

those who visit it and even those who casually pass by.

How fortunate we are to have our great National Park System with all its skills and competence. Not only to bring back to life those important areas and structures that have laid dormant so long, but also, to manage them, display them and artfully make them available to all Americans.

We are excited about bringing the Frederick Douglass Home into the Department of the Interior during this, the centennial year of the National Parks.

One hundred years ago . . . Yellowstone National Park . . . far in the West . . . was brought into being out of the wonderland of the frontier.

I dare say that few here today have had the opportunity to see this magnificent monument of nature so very far away.

But the President, understanding this, has directed that the Parks . . . in the second century of their history . . . be brought to the people. His legacy of Parks program assures this will be done.

Today is a very special day. As today, in the spirit of conservation and preservation:

In the spirit of this Administration.

In the spirit of our great National Capitol Park System and

In the spirit of Frederick Douglass, who devoted his life to the highest American

principles, we are joining together, to dedicate this his home.

Frederick Douglass leaves for America's history a dramatic reminiscence of a great and moral man. A man whose powerful voice still rings with lessons for our own time.

In the knowledge that the Frederick Douglass Legacy stands for the benefit of all Americans, it is significant that Congress has marked this, his home, as a National Shrine.

President Nixon allocated over \$400,000 for Cedar Hill's restoration but the high privilege of bringing it to life is yours and mine today.

The American poet, Walt Whitman, was a contemporary of Douglass. Both felt the country's vigor. Whitman wrote after the Civil War:

"Political democracy, as it exists and practically works in America, with all its threatening evils, supplies a training school for making first-class men. It is life's gymnasium, not of good only, but of all."

He gloried in the fact that the American contest for life was open to all men. Douglass proved Whitman right.

For Douglass both life and freedom began at age 17 when he over-powered a professional slave broker, and fled from a plantation where his birth had only vaguely been recorded as to time and place.

Believing justice was too often in jeopardy, Douglass always eloquently stood in its defense.

It wasn't easy, it occupied every year of his life; and when Douglass died in 1895, the task was still not completed.

Douglass added volumes to the understanding of what it meant to be a free and dignified man.

He hammered away at Southern slavery and Northern hypocrisy when he said:

"You degrade us, and then ask why we are degraded—Douglass said—"You shut our mouths and then ask why we don't speak—You close your colleges and seminaries against us, and then ask why we don't know more."

Douglass continued his fight for equal rights after the Civil War.

Three grateful post-War administrations placed him in high office. Douglass spent the last 15 years of his life here at Cedar Hill and he always remained the crusading defender of justice in jeopardy.

The inspiration of Frederick Douglass raises a dignity in all men. Today, we dedicate his home knowing that future generations will find this inspiration; this greatness, this decency that made Frederick Douglass an outstanding American.

Thank you for inviting me to share with you, the honor of bringing new life to the Frederick Douglass Memorial Home.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 21, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Preserve me, O God: For in Thee do I put my trust.—Psalm 16: 1.

God of our fathers and our God, to Thee we come praying that our land may be forever bright with freedom's holy light. For this we thank Thee: for the contribution of our Founding Fathers and particularly for the contribution of our first President, whose birthday we celebrate today. May the spirit which was in him become the spirit which shall be in us as we face the experiences of these challenging times.

Bless Thou our President as he talks with the leaders of China. Grant him courage, faith, and wisdom that he may play his full part in ushering in a new day of peace on earth and good will among men.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8699. An act to provide an Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States; and

H.R. 9180. An act to provide for the temporary assignment of a U.S. magistrate from one judicial district to another.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 166) entitled "An act to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known to the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. HATFIELD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1394. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act to abolish the referees' salary and expense fund, to provide that fees and charges collected by the clerk of a court of bankruptcy in bankruptcy proceedings be paid into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, to provide salaries and expenses of referees be paid from the general fund of the Treasury, and to eliminate the statutory criteria presently required to be considered by the Judicial Conference in fixing salaries of full-time referees;

S. 1395. An act to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76) to increase the maximum compensation allowable to receivers and trustees;

S. 1396. An act to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 63) and section 631 and 634 of title 28, United States Code, to permit full-time referees in bankruptcy to perform the duties of a U.S. magistrate;

S. 2359. An act for the relief of Willard O. Brown;

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972.

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning, March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Ac-

tion" and to designate Sunday, March 26, 1972, as a national day of prayer for these Americans; and

S.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of the term of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Mr. STENNIS be appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 12067) entitled "An act making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes" in lieu of Mr. McCLELLAN, excused.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 1972, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI) to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MAZZOLI read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds

a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to

mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad, of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can,

in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequently interruption of their peace

by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: They have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these

advantages on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute: they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with

care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to

foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense

of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human

nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest; in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one of the enemies of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free peo-

ple ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by

policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not neces-

sary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, without its being considered a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD following the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address and also in that portion of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of remarks."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE COST OF ARTHRITIS AND RHEUMATISM

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a time during which

there is much emphasis on the conservation of our Nation's natural resources. This concept, indicative of the mood of all Americans, is moving our Government to protect the land that has blessed the saga of this country, and I am in total agreement with this mood. But, the natural resources of this Nation are not just the rivers, the air, the wildlife by far the greatest and most valuable resource is that of human lives, and more importantly, the health of those lives.

