a simple withdrawal of American forces in return for prisoners of war. He tied withdrawal to the acceptance of a cease-fire throughout Indochina. The Communists oppose this because, in their view, under existing conditions, total cease-fire would simply solidify Saigon's political control over most of the South Vietnamese population. They see a simple cease-fire as the same as losing the war because it requires them to give up their struggle to achieve their goal. The Communists have proposed a partial cease-fire between their troops and withdrawing allied forces, but it would take effect only after a political settlement was reached.

The President responds to his critics by saying that his proposal for a fixed date of withdrawal, a cease-fire, and an exchange of prisoners was rejected by the Communists, not because there was an objection to a cease-fire, but on the grounds that there must be a political solution in Indochina alongside a military solution. He also says that although his proposal is complex, with provisions for a political and military settlement, he is prepared to revert at any time to the simpler proposition offered in the private talks on May 31, for a withdrawal of American troops unilaterally in return for a cease-fire and an exchange of prisoners.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The apparent failure of the President's peace proposal to break the deadlock raises the question as to what happens next. Administration spokesmen have been reluctant to speculate on the future. The President said that the only alternative is to continue the Vietnamization program, which means that American troop withdrawals will go on and so will periodic bombing of North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

The hope, of course, is that the President's revised proposals, and the spirit in which they were offered, will serve as a beginning point for what could become the first real bargaining since the frustrating negotiations at Paris began 3 years ago.

The hopeful view is that the wide gap between the two sides on the political questions has been narrowed. The President made a major concession by offering the resignation of President Thieu 1 month before the supervised elections. Even though the North Vietnamese are suspicious of these elections, especially when the President suggested that a Thieu supporter, the chairman of the Senate, should head the caretaker government, the timing of Mr. Thieu's departure is surely negotiable, as is the makeup of the electoral commission. The President has made a proposal which could lead to a change of government in South Vietnam. There is room for negotiation on the political arrangements, the cease-fire, the withdrawal of troops, and the exchange of prisoners. The proposal at least begins to focus on the central issue of how power is to be exercised in South Vietnam when the war is over.

This hopeful view emphasizes that the Thieu government is growing stronger, its economy improving, its military able to maintain security, and Hanoi will want to negotiate now rather than later.

The pessimistic view is that the discussions have only emphasized that the North Vietnamese are adamant on gaining political control of South Vietnam, and anything less than assurance of a takeover will not be acceptable to them. They have sought that goal for over 30 years and they are not about to give up now. They want to drive out all the foreign soldiers and unify the nation under the control of the Communist Party of Vietnam.

In this view, Hanoi just does not have much reason to negotiate. If they withstood everything that South Vietnam could offer, when it had the help of 550,000 Americans and all kinds of extra firepower and mobility, they can certainly do better after the Americans are gone, taking most of their helicopters and guns with them. And no matter how successful Vietnamization may be, the improvement of Saigon's fighting capabilities will not offset the American withdrawal. As one American analyst put it:

Why should the North Vietnamese compromise. Instead they will just wait.

In the long run, the North Vietnamese appear to have great leverage. The U.S. military effort is declining, and even large amounts of U.S. assistance to South Vietnam will not be acceptable to a nation that wants to forget this war. U.S. bargaining power recedes with its declining military power.

But, the South Vietnamese Government, although plagued with problems, is not near collapse and their military power is no pushover for a war-weary North Vietnam.

The effect, then, of the negotiating deadlock is that the war will go on. Each side has presented the other with unacceptable demands. Hanoi wants the United States to get out, take everything with them, and stop all aid to South Vietnam. The United States wants Hanoi to stop fighting, withdraw its troops, give up the goal it has sought for decades, and enter into an election they feel will be controlled by Thieu's agents.

Somehow, this frustrating war must end. I do not see how unless we set a date for withdrawal, end our military activity, and Hanoi returns our POW's as we withdraw, and refrains from attacking our forces as they withdraw. This leaves most questions unanswered, including the central one of who controls South Vietnam, but it would permit the process of accommodation in South Vietnam to begin in earnest.

I insert an article appearing in the February 1, 1971, edition of the New York Times comparing the peace proposal of the two sides at this point.

PROPOSALS BY TWO SIDES COMPARED

WASHINGTON, Jan. 31.—Following is a comparison of the nine-point peace proposal made public by the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris today and the eight-point plan of the Governments of the United States and South Vietnam revealed by President Nixon on Jan. 25:

TROOP WITHDRAWAL

North Vietnam plan: The withdrawal of "the totality" of all United States and allied foreign forces from South Vietnam and other Indochinese countries should be completed within 1971. (The plan was first proposed privately June 26, 1971.)

United States plan: The total withdrawal of all United States and allied foreign forces from South Vietnam alone within six months of an agreement.

PRISONER RELEASE

North Vietnam plan: The release of all military men and civilians captured in the war carried out "parallelly and completed at the same time" as the troop withdrawals.

United States plan: The release of all military men and "innocent" civilians carried out in parallel with the troop withdrawals. Both sides to present a complete list of military men and civilians held throughout Indochina on the day an agreement is signed. Release to begin on the same day as the troop withdrawals and to be completed when they are completed.

POLITICAL FUTURE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

North Vietnam plan: The United States should stop supporting the present government in Saigon so that there may be set up in its place a new administration standing for "peace, independence, neutrality and democracy." Negotiations between the provisional revolutionary government, or Vietcong, and the new administration to settle "all internal affairs of South Vietnam."

United States plan: A free, democratic presidential election within six months of the agreement, organized and run by an independent body representing all political forces in South Vietnam. The body will determine the qualification of candidates. There shall be international supervision of the election.

The incumbent President and Vice President of South Vietnam will resign a month before the election. The United States will remain neutral, support no candidate, will abide by the outcome and "is prepared to define its military and economic assistance relationship with any government that exists in South Vietnam."

South Vietnam, along with the other countries of Indochina, should adopt a foreign policy consistent with the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva accords. Reunification of Vietnam to be negotiated between North and South without annexation by either party or outside interference.

REPARATIONS

North Vietnamese plan: The United States Government must bear full responsibility for, and pay reparations for, the damage caused by the United States to the whole of Vietnam.

United States plan: No specific mention of damage, but the President, the White House has said, offered to finance a $7.5-billion reconstruction program in Indochina of which the North Vietnamese share would be $2.5-billion.

INDOCHINA

North Vietnamese plan: The United States should respect the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina and those of 1962 on Laos. The United States should stop its aggression in Indochina and let the Indochinese people settle their own affairs by themselves.

United States plan: "Both sides" should respect the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. There will be "no foreign intervention" in those countries.

RESOLUTION OF INDOCHINESE PROBLEMS

North Vietnam plan: The problems among the Indochinese countries should be settled by those countries "on the basis of mutual respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity and noninterference in each other's internal affairs." North Vietnam "is prepared to join" in resolving such problems.

United States plan: The same language is used, with the following addition: "Among the problems that will be settled is the implementation of the principle that all armed forces of the countries of Indochina must remain within their national frontiers."

CEASE-FIRE

North Vietnam plan: All the parties should achieve a cease-fire "after the signing of the agreements on the above-mentioned problems."

United States plan: A general cease-fire to begin when the agreement is signed. As part of the cease-fire, there will be "no further infiltration of outside forces into any of the countries of Indochina."

INTERNATIONAL SUPERVISION

North Vietnam plan: "There should be an international supervision."

United States plan: International supervision of the military aspects of the agreement, including the cease-fire, the release of prisoners of war, withdrawal of outside forces from Indochina and the implementation of the principle that all armed forces of the countries of Indochina must remain within their national frontiers.

INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEE

North Vietnam plan: An international guarantee for the "fundamental rights of the Indochinese peoples, the neutrality of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and lasting peace in this region."

United States plan: An international guarantee for the "fundamental rights of the Indochinese peoples, the status of all the countries of Indochina and lasting peace in this region."

Other differences: In addition to those inherent in the text of the plans, such as the timing of withdrawal and provisions of the cease-fire, the two sides have argued during the negotiations over the definition of "withdrawal" and the political future of South Vietnam.

On withdrawal, the North Vietnamese have insisted, according to the Presidential adviser on national security, Henry A. Kissinger, that it must include the removal of all American equipment and the cessation of all economic and military aid to the South Vietnamese Government.

They also, according to Mr. Kissinger, have demanded that the United States set a date for total withdrawal and implement it, regardless of subsequent developments on prisoner release, and other issues.

On the political future of South Vietnam, Mr. Kissinger says that the North Vietnamese have demanded that the United States bring about, directly or indirectly, the overthrow of the present Government.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD the speech given by the Honorable Jack Williams, Governor of Arizona, on January 21 when our State had the honor and pleasure of being host to the convention of the National Federation of Republican Women. Governor Williams is a fine speaker and always offers a noteworthy message to his audiences. This speech is certainly no exception to that rule, and gives all of us food for serious thought. I hope my colleagues will pause to read and ponder it.

The article follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

(Address by Gov. Jack Williams)

Voltaire once said that history is velvet shoes going downstairs and wooden shoes going up! The ebb and flow of great nations can be represented by its moments of highest courage and greatest heroism. Then the doldrums when it dons velvet slippers.

Not too long ago, in our history, heroes walked our land and were aware of honor, duty, country. Other heroes walk again today, but unknown to most, save in a few instances. These are men who promise no glittering easy path of affluence and national cynicism, but instead, the blood, sweat and tears that Churchill once talked about.

Out of the crucible of the uneasy and

ravaged sixties, when mobs stormed our streets and burned our buildings and shouted crude slogans against our national honor, will again come America's greatest hour.

This nation has faltered, of late, on the shoals of self-despair and criticism. No great nation can long endure when its traditions are twisted as Kipling once wrote, "To make a trap for fools; and knaves are allowed to carry banners, shout slogans and flaunt divisive symbols, that have their roots in foreign ideologies."

Since history's dawn, blight, pestilence and trouble have visited themselves upon both civilized and uncivilized people of the world. One by one, society has attacked these problems with force and energy and a great many of them have been solved.

Make no mistake about it. This is the year of decision, and you represent the Party of American common sense.

A bewildering array of aspirants for the presidential nomination, like Stephen Leacock's headless horsemen, have mounted their steeds and are riding off in all directions across our land. They extravagantly promise to better the things that have been commenced over the past thirty-seven months.

Free Angela Davis shouts one! Stop the war, I want to get off, screams another. Cut our defenses, shrieks still another. Their proposals have a ring of desperation as each candidate tries to outpromise the other contenders. They propose spending money as though it's going out of fashion. And they propose humiliating our nation by crawling on our stomachs to the peace talks at Paris.

Let me recall a moment not too long ago. The scene was the Dan Carmel Hotel atop a high bluff overlooking Haifa Harbor, and I was talking to a vice president of Technicron, the M.I.T. of Israel. Professor Herman Fenkel was curious about the United States.

"There is a desire for isolation abroad in our land," I said. "The peaceniks are on the streets, shouting—Peace at any price. A strong defense is to have no defense, they say. Make it evident to everyone that we offer no threat of any kind."

"You go back, Governor Williams," gravely remarked Herman Fenkel. "You go back to America and tell them that we tried that in Germany and six million of us went to the ovens!"

It's a hard prophecy to deny.

There is a tide in the affairs of men, that at its crest leads on to victory. As a friend said recently to me, "The waves recede, but the tide comes in."

History does repeat itself. And this nation has always had the right men at the right time to save it.

There is an excitement and a sense of destiny that we should feel today, in this Republican Party. And, you should feel it first. We have some surface symptoms of difficulty, but adversity is the spur to great success.

It's wooden shoes going upstairs that counts. I am an eternal optimist. I know, from the public prints and the electronic media, that we should be depressed and gloomy. But, I can remember when things were really tough. Today, we are rich enough to afford to worry about the smoke coming out of smokestacks that indicate men are working. I can remember when the smokestacks across this land were not smoking and men were not working, and the cardboard was in the shoe; and the depression was upon the land.

Strangely enough, then, in extreme poverty we had faith, and in extreme unemployment we had neighbors.

Those who say that poverty is the seedbed of crime don't know what they're talking about. Affluence is. And those who say that a weak America will be a better America fail to understand the lessons of history.

It is only when we succumb to self-pity and despair that we encourage the possibility of failure. It is important to remember that lack of faith is the keystone to the arch of despair, and despair forms the framework for failure.

There are many who claim everything is wretched. I say that all is not wretched. I say a lot of things in this country aren't wretched at all. We have done wonderful things and left some ragged edges in the process. I trust that coming generations will smooth these ragged edges and, hopefully, go on to greater things.

Let us list some of our problems, painted and gilded into works of dishonest art by our opposition:

The false dream that one-third of the population can support the other two-thirds.

The abandonment of the family unit as the backbone of our society.

Respect for authority is under attack on all sides.

Respect for law, the courts, and more important, the parents, has become a joke with some.

The dope scene with the real cop-outs who refuse to face reality.

These are the ones in velvet slippers going downstairs.

Dishonesty is dishonesty, whether it is stealing from the income tax form or from your employer by failing to produce an honest day's work, but accepting a full wage.

An early criticism of our country related to the weakness of a democracy. We were warned when people learn they can vote themselves benefits from the public treasury, there is no stopping them until they have plundered it in its entirety.

Today, the motley crew of Democratic aspirants who have visited us, recently, have had one common theme. They have promised more from the public treasury.

My friends, the American people are not stupid. They know the old shell game very well. Those who have been running the shell game have tried to tell us otherwise.

But history shows over and over again, and the facts of life demonstrate it in our own time, that the only goal we can offer with any realistic promise of fulfillment is equality of opportunity. Let each put on his wooden shoes and go to work, climbing the long, hard, but existing, stairs which lead to greatness in a nation and in man.

We are told, today, that America is the richest nation on earth. And somehow we swallow that guff. Actually, we are more in debt than all the other nations of the world combined, but our Democratic spendthrifts keep promising more.

Do you know what a debt of four hundred billion dollars plus, is?

Let me try to describe it. If you stacked up one million dollars in thousand dollar bills, you'd have a stack eight inches high. If you stacked up a debt of four hundred plus billion dollars in thousand dollar bills, you would have a stack over fifty miles high . . .

But, we can handle this debt, and we can have a full employment budget, if we will but go back to work and produce. If we'll put on those wooden shoes and start climbing.

Essentially, America is a good nation, and a great nation. And we are a great people. We are almost without number in our infinity of skills, talents and abilities.

These national doldrums we face today result from prodigious, exhausting efforts in the past that won two world wars, put out a score of brush fires, spent two hundred billion dollars in feeding the poor around the world and restoring the ravaged. No nation has ever tithed itself so generously to help others. We may be disappointed that there is little, if any, gratitude from those we helped. But we didn't rebuild Germany and Japan's economy, expecting their thanks. We didn't send our foreign aid around the world to make ourselves rich. We did it because we have been taught that one does the decent things and helps one's neighbors to fight communism.

Now is a moment that could have been predicted. Our former foes are challenging us, and our former friends are criticizing us, and within we are torn by conflicting ideologies only the unchallenged can afford. Our national goals have been lost in an euphoria of helping everybody and everything and being all things to all people.

It is time again to reset our compass and our course.

We have a destiny among nations. It is clear, shining and magnificent as when it was first voiced in that Declaration of Independence almost two hundred years ago.