We are engaged in battles on many fronts against the diseases that attack the happy pursuit of life in the United States. Individuals, groups, and governments are cooperating to eliminate the ills that every minute, every second, strike at the well-being of Americans everywhere. One of the most widespread hazards to health that our citizens face is that of arthritis.

Many people have false conceptions about this disease. It is, in fact, many diseases, some mild, some devastating.

It can and does occur at all ages, from infancy on. Almost everyone, if he lives long enough, will develop some form of arthritis. Studies show that 97 percent of all individuals over age 60 have enough arthritis so that it can be seen in X-ray films. There are at least 50 million Americans with some arthritis. It touches every family in the United States.

I am afraid that our people have become somewhat accustomed to its prevalence. Many believe that nothing can be done. But something can and must be done when its toll has been 17 million victims in the United States. A large percentage of those have been senior Americans, whose values to this Nation are just as important as that of our young citizens.

I include a copy of "What Is the Prevalence and Cost of Arthritis and Rheumatism; What Is Being Done for the People With These Diseases?" compiled by the National Health Education Committee in the RECORD. I want my distinguished colleagues to be aware of the nature of this crippling and to ask themselves how we can do more to support research to combat this dread disease. The material follows:

WHAT IS THE PREVALENCE AND COST OF ARTHRITIS AND RHEUMATISM? WHAT IS BEING DONE FOR PEOPLE WITH THESE DISEASES?

(NOTE.—This fact sheet has been compiled from the best available information by the National Health Education Committee, Inc., 866 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017.)

I. How many people in the United States have arthritis and rheumatism?

1. About 17 million people in the U.S. today (1 out of every 11 Americans) are afflicted with arthritis severe enough to require medical care. At least 50 million Americans have some arthritis. (7)

a. No other disorders cause more prolonged misery to a greater number of people in the U.S. than do the arthritis and rheumatism diseases. (1)

2. Arthritis and the rheumatic diseases are second only to heart diseases as the most widespread chronic illness in the United States today. (2)

a. The leading causes of activity limitation in the U.S. today are: (2) Heart conditions, 16%; Arthritis and rheumatism, 15.4%.

b. Arthritis and rheumatism ranked second among the chronic conditions which prevented people from carrying on their major activity (work, keeping house, school). (2) Of those people unable to carry on their major activity, 24.9% reported heart conditions as the cause and 16.5% reported arthritis and rheumatism as the cause. (2)

3. An estimated 3.4 million arthritis victims are disabled—limited in their usual activities—at any one time. (3)

a. Of these, 353,000 are under 45 years of age. (2)

b. 680,000 or 16.5% are unable to carry on their major activity (work, keeping house, school) because of arthritis and rheumatism. (2)

4. Arthritis and rheumatism cause 205 million days of restricted activity annually and 12.2 million days lost from work (regular job) annually. (7)

II. What are the major forms of arthritis and rheumatic disease?

Arthritis (which literally means inflammation of a joint) is an umbrella term covering more than 80 forms of rheumatic disease that attack the joints and/or other connective tissues of the body. Some are very common; some very rare.

The three major forms are: (3) Rheumatoid arthritis; Osteoarthritis; Gout.

Other diseases associated with arthritis which are common and serious enough to be of concern include: (3) Rheumatic fever; Ankylosing spondylitis; Scleroderma; Systemic lupus erythematosus.

III. How many people have rheumatoid arthritis?

Rheumatoid arthritis affects about 5 million people in the U.S. today, and is the most devastating and crippling form of arthritis. (3)

It is a chronic, inflammatory connective tissue disease that leads to permanent joint deformities and other complications producing disability and chronic invalidism. (1)

The majority of its victims are young and middle aged adults in their most productive years, between 20 and 45 years of age, although it can begin both earlier and later. (3)

The primary cause is still unknown. (1) There is no specific cure, though it is often possible to control the disease or ameliorate its manifestations.

IV. How many people have osteoarthritis?

About 10 million Americans have osteoarthritis severe enough to cause painful problems. (7)

Osteoarthritis is associated with aging and degeneration of joint tissues. It usually develops more slowly and is milder and less painful than rheumatoid arthritis, although it can end up producing pain and disability in some victims. (3)

No specific treatment is known for osteoarthritis and this form of disease must be managed by the control of symptoms and the relief of strains on the affected joints.