Two hundred years isn't very old for a nation. Recently, in Spain, I saw the ruins of a Moorish greatness that lasted six hundred years, until the French defeated the Moors at the Battle of Tours and decided at that moment the future of Europe, whether it would be a Moslem or a Christian future.

We are only beginning to sense our greatness and that greatness is to be found today in the article of our Republican faith. For too long have we wandered from the pathway outlined for us by those men who penned our Constitution and gave us the chance to be free. Men of industry teamed up in research and development to produce the necessities and the luxuries of life that some scorn today, even while they enjoy them. Millions of Americans have died and millions have suffered in the wars of this Republic that we might have greater freedom than any other citizen of any other nation in any other period of history of mankind.

We should cherish those freedoms—to work, to love, to learn, to play; freedom to compete, to invent, to save, to invest, to create, to promote and to own; freedom to choose, to join, to vote, to speak, and to walk erect with head held high; freedom to be ourselves and to be free to glorify our God. Life would be a void, without a sense of purpose, if we were to lose these things.

We shall not lose them because the Republican Party stands ready to defend them. Mankind hasn't changed in a thousand years and more. Common sense tells us that. That is why I say that our Party is the Party of common sense and as the Party of common sense is really closer to the people.

The common sense I talk about should prove that people haven't changed. Aesop's Fables, written over two thousand years ago, depict our same foibles and personality, the laws of Leviticus apply today, as they applied when written.

If we are to base our decisions on common sense, we must recognize that each of us serves a particular purpose in our Party, and that the re-election of Richard M. Nixon is of paramount importance, whether you agree with every nuance of his political judgments or not!

Having some knowledge of the Executive demands related to the other two branches which represent checks and balances in our form of government, I know his dilemma. We have been taught in the past thirty years to believe that the President of the United States runs the country, should be credited with all useful advances and charged with every failure. Yet, common sense admits we are a nation of checks and balances; the Legislature and the Courts have a profound influence.

We blame the President if there is a slight recession in the economy.

We blame the President if war breaks out anywhere on this globe.

We blame the President for the price of bread or the cost of shoes.

The truth, my friends, is that the President is the administrative head of this nation. Congress determines the policy, and recently the Supreme Court has trimmed the sails.

You know—even those most strident conservative critics surely can't say that the President is all bad when he appoints a man like Arizona's Bill Rehnquist to the Supreme Court.

If you judge a man by the enemies he makes, Bill has a magnificent record.

In fact, the knockers give little credit. They never have, but, if there is one great achievement on the part of Richard M. Nixon, it could be in our eyes his shifting the balance of the Supreme Court away from its far left ideologies.

Some of the other criticisms, common sense tells us, are the inevitable result of being a doer. And, during the past year especially, none can accuse our President of not acting boldly, courageously and vigorously. The leadership of this world today demands such decisiveness and action if it is to be saved from drowning in a sea of confusion and cross purposes.

Indeed, we have a President who is leading our country with courage, intelligence and with a dignity and an assurance that we have not witnessed for some tme, would that he had more support in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

Comes now that time of travail for any political leader, when the purveyors of calumny and slander have a field day, when the publishers of untruths and half truths start the presses, when the electronic media paints the picture of the little girl picking daisies. Remember?

Be prepared for even more slanders, half truths and outright lies.

A strange coterie of opponents are gathering. The party of the opposition is fielding men who have an ideological difference with us. But, that difference plays into the hands of those who would destroy us.

We should remember the man in the fable riding the little ass who tried doing everything the passerby asked him to do, would up carrying his son, and his donkey, and his burden across the bridge and lost his little ass and everything.

The American people should remember how the world's most powerful military establishment was reduced to second-rate impotence, how inflation was permitted to soar, and how a welfare state that enslaved us all, either with debt or dependence, was encouraged.

At the turn of the 17th century, England under the leadership of King William, according to Churchill's Chronical, seemed to be laying, after generations of religious, dynastic and territorial wars, the foundations of a lasting peace for the whole world. (Does that sound familiar?) But, Churchill continued, at the very moment when all that the hearts of men desired was coming within their reach through his exertions, the King was woefully and even fatally weakened by the action of the House of Commons. They rejoiced in peace and clamored for freedom. Groaning and impatient, Commons plunged into a career of disarmament and constitutional assertiveness that found them vowing to break up the standing army. An orgy of insult and abuse, in which the civil population heartily joined, began around all uniformed men. (Doesn't that sound familiar?)

This nation has gone through it. History is replete with just what is happening. And common sense should tell us that those who advocate—Better Dead than Red, or any lesser interpretation of that slogan—either fail to learn from the lessons of history and lack common sense or are serving that worst of all roles, the role of the witting, or unwitting, traitor.

The Party of the opposition has, unwisely, weakened our nation. They fought the ABM—a weapons system which the experts believed essential to our national survival. It passed by a single vote—the tie-breaking vote of Vice President Ted Agnew.

There was an honest difference of opinion about building an SST. The program was stopped. France, as a gesture of significance, flew its own SST to the meeting with President Nixon in the Caribbean recently, and Russia plans to bring its proto-type to the next air show. These gestures are not missed by those who want to believe that our nation is destined for a second-rate status.

Obstructionism is a giant industry in America today, and hundreds and thousands of men and women are being penalized.

The idea of wage and price controls is repugnant to a great many people, especially to most conservative thinkers. The President's critics in Congress called for such controls and passed the authorization necessary to give the President the power to invoke them.

Now, these same forces are his most violent critics, and with a relaxation of some controls, everyone is complaining. Yet, he said over and over he would show us the way, and then ask for voluntary compliance. He did. And everywhere that the shoe pinched, the patient squawked. But the controls had an effect. It reminds me of a classic dictum: Those who will not control themselves from within must be controlled from without by force.

The Vietnam War has divided this country as all wars which are unwinnable must. It has dragged on interminably. MacArthur once said this: "War is a terrible thing, and a tragedy when resorted to, to settle the differences between nations. However, once that decision is made to resort to war, then it is important to win it, to resolve the matter. If you don't resolve it, you simply will have to fight again later."

How true that the Korean sacrifice settled nothing and twenty years later we still meet at the peace table at Punmonjon. With Vietnam, there are those who support Hanoi and those who support Saigon. Most of the liberal criticism today is aimed at Saigon—corrupt, ineffective, and incapable of defending herself without our aid. Who points out that Hanoi cannot defend herself without Moscow's aid? In effect, why is Hanoi so pure, and if she is claiming purity, what is she doing in Cambodia and Laos? Common sense tells us that Moscow is on a fishing expedition and will absorb as much of the Far East as is permitted. Why do you think China is concerned today? She doesn't want to see the Pacific a Red Soviet lake.

Yet, in Philadelphia, one of the President's political critics declared it has taken Nixon longer to get us out of the war in Vietnam than it took us to defeat Adolph Hitler.

What he conveniently forgot to say was that from 1962 to 1968, when his Party was in power, they imposed a "no-win" policy on our military leaders and that in an agony of frustration we have sacrificed the lives of almost fifty thousand Americans, fighting in a war they were not permitted to win.

My friends, it is time for the American people to speak effectively against such unbelievable charges which not only frustrate our national life, but threaten our national future.

If we don't care enough to survive ourselves, we will be a very small footnote on the pages of history.

What has disappeared from our national scene is not only a sense of purpose, but a reverence for this country and its basic ideals.

Thirty years ago, when the ominous cloud of World War II loomed on the horizon, we could truthfully say that politics ended at the water's edge. Many of us disagreed with President Franklin Roosevelt's domestic policies, but I would remind you it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House, joining hands with the Democrats and the President, which made it possible for the free world to survive that terror.

Don't ever forget the enemy at that time was intent upon world domination and extermination of all minorities that couldn't be used as slave labor. To the young today, World War II sounds like ancient history. But, from it we should learn one great lesson. Professor Herman Fenkel said it; I say it again. Six million Jews were exterminated in the ovens and the concentration camps.