V. How many people suffer from gout?

About a million Americans suffer from gout. (3)

Gout is an arthritic disease that most often affects the joints of the feet, especially the big toe. (3)

A susceptibility to gout is inherited, and most of its victims are men. Attacks of the disease last for days or weeks, and usually produce intense pain. Gout is related to excess uric acid in the blood and tissues. (3)

The disease can now be controlled by drugs and treatment that reduce the uric acid level. (3)

VI. What is the economic loss to the country from arthritis and rheumatism?

1. Arthritis and rheumatic disease is conservatively estimated to cost the nation \$3,645,000,000 annually. Of this amount:

a. \$1.7 billion is lost in wages and salaries by persons unable to work because of their ailment. (7)

b. \$1 billion represents annual medical care costs. (7)

VII. How much does the Veterans Administration pay in compensation or pension payments to veterans because of arthritis and rheumatic diseases?

1. As of September 1968, there were 301,064 veterans receiving compensation or pension payments whose major disability was classified as arthritis or rheumatic disease. The estimated annual value of these payments was \$271,130,256. (5)

VIII. How much does the Federal Government lose in income and excise taxes?

The Federal Government loses in one year in income and excise taxes alone over \$200 million on the wages and salaries lost by persons unable to work because of arthritis and rheumatism. (11)

IX. What methods of treatment are presently in use for arthritis and the rheumatic diseases?

1. Rheumatoid arthritis. (4)

a. Lacking a specific cure for rheumatoid arthritis and since it is a systemic disease, measures of proved value, for the most part, are directed toward improving the patient's general health—these include rest, nutrition, drugs for relief of pain and for rest, sleep, physical therapy, psychotherapy and rehabilitation.

b. Measures for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis on which there is fairly uniform agreement but no complete unanimity include: (4)

(a) Salicylates: The salicylates, of which aspirin is the most common, are perhaps the only drugs that over the years have been widely used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Aspirin, in adequate dosage, has proved to be one of the most effective and least dangerous of any drug in relieving the symptoms of the disease. Aspirin not only eases aches and pains in joint stiffness, but research indicates that in the early stages of rheumatoid arthritis, the drug probably lessens the inflammatory process that is the basis of the disease.

Aspirin is available in various forms that permit the use of the drug in persons who are unable to tolerate it because of gastrointestinal distress.

(b) Steroid hormones: These drugs are cortisone and hydrocortisone and their synthetic analogues, prednisone, methyl prednisolone, triamcinalone and dexamethasone, etc. The steroids can be quite effective in suppressing the painful and inflammatory symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis. Carefully selected arthritics respond quite well to these highly potent drugs. Care must be taken to guard against serious side reactions.

Any form of treatment is usually most effective during the early stages of the disease. This is also true of the steroids. As with gold and phenylbutazone, the steroids do not benefit everyone and a good number of arthritics will experience toxic and undesirable side reactions with their long use.

Corticotropin (ACTH), a product of the pituitary gland, though a hormone like the steroids, is in itself not a steroid. ACTH, however, stimulates the production of steroids by the body. Its use has diminished greatly primarily because it can be given only by injection.

(c) Gold Salts: Injections of gold have been effectively used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis for at least a quarter of a century. The mode of action of gold on the rheumatoid process is not known. However, experience has shown that about two out of every three persons given gold undergo a beneficial response. Not only does gold restrict the disease activity, but it also suppresses many of the inflammatory changes caused by the rheumatoid process. Not all arthritics will benefit from the use of gold and about 1/3 of them will suffer toxic and undesirable side reactions from it.

(d) Phenylbutazone: This drug is a syn-

thetic chemical and not a steroid or a hormone. It is an analgesic for rheumatic complaints (not headaches) and is an effective pain killer in all types of arthritis especially in spondylitis and gout. In the early and acute stages of rheumatoid arthritis, the drug brings about a decrease in joint swelling and muscle stiffness. The action of phenylbutazone, the little that is known of it, is not hormonal in any way and has nothing to do with the adrenal or the pituitary glands where hydrocortisone and ACTH are made by the body. As with gold and the steroids, phenylbutazone cannot be taken by all arthritics; not all will benefit from it and a good many will experience undesirable side reactions.

(e) Anti-malarial drugs: Certain compounds such as chloroquine, which have been developed against malaria, are used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and systemic lupus erythematosus. Care must be taken in their use because of possible systemic toxic effects, including ocular movement. (4)

(f) Indomethacin: This is a new anti-inflammatory drug, not related to cortisone or aspirin, which may relieve certain symptoms associated with rheumatoid arthritis. It can be prescribed for long-term treatment, with relatively minor side-effects. Experience suggests its greatest usefulness to be in spondylitis, gout and osteoarthritis, particularly osteoarthritis of the hip. (4)

2. Osteoarthritis. (4)

a. No specific therapy is known for the treatment of degenerative joint disease. Treatment is symptomatic and includes rest for the involved joints, physical therapy, weight reduction, drugs and, in some cases, reconstructive surgery to correct badly deformed joints or other mechanical disturbances.