War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest thing. The decayed state of moral and patriotic feeling which insists there is nothing worth a war, is worse.

We forget that if we abandon the South Vietnamese before they can defend themselves, we deliberately condemn millions to the most brutal of deaths and retaliation. The same politicians who strongly condemn Richard Nixon's efforts in Southeast Asia to extricate our forces, appear to applaud the brutality which accompanied the recent difficulties in East Pakistan.

You saw the News and television shots of brutality and horror which accompanied India's armed intervention in East Pakistan.

Let those who complain about South Vietnam raise their voices in protest over the little boy kicked to death in East Pakistan. Let those who piously ask what we are doing in South Vietnam ask North Vietnam what they are doing in Laos and Cambodia.

As our Democratic friends trek the hustings, remember they were there when the Senate and the House voted appropriations which put us so deeply in debt—a federal debt, incidentially, which is largely responsible for the inflation that robs every man of a part of his paycheck. They were there when the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was passed. They have been there during the whole dreary exercise that President Nixon is trying so desperately to correct under our system.

It is time for common sense again, the common sense that framed the words and actions of those great patriots who formed our country.

The common sense that is represented in the Republican Party's policies and participants today.

The common sense that reminds us to give up the velvet slippers of the welfare state and the impotence of disarmament and the breakdown in patriotism, respect and loyalty, and the common sense to don the wooden shoes of work . . . for duty, for honor . . for country.

LONG ISLAND RESTAURANTS BOYCOTT FRENCH WINES

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is well recognized in this country that we are now in the midst of a horrifying drug epidemic which threatens to ruin the lives of many of our young people. Heroin overdoses in Chicago alone last year accounted for more than 300 deaths among young people.

Government officials have called for stronger measures to deal with this national problem including rehabilitation and treatment of heroin addicts with other drugs and payments to foreign governments to encourage farmers not to grow the poppy from which heroin is refined.

Recently, I along with Hon. CHARLES RANGEL from New York, urgently called for strong measures to encourage the French Government to close down the

heroin refineries which we know are operating in the Marseilles area. It is here that most of the world's heroin is processed before being smuggled to the United States.

I am happy to report that some progress has been made in this area of enforcement. The French Government recently apprehended a large group of heroin manufacturers, arresting 23 suspects and, in effect, closing down one source of supply to distributors here in the United States. But this is not enough.

Apparently some American citizens also think that more sanctions are necessary. I refer specifically to a group of restaurant owners in the Long Island, N.Y., area.

The New York Times of January 31 carried an article which explained how the Long Island Restaurant and Catering Association, a group of 120 members, decided to boycott wines, liqueurs and brandies made in France, hoping to persuade the French Government to deal more forcefully with heroin traffickers.

I commend these people for their concern and their courageous action even though it will no doubt mean a financial loss to them. As the owner said:

It was necessary to impress the French Government that we will take a strong stand against their apathy in dealing with this problem.

I would like to mention that the president of the association, Mr. Warren R. Spellman, indicated that he will ask the Restaurant Association of the State of New York, a group with 3,000 members, to join the boycott. It should be noted that Mr. Spellman is president of the Long Island Committee for Crime and vice president of the National Association of Crime Commissions—so he is well aware of the resultant crime that drug abuse causes.

Mr. Spellman also stated that a national boycott of this nature could well mean that approximately 3 million bottles of French wine would not be sold each month. A venture of this proportion would surely not go unnoticed by French officials.

We, in American Government, are making every possible effort to convince the French Government, as well as other governments, that it is in their best interest to cooperate with us to end the extensive flow of heroin and other drugs coming into our country.

But this boycott by the restaurant owners in Long Island shows the true voice of the people. For this we are thankful and I can only hope that the boycott spreads to other cities in the United States.

If the proper officials hear this voice of the American people, then I am convinced that we can cut off the supply of heroin and this deplorable situation can be ended. We then can begin more extensive treatment programs to help those who have become victims of the insidious influence of heroin and other narcotics. I ask to insert the aforementioned article to be reproduced for all to read. It is as follows:

LONG ISLAND RESTAURANTS BOYCOTT FRENCH WINES

(By Roy R. Silver)

WOODBURY, L.I.—A boycott of French wines, liquors and brandies in an attempt to have the French Government deal more forcefully with the heroin problem was started today by the owners of many of the top restaurants in Nassau, Suffolk and Queens counties.

The boycott, was voted by the Long Island Restaurant and Catering Association, representing 120 restaurants and caterers.

A proclamation adopted unanimously at a meeting in the Royal Viking Restaurant here said that the main source of supply of heroin was drugs imported from Turkey, processed in Marseilles, France, and then distributed illegally throughout the world.

The restaurant owners said that even if a boycott meant a financial loss to them, it was necessary "to impress the French Government that we will take a strong stand against their apathy in dealing with this problem."

They said that many appeals to the French Government "to seriously crack down on importers, processors and exporters of heroin for foreign consumption have gone unanswered."

Placards announcing the boycott will be placed in participating restaurants and small cards will be placed on tables to advise customers to refrain from buying French wines and liquors and to order other imported or domestic wines instead.

Warren R. Spellman, owner of the Holiday Manor in Bethpage and president of the local association, said that the Restaurant Association of the State of New York, with 3,000 members, and the National Restaurant Association would be asked to join the boycott.

VICTIMS OF ADDICTS

Mr. Spellman, who is also president of the Long Island Committee for Crime Control and vice president of the National Association of Crime Commissions, said that many restaurant owners had been the victims of crimes by drug addicts.

He noted that of the 33 million gallons of wine sold in New York State last year, imported French wines made up "a large share."

"We feel that if each restaurant can sell one less bottle of French wine a day, it will be 3 million bottles a month less nationally," Mr. Spellman said.

He said that many people bought expensive French wines because of their reputation, but added that California and New York State wines were becoming camparable in quality and taste and that customers would switch because "the price is right."

Jean Pierre Gachelin, who is in charge of the division of food and beverages in the commercial attache's office at the French Embassy, said today the press had reported that "American officials have found that French police and authorities are most cooperative in combating the drug problem."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CAN PRICE JUMPS FOR MEAT BE STOPPED?

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, when the housewife goes to the supermarket to buy meat she knows that the fight against inflation has not yet been won. Meat prices keep going higher; and current indicators point to further rises in the spring and summer. This, of course, affects every one of us, but for the low-income family price jumps take food off the dinner table.

I am not ready to assume that higher and higher meat prices are a fact of life, like death and taxes. Two weeks ago I telegrammed President Nixon asking for a substantial increase in imported meat quotas as one step that should be taken to hold prices somewhat in line. For the sake of the American consumer, I hope the Cost of Living Council is giving serious thought to what countermeasures can be taken to offset the price increases for beef and pork that loom ahead.

To shed light on some of the background contributing to the price hikes, I want to include here an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 19:

MEAT TAB GOING UP

(By Ann McFeatters)

Meat prices are up—and going higher.

Pork and beef are the big culprits. Here's why:

Last year the pork supply went up and prices to farmers went down so farmers began breeding fewer hogs. Now 8 per cent fewer hogs are coming to market driving prices up. The price the consumer pays for pork and pork products therefore will rise. Monday the prices for live hogs paid by packers, who slaughter and dress the animals for retail sale, were the highest in a year and a half.

Cattle prices Monday soared to the highest level in 20 years, astonishing everyone, including the Department of Agriculture and the packers, represented by the American Meat Institute.

WEATHER BLAMED

In Chicago the National Livestock Producers Association blamed bad weather. Because many farmers couldn't get their animals to market the price paid for the available livestock soared.

But Agriculture Department livestock economic specialist Don Seaborg said beef prices have been going up gradually for some time and will continue upward for a while.

He said the reason is that people are eating more beef and with pork prices climbing there is less competition to keep prices down.

A spokesman for the meat institute said a 750 million-pound decline in pork production is predicted. He said that means the

average American will eat five pounds less pork this year. On the other hand, he's expected to eat six more pounds of beef.

Government economists admit general meat prices will be even higher than last year, hoping only that the rise won't be as fast as it was last year.

An example of the rate of increase is the average retail price paid per pound in November for all choice beef—$1.06, which compares with 97 cents a pound paid in November, 1970. And this week the wholesale cost of pork increased 20 per cent.

Monday's high prices paid by the packers for live cattle means prices will rise again shortly because packers are slaughtering as fast as the cattle come in.

"I'm sure the packers won't be able to absorb that large an increase (between 50 cents and $1.25 per 100 pounds)," the meat institute spokesman said. "Prices will go up."

The higher meat prices will affect President Nixon's stabilization program. This week the executive director of the Massachusetts Retail Grocers Association, Malcolm McCabe, said it is unfair that prices of agricultural products are not subject to Price Commission controls.

"Skyrocketing meat costs charged to retailers are making a travesty of the war on inflation" he said, adding that the cost of pork chops means more to the average household than the "flood of talk and explanations" from government and industry.

"The price of pork chops will elect the next President of the United States," he said.

MAKING THE ROUNDS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, having served at the U.N. during the last session and having been especially concerned with the budgetary status of that institution, I was especially intrigued by an editorial in the San Diego Union of Tuesday, January 25, 1972.

The point which this editorial makes is quite objective, and I therefore direct it to the attention of the Members:

MAKING THE ROUNDS

It is a bad season for Secretary General Kurt Waldheim to be making the rounds in Washington in search of financial help for the United Nations, which for all practical purposes is flat broke. The capital mood is not likely to be receptive after the U.N. performance on the China issue last fall.

His hope is to raise $45 million in advance payment of dues from U.N. members so the organization can meet its payroll in the months ahead. He also is proposing that member nations cancel any loans they have made to the U.N. In September, he promises to unveil a new plan for U.N. financing, presumably one aimed at keeping the budget in balance.

Mr. Waldheim should put first things first. His appeal for a dues advance and loan write-off would find a better reception if the U.N. would first adopt a policy to deal more strictly in the future with members who welsh on their obligations. The Soviet Union and France, for instance, have never paid their assessment for the U.N. peacekeeping operation in the Congo.

U.N. leaders even are considering the possibility of solving their financial problems with a lottery. Surely if the world organization's dues and assessment schedule were more equitable and better enforced, and if its spending policies were more realistic, it would not have to go begging—or selling lottery tickets.

CONFIDENCE IN THE U.S. DOLLAR, LIKE CONFIDENCE IN THE AMERICAN FLAG, DETERIORATES ABROAD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount that the attempt made by the Nixon administration to salvage the American economy has failed.

This is most evident in the continuing plunge of the American dollar abroad as confidence in the American economy wanes. The chairman of the current Paris monetary meeting of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development is reported to have commented that things "will get worse before they get better" and that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was "bound to be a confidence problem."

This situation continues to threaten the U.S. economy. The present price of gold on the open market reached a high of $48.10 per ounce recently—this while the official rate fixed by the American Government is $35 dollars per ounce, with the proposed devaluation only to set the price of gold at $38 per ounce.

It is evident that the steps taken by the Nixon administration have failed to combat inflation and restore confidence in the dollar—this because devaluation is but an emergency or stopgap measure that fails to get at the root cause, excessive Government overspending brought on by irresponsible action or the wasting of tax income by ridiculous experiments in living.

The related news clippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1972]

GOLD PRICE RISES ABOVE $48 AN OUNCE

(By Jonathan C. Randal)

PARIS, February 1.—The price of gold rose above $48 an ounce today for the first time as world monetary experts predicted the United States would run "sizeable" balance of payments deficits until 1973 despite de facto devaluation of the dollar.

Otmar Emminger, German Bundesbank vice president and chairman of the current Paris monetary meeting at the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development, said "There is no basis for talk of a lack of credibility" in recently negotiated currency re-alignments.

But with the dollar weakening all over Europe and the London gold price at $48.10—a 95 cent jump in 24 hours—Emminger's qualified optimism struck the market as a bit forced.

"Realignment has a good chance of leading to the desired result," he told journalists after the first major monetary meeting of the 23-nation OECD since the Dec. 18 de facto devaluation of the dollar, "it just takes time."

Emminger conceded "things will get worse before they get better" and that the U.S. balance of payments deficit was "bound to be a confidence problem."

He maintained that the U.S. balance of payments deficits would continue for two years "with the main improvement" unlikely before 1973.

He explained that "the perverse effect" on U.S. international accounts was because the American economy was picking up faster than those of its major trading partners.

As a result, imports into the United States cost more immediately because of the dollar devaluation whereas U.S. exports would take longer to increase especially with many of the potential overseas markets expected to remain sluggish for most of this year.

Lower interest rates in the United States than in Europe also have discouraged the once expected massive repatriation of the some $27 billion of U.S. currency which flowed abroad last year during the monetary crisis and has yet to return in any but token amounts.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 2, 1972]

DOLLAR AT LOW, GOLD AT HIGH ON JITTERY EUROPEAN MARKET

LONDON.—The dollar hit new post-devaluation lows in Europe while speculator rushing to buy gold forced the price of the metal up to a new high point in jittery financial markets today.

The dollar plunged to a record low in Frankfurt, and the West German State Bank (Bundesbank) moved into the market to shore up the U.S. currency for the first time since the Washington currency agreement in December.

Steady pressure drove the dollar down to low points in Britain, France, Belgium, Switzerland and Holland when operators switched from dollars into European currencies in hectic trading.

Dealers could not pinpoint a single specific reason for the new flurry of dollar selling, but some said the swift leap in the price of gold had spilled its effects into already highly nervous currency exchanges.

Buying orders for gold at a time when potential sellers were reluctant to part with their holdings jerked the price up to a record $48.60 an ounce, a morning gain of 57½ cents an ounce in London.

Gold was now more than $10 an ounce higher than the proposed U.S. increase in the official price of monetary gold soon to go to Congress.

Gold gamblers who bought the metal a month ago were already showing profits of more than $4 an ounce, but dealers said these speculators were in no hurry to cash in and seemed ready to wait for still bigger gains. In the Paris market, the gold price also soared to $48.60 an ounce—a jump of $1 an ounce there since yesterday.

SHARON'S LUNAR ARTIST

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are proud of this Nation's daring and adventurous journeys to the moon. We in the Sixth District take special pride in the artistic talent of Sharon resident Carl Broemel who has painted in authentic detail the lunar landscape viewed by the crew of Apollo 12.

To insure the total technical accuracy of his work, Artist Broemel consulted with manufacturers of the lunar module and instruments, as well as with Apollo 12 Astronaut Charles Conrad. Another painting by Mr. Broemel was selected

by the Air Force as its official Christmas and New Year's greeting card.

Carl Broemel, who has painted for some 55 years, is to be congratulated on his splendid achievement. For the interest of my colleagues, an article concerning Mr. Broemel's views toward this extraordinary artistic challenge which appeared in the Lakeville Journal follows:

SHARON'S LUNAR ARTIST

(By Betty Shepard)

Artist Carl Broemel of Ellsworth in Sharon will soon receive a visit from a moon man—and strictly on business. Astronaut Charles Conrad, featured in the painting reproduced on this page, will have to check out the technical details before the artist will call the work finished.

The subject is Apollo 12 on the moon, with Astronauts Conrad and Alan Bean. Apollo 12 took off Nov. 19, 1969. It was only possible to do the painting, Mr. Broemel states, because of the help offered from the various large corporations who designed and made the Lunar Module and instruments—and with the advice of Captain Conrad.

"The Lunar Module is no small affair," Mr. Broemel says. "It is 24 feet high and 31 wide at the base and is never seen on earth in its final stage. It is packed into a canister at Long Island, placed into the missile at Cocoa Beach, then shot out at the moon, where it opens up like a flower and descends slowly to the moon's surface.

"When the astronauts leave, they are shot up into the sky by the upper section. This is then abandoned when they are safe inside the capsule in which they will return."

"The different atmosphere and lighting on the moon made this an interesting undertaking," the artist states. "The only color in my picture is the gold-covered crinkly foil covering the Lunar Module as protection against radiation. The sky is black and the moon light grey." Any object that is not in the sun, according to the artist, is black.

The sun, according to the artist, is never more than 12 degrees from the horizon and the day is 14 days long. "It's a long, low slanting light, so great that one cannot look into it."

The posture of the astronauts, according to the artist, is caused by the weight they carry on their backs, nearly 200 pounds. "If they straighten up, they will fall over backwards. To keep their center of gravity they have to bend their knees and lean slightly forward."

When Mr. Broemel decided he wanted to paint a picture of the moon—"very good material for abstract painting"—he consulted his son-in-law, William Attride, who had been at Cocoa Beach for 10 years as an active project engineer on the missile base. It was Mr. Attride who put him in touch with the astronauts.

The painting, started in August, "became much more of a mechanized project than I expected." The artist soon gave up the idea of making it abstract when he saw that the subject matter was far too complicated. The painting, in oil, is 30 by 40 inches.

When the painting is completed it will be given to Astronaut Conrad, but Mr. Broemel will have the reproduction rights. It has taken this long, he states, because he wanted to make sure he had recreated the image correctly: when he got stuck he would write the manufacturer of the space machinery and equipment for further information.

Another painting by Mr. Broemel, this time of Eskimos, is entitled "Northern Lights at Frobisher Bay." It was picked for the official Christmas and New Year's greeting card of the Air Force. This painting, owned by the Air Force, is now included in a collection of 2,300 paintings, some dated as early as 1915, others as up-to-date as now.

"This particular painting was the result of my trip to the Arctic in mid-winter some 12 years ago," the artist states.

For the Air Force Collection, artist illustrators of three societies—New York, San Francisco and Los Angeles—cooperate with the Air Force by visiting air bases and installations around the world to record their impressions of the men, equipment and mission on canvas.

Once a year these groups present about 100 paintings to the Air Force to keep the collections current. This year the group held 56 exhibitions throughout the United States, drawing almost one and a half million visitors.

Mr. Broemel has been painting for 55 years, and for the last three years his style has been essentially abstract. He and his wife Ruth have lived in Sharon since 1959, moving here from White Plains.

"Most of my life was spent in Cleveland," he states. He has done some architectural designing, but is known mainly for his painting and illustrations.

The Broemels have three children: in Daytona, Fla., Wilmington, Del., and Norwalk, Conn., and eight grandchildren.

Mr. Broemel states he was also sent by the Air Force to missile bases in the Mediterranean. All artists who work this way for the Air Force contribute their paintings.

"We are always on call," Mr. Broemel says, "but I think I have reached the age now where I like to stay home."

THE PRUNING OF THE PRESIDENCY

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, Wes Barthelmes, a most knowledgeable Senate staffer, has written for Commonweal magazine a very incisive piece on the steady erosion of congressional power. I think that every Member of this body, as well as the Senate, would benefit greatly by reading Mr. Barthelmes' observations:

[From the Commonweal magazine, Jan. 21, 1972]

THE PRUNING OF THE PRESIDENCY

(By Wes Barthelmes)

It may be premature to transfer the Congress from the political scientists to the cultural anthropologists for study, but our national legislature may be considered a marginal political institution, vulnerable to a final sacking by an American Cromwell. Worse still, few of its 535 members acknowledge, much less understand, the weakened congressional condition. Alarmed members are mostly those on the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees, because it is in these areas that the greatest enfeeblement of congressional authority has taken place.

The historical explanations for the flow of power from the Capitol to the White House are many. The history of the presidency itself is marked by a sporadic gathering-in of power by successive occupants. But, until modern times, there were also intervals of congressional reassertions and passive presidencies. No longer. The trend now moves without interruption, in part, because the nation has been on a war-footing for the last 30 years—with no end in sight. Along the way there has occurred both an intellectual and programmatic confusion betwen the roles of the President as Chief Executive and as Commander-in-Chief. Our Prince Metternich, Henry Kissinger, and his predecesors as Chief Councillor-of-State under Democratic administrations take the view that only the presidency is able properly to determine and execute foreign policy—and to this end, Congress as an institution is an impediment. Presidential historians such as Corwin and Neustadt have cultivated an atmosphere of public approval for the "heroic" presidency.

Amid continual politics of crisis, the Congress, in diverse moods, has acquiesced in making ill-advised grants of authority to demanding Presidents. Sometimes stampeded, sometimes misled and lied to, sometimes slothful in respect to its Constitutionally assigned obligations, the Congress has compiled for history a case study in institutional self-destruction. There is no persuasive argument that the Congress has been an unwilling victim of presidential depredations. Conversely, it has invited presidential domination in large part by acquiescing to (a) an autonomous committee system, (b) a system of promotion to leadership positions that lacks accountability, and (c) a grossly inadequate, even obsolete, system of information-gathering for legislative purposes. When ravaged, it has seldom fought back.

Members of Congress have only themselves to blame for the crumbling oedipus which they occupy. Few have cared and an example has been set for them by congressional leaders who don't lead, particulraly those in the House of Representatives. As for the Senate, under the self-deception of exercising extended debate, it exists as a sort of cave-of-the-winds and seldom legislates outside the frozen formats established for domestic legislation by the New Deal.

Restoration of the federal system of checks-and-balances would be the most worthy undertaking for the American Bicentennial Commission. Lord Acton, where are you? The Congress, for better or for worse, is the only one we have and it is time to make amends before the monarchial tendencies of the White House multiply.

The potential is there. Paradoxically, the number of able men and women in the Congress is greater than ever—numbered not by the fingers-of-the-hand but by the dozens—yet the whole adds up to less than the sum of the parts. In addition, a promising historical situation exists. The theory of presidential sagacity and dominance may be floundering on the shoals of Vietnam—and, lately, as a result of the India-Pakistan imbroglio. This should be exploited.

There are slender beginnings. Two Supreme Court nominations of President Nixon have been rejected. Within the last two years, the Senate has successfully instigated marginal restraints upon the President's freedom-of-action in Indochina—the Church-Cooper amendments being the foremost. Arsenal diplomacy, as exhibited through the foreign aid program, received a setback in late October when the Senate defeated the omnibus bill for military and economic aid. But it will also require restraints, self-imposed, on the part of Presidents in recognition of the Constitutionally assigned roles for the Congress in respect to domestic and foreign-policy making.

Perhaps, it is too much to expect of candidates to make such a public recognition now that the presidential rutting season is engulfing us—ten wordy months prior to Election Day. The sitting President has demonstrably refused to acknowledge the Constitutional role of the Congress. And the Democratic candidates, humming "Hail to the Chief," are neither volunteering their views, nor being asked.

"THE SUNDAY SENATE"

The psephological specialists continue to confuse election statistics with substantive politics. "The Sunday Senate," that aggregation of network interview shows, focus on This One as a ront running candidate for the Democrats and That One as a "dark

horse" for the Republican nomination. Ad-hominem questions dominate the question period in the context of an assumption that, of course, it is obligatory upon the next President to do more than his predecessor. Is it crankish to suggest that we all might be better off if each presidential candidate promised, if elected, to do less—or, at least, do whatever he wishes to do in full and advance consultation with the Congress?

One wonders, matching hope against experience, whether improvements can be forced upon the traditional pattern of presidential campaigns, unsavorily expensive ones of low comedy, mass rowdyism, and occasional high drama. Is it not legitimate to ask the candidates as to whether each adheres to the cult of the presidency, Rossiter's "compelling focus of power, prestige and patronage." One contrasts today's imperial trappings at the White House with Franklin Pierce's fumblings in the darkness at the White House after his Inauguration and eventually his finding a mattress on the floor upon which to spend his first night as President.

The chaplains and intellectual Mandarins of American Empire continue as Privy Councilors to Presidents who drape around them the cloak of presidential immunity from questioning congressional committees. Are the candidates for President willing to relent in this practice? If so, it would be instructive to see the Rev. Billy Graham giving witness before a Senate Committee on Godliness as to his fitness to be a presidential advisor.

The grotesqueries of the 1968 presidential campaign seem to have been forgotten. All shades of political opinion insist on finding someone upon whom to shift the insupportable burden of resolving the issues afflicting our nation. The Right seeks its Bismarck; the Muddled Middle, its Nice Guy; the Left, its Frank Merriwell of social change. The sobering lesson of the Decade of Assassinations seems forgotten.

More profitably than building cults of personality—competent candidates are not necessarily effective Presidents—reporters of tube and typewriter could help nurse American politics to health if they pose new questions to presidential contends. One question relates to a President's rendering unto the Congress the things that are the Congress'. Recent Presidents have consistently refused to do so. Two examples underscore this unwillingness.

One involves the practice of executive impoundment of congressionally appropriated funds, which, at last report, totaled $11.8 billion. This practice, exercised by both Democratic and Republican Presidents, strikes at the most important power of the Congress—the power of the purse, the power to decide to spend, or not spend public funds. There are instances when a President is not obliged to spend such funds as when a program costs less than the appropriated amount. The Congress acknowledges such legitimate and commonsense withholdings. But most of the impounded funding is the result of a succession of Presidents deciding for insufficient reasons not to fund programs that Congress has ordained are to be funded. It's a Congress-be-damned attitude. Congress seldom has tried to correct this presidential purse-snatching, although in December the Senate stipulated that some of these funds, assigned for domestic programs, be released. The House has yet to give its concurrence.

WARMAKING POWERS

The second example relates to the warmaking powers under the Constitution. The specific bill was that of a $21.3 billion military procurement measure for fiscal 1972. As the bill moved through the Congress, there was added an amendment offered by the Senate Majority Leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana. The amendment declared it to be "the policy of the United States to terminate at the earliest practical date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces at a date certain, subject to the release of all American prisoners-of-war. . . ." During a discussion of the amendment in its final form, Senator Stennis, chairman of the Armed Services Committee and floor manager of the bill, said on November 11 that if the bill, to which the Mansfield amendment was attached, became law then "As a policy matter, it binds the Congress and the President of the United States."

Six days later, the President did sign the bill (and the Mansfield amendment) into law. But the President said he would not obey the amendment because it "does not represent the policies of this Administration . . . it is without binding force or effect. . . ." Nixon's defiance was not challenged by the Senate, although a back-stage effort to mount a counterattack was undertaken and then fell apart. Nevertheless, the Mansfield amendment is now part of the law and, as such, is not subject to dismissal by the President.

Each contender in the grand competition for the presidency should be asked what his attitude would be if he found himself living in the White House. Would he continue to exercise unchecked presidential discretion over public spending? Would he continue to order our military forces into action and, in opposition to congressional intent, keep them there?

Probing further, there are questions to be asked about the infringement of rights of private citizens by government surveillance, the mania for stamping as "Secret" every scrap of paper in the drawers and files of Executive Branch departments, and the consistent refusal of Presidents to provide the Congress with information about long-range foreign military assistance plans.

These are more useful fields of inquiry than questions about whether a candidate will carry California or to whom he'll offer the Vice Presidency. Otherwise, we again court disappointment and a compounded disequilibrium of national political institutions when we express interest in what a candidate will do, but not how he plans to do it.

We need not heroics in our next President, but simply the competent toil of an accessible, fair-dealing, plain-speaking President willing to share his burdens—and glory—with the Congress and the people.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO APPLAUDS "PROJECT POLE"

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1969, I spoke in this Chamber in support of the Polish American Congress campaign to halt defamation of the Polish people in America. At that time I expressed wholehearted support for their effort through the mass media to combat the innuendoes, the sick jokes, and the countless other vicious, contemptible, and cruel methods employed by mass media to depict members of ethnic groups as imbeciles, cowards, liars, and slobs.

Today, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues not to the efforts of a group, but to the crusade of one man, to halt use of the "Polish joke" in characterizing Polish-Americans. Edward J. Piszek, a self-made Polish-American businessman who owns Mrs. Paul's Kitchens, has launched "Project Pole" with a series of newspapers ads in Detroit focusing on the great contributions of Poles to the advancement of world civilization.

Some of the outstanding Poles who have been the subject of Mr. Piszek's ads are Nicolaus Copernicus, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Kazimierz Pulaski, Joseph Conrad, Frederic Chopin, Marie Curie, Ignacz Jan Paderewski, and Zygmunt Wroblewski.

I commend and congratulate Mr. Piszek for presenting to the people of America a true image of the Polish people and the Polish heritage. His positive contribution toward stopping defamation deserves the support of all ethnic groups, and indeed all Americans, for it enhances the spirit of brotherhood in which the Founding Fathers established our great democracy.

An article about "Project Pole" which appeared in the January 14, 1972, edition of Life magazine follows:

ONE-MAN CRUSADE AGAINST THE POLISH JOKE

(By Michael Durham)

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

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

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

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

The working director of Project Pole is a genial, bespectacled priest, Father Walter J.

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

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

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

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

No chauvinist when it comes to charity, Piszek has not only donated 11 mobile TB detection units to Poland, but also helps support a college in Ireland ("I like the Irish, they're very Polish"), Father Ziemba's Orchard Lake Seminary ("the Polish Notre Dame") and the state of Israel, which commended him for purchasing bonds.

Piszek is buoyed by the prospect that a Polish-American might even become President of the United States. "Edmund Muskie is trying to bring the country together," he says, "which is what I'm trying to do. It's like a dirty window. If you wash your side and I don't wash mine, what are we going to have?" he asks, beaming at the simplicity of the revelation he is about to bestow. "We are going to have a dirty window!"

THE PRESIDENT'S "PEACE PROPOSAL"

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, statesmen responding to President Nixon's latest Vietnam peace proposal continue to question whether it is actually designed to end American involvement or to pacify the American public. Writing in the Washington Post, February 2, 1972, former U.N. Ambassador Charles W. Yost, recognizes that the President's plan would have been progressive in 1968, but is far behind the times in 1972. Further, he emphasizes that the election scheme devised by the President fails to deal with Hanoi's basic distrust of the Thieu regime and leaves Thieu's well-entrenched machine in a firm position to control the proposed election.

Ambassador Yost concludes, however, that it is still not too late to end this war and achieve the return of all American prisoners of war. He reaffirms his belief that we must no longer prop up the Saigon government and must seek a release of American POW's based solely upon the setting of a date certain for withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam. This is the only real peace proposal which has any chance of success.

Following is the text of Mr. Yost's article:

UNITED STATES IS LATE AGAIN WITH VIETNAM CONCESSIONS, BUT IT IS NOT TOO LATE TO MAKE A DEAL FOR THE POW'S

(By Charles W. Yost)

Among the many tragic aspects of United States involvement in Vietnam, two particularly stand out at this moment when the administration has revealed its latest "peace proposal." The first is that, seven years after the massive involvement which most Americans now believe was an appalling mistake, the administration is still determined to win the war, even while leaving it. The second is that concessions on our part necessary for a negotiated settlement have always come much too late.

There was a time, some years ago, when a plan similar to the one now offered by the administration might have succeeded in ending the war. In 1968 I prepared for a private organization a plan for a Vietnam settlement which contained most of the elements of the latest United States proposal. This plan was submitted to the incoming administration in December 1968. It is most gratifying to find that it has been in large part adopted nearly four years later.

There are, however, two significant differences between the two plans. The first is in timing. At the beginning of 1969, the United States had more than half a million troops in Vietnam, and Hanoi might possibly have been willing to pay a high price to get them out quickly. By the summer of 1972, United States forces will presumably be down to about 30,000; our leverage is already vastly less; and the price we could now exact for what we have to offer would be a small one.

The second significant difference—this one substantive—between my plan of 1968 and the administration's of 1971 was that I suggested that new elections be conducted, not by "an independent body representing all political forces in South Vietnam," but by a neutral interim government having that representative character.

Such an interim arrangement might possibly have been saleable to both sides in 1969 if the United States had pressed hard enough. It is now, because we have long since passed decision-making from ourselves to Thieu.

The administration proposal leaves Thieu's authority essentially intact, and from Hanoi's point of view, this is a fatal defect. While the plan provides for the resignation of President Thieu and his vice president one month before the election takes place, and for the "independent" election supervision, it otherwise leaves the entire apparatus of government, executive and legislative, national and local, police and military, in the hands of the present regime.

This is the apparatus that would in fact, whatever else might be stipulated, "run" the elections. Under those circumstances the result would be a foregone conclusion. The fact that President Thieu has cheerfully accepted this program suggests that he is not worried about its outcome.

Naturally every American would be delighted if Hanoi would accept the administration's latest "peace proposal." We would however, be deluding ourselves enormously—for about the hundredth time in the Vietnam war—if we really expected that they would.

So far Hanoi's rejection seems unequivocal. The official Chinese press agency has characterized it as a "plan for persisting in the war of aggression against Vietnam and Indochina." That does not sound hopeful.

To be quite frank, there never was any sound reason for believing that Hanoi would accept at this late date a cease-fire and political "settlement" which would be almost certain to confirm the Thieu regime in office.

The idea of a cease-fire is particularly chimerical. For many years the previous administration and this one have been pursuing this particular will-o-the-wisp. It was always entirely clear that the North Vietnamese would never agree to a cease-fire of any significant duration as long as United States or South Vietnamese forces held the populated centers in the south. To do so would have been to admit that they had lost the war, which they have not been and are not willing to do.

One cannot help but wonder, therefore, whether this latest proposal, like all the similar ploys of the Johnson administration, was not put forward, and spiced by the exciting bustling back and forth to secret meetings, chiefly in order to persuade the American electorate that its government has "gone the last mile for peace"—while it continues to wage the war.

As cynics have noted, the rejection of this "peace proposal" and the anticipated launching of new offensives by Hanoi could easily be used as pretexts for more United States bombing and hence more, not less, United States involvement.

The only way quickly to end United States participation in the war is the one repeatedly proposed by majorities in the Congress—to offer a firm and early date for total United States withdrawal in exchange only for the simultaneous release of our prisoners.

The future of Vietnam will eventually be settled between the two Vietnamese governments, either by negotiation or by continued fighting. It is far too late for the United States to play a decisive role either in propping up the Saigon government or in changing it. Vietnamese politics is no longer our business. That should be the ultimate meaning of "Vietnamization."

It is not too late, however, for us to make a deal for the release of our prisoners. After all, they are of no use to Hanoi except as leverage for bargaining the United States out.

Once Hanoi is convinced the United States is going out completely, out of Vietnamese politics as well as out of the war, a deal on prisoners should still be possible. But the longer we wait, the more we pretend to pursue phantom "peace proposals," the less and less our leverage for the release of our prisoners will become.

FATHER OF MEDICARE AIME FORAND

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in rising to pay tribute today to the memory of my predecessor on the

venerable House Ways and Means Committee, I am not just paying tribute to a great legislator from the neighboring State of Rhode Island nor a great representative for New England cn that important committee. In rising to pay tribute to former Representative Aime J. Forand I am rising to pay tribute to a great American, a man who has left his indelible imprint on the legislative history of this country, in the area where it probably matters most, in the annals of social legislation.

It is not all that uncommon in Congress for a Congressman to become closely identified with a particular bill and to the extent that he works at it and pushes for it, the man and the bill become inseparable and inextricably linked as one. This happens quite frequently to no one's great surprise in a body such as this. Such was the case with Aime Forand. Only in his case, because of his foresight and singular persistence, one of the great landmark bills passed into law and has become part of our national scene today.

I am referring, of course, to medicare and its father, Aime Forand. In fact, when medicare legislation became law in 1965, Congressman Forand was already retired 5 years from this House. Yet so hard and so long had he fought for the concept behind such legislation that there was no doubt in anyone's mind as to whom the victory belonged that day. All thoughts were with our former colleague. His crusade, and that is what it was, was not an easy one. He ran headlong into some of the fiercest opposition any legislative proposal has ever encountered. And yet the Congressman persisted, taking comfort in the knowledge that millions of senior citizens, a novel concept at that time, were behind him and were counting on him to help them meet one of old age's greatest problems, adequate health care and insurance.

In his retirement, he was not inactive. As national chairman of the National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security, he was in fact very much in the battle. In some senses, more involved in the struggle for medicare than when he was in Congress, free from the details and other concerns of representing a congressional district, Aime Forand could devote his full attention and energy to what by then had become uppermost in the minds of himself and the senior citizens of the Nation.

In a real sense, Aime Forand came well-equipped to do the job. His whole life was the story of a self-made man. From a large family he was in fact forced to drop out of school at the seventh grade. Why? Because of his father's illness and the staggering burden it placed on the family's limited resources. The rest of his education came the hard way, in between jobs and working and sleeping. Before he came to Washington he had been in administrative positions dealing with the problems of the aged firsthand, which gave him tremendous practical insight into the problems facing the elderly. When he introduced his medicare bill in 1957, he said something which I think would be difficult to surpass, for it's compassion in a nutshell—

The needy will never again be just statistics to anybody who has to deal with their personal problems.

When Congressman Forand retired from Congress in 1960, he had served 24 continuous years. During much of that time, he served with another great congressman, John Fogarty. I do not think I am overstating the facts in saying that at that time it would have been difficult to find another State that had a delegation of higher caliber, of greater dedication to the problems of the sick and the elderly, of greater compassion and with greater respect from their colleagues than the State of Rhode Island. The quality of service of both these congressmen will long serve as an inspiration to students of our Nation's history as a model of what one small state can contribute in talent and human resources to the national leadership at a time when the Nation needed such qualities the most. When he retired from Congress, Aime Forand was the second-ranking Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee and the acknowledged expert in Congress on legislation affecting the social security system. If any man in recent legislative history was the father of an idea whose time had come, and I am thankful to God Almighty that he was granted the years to see his idea through to fruition, it was our dear departed former colleague, the Honorable Aime J. Forand.

SENATE—*Friday, February 4, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord whose mercies are without end and whose grace is sufficient for all our need, as Thou hast been the guide of past generations be to us our guide in the perilous and demanding days in which we live. Strengthen all who bear the responsibilities of public office in this land. Enlighten them by Thy spirit.

Make us a people strong in character, in virtue and morality, in piety and patriotism, in material and spiritual resources that we may guard faithfully the values entrusted to us, employing our might only for the extension of Thy kingdom and in the service of mankind. Lift our vision to behold the world that is yet to be and hasten the coming of Thy kingdom.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT, SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that calendar No. 105, Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, a concurrent resolution calling for suspension of military assistance to Pakistan, and so forth, be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1972

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Later this order was changed to provide for the Senate to convene at 10 a.m. on Monday.)

THEN AND NOW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during the 1968 election campaign, when Mr. Nixon was a candidate, he was repeatedly asked on the platform, by the press, and on television to comment on the conduct of the war and of the negotiations in Paris un-