Cortisone-like drugs are rarely used in osteoarthritis except in instances where they are injected into joint spaces. Aspirin, phenylbutazone, indomethacin and perhaps other drugs can be helpful. (4)

3. Gout. (4) The acute, painful attacks of gout can be controlled quite well with several drugs now available, particularly colchicine, phenylbutazone, indomethacin and cortisone-like compounds. Also modern drugs, for example probenecid and sulfinpyrazone now can be prescribed to prevent the excessive accumulation of uric acid. Early treatment is important. (4)

4. Rheumatic Fever. Rheumatic fever is an acute systemic disease accompanied by fever and painful joints. It frequently damages the heart. Anyone of any age can be attacked by rheumatic fever, which nearly always follows a streptococcus infection, although it is most frequently observed between the ages of 5 and 15.

Those who have had one rheumatic fever attack may be susceptible to others and frequently contract it again.

Flare-ups of rheumatic fever can be prevented, however, by proper use of antibiotics (especially penicillin) to prevent the streptococcus infection. The avoidance or prevention of streptococcal infection by the systematic use of penicillin or a similar antibiotic will nearly always prevent attacks of rheumatic fever.

The treatment for acute attacks of rheumatic fever consists of rest, anti-inflammatory drugs such as aspirin, and sometimes cortisone-like compounds. (4)

X. What are some of the current research leads being pursued against arthritis and rheumatic diseases?

The primary cause of rheumatoid arthritis is still unknown. Two leading theories, supported by considerable evidence, suggest that an obscure infectious process or an autoimmune reaction (characterized by manufacture by the body of antibodies that attack its own tissues) may be involved, or possibly a combination of both processes. (1) More research has centered on a possible infectious

cause for rheumatoid arthritis during the past 5 years than during the previous 20, but while specific infectious types of arthritis are known due to invasion of joints by certain microorganisms, no microbial agent has yet been positively identified as a cause of rheumatoid arthritis. (1)

In the search for better drugs for treatment of arthritis, attempts are being made to redesign known steroid compounds which have demonstrated salutary anti-inflammatory action but which also cause serious side effects on prolonged use. (1)

Among other new agents, compounds related to triamcinolone have been subject to careful clinical testing. Among these is a new steroid drug triamcinolone hexacetonide, which seems to combine the important features of rapid and prolonged action with minimal side effects on prolonged repeated use. The hexacetonide appears to retain the desirable qualities of the parent compound and to require less frequent administration. (1)

Research is under way to try to gain more knowledge of the transport of antibiotics from the blood into synovial (joint) fluid and surrounding tissues of patients with infectious arthritis. If effective levels of antibiotics could be demonstrated in the synovial fluid of patients receiving generalized treatment with the drug through intramuscular or intravenous injection ("systemic therapy"), direct injection of antibiotics into affected joints with its attendant difficulties, such as secondary infection and joint trauma, could be avoided. Treatment could be simplified in cases of multiple joint involvement. (1)

XI. Are some people affected more by arthritis and rheumatism than others?

1. Persons who work outdoors and who work with their hands appear to suffer more from rheumatic diseases than those in sedentary occupations. (7)

a. More farmers are stricken with arthritis and rheumatism than individuals in any other field or occupation. (7)

b. Factory workers make up the second largest group in this country affected by arthritis and rheumatism. (7)

c. Three times more women than men suffer from arthritis and rheumatism. (7)

XII. How many physicians specialize in the rheumatic diseases?

1. There are approximately 1850 members of the American Rheumatism Association, a professional society of physicians interested in treatment of or research in arthritis and the rheumatic diseases. (3)

2. Only 57 of the nation's 100 medical schools offer a full program of courses in rheumatology. (3)

XIII. What facilities are available for treatment of arthritis and rheumatism?

1. A large "delivery gap" exists between the help that can be given to arthritis victims and what they actually receive. An adequate, comprehensive system has yet to be developed. Arthritis is the Nation's number onecrippler but its victims are short-changed by a medical system that is oriented to treating acute, not chronic disease. (3)

2. The Arthritis Foundation has supported pilot programs which have clearly demonstrated the value and effectiveness of comprehensive care for arthritis victims, but the Foundation lacks the funds to provide such treatment for every arthritis sufferer and has sought Federal action to bring these programs into existence throughout the country through the establishment of a network of arthritis centers and satellite clinics. (3)

3. The Arthritis Foundation states in its 1968 Annual Report that there are now about 50 first-rate arthritis research-training-care centers in the U.S. and more than 300 clinics.

a. In 1948, there were only 6 arthritis medical centers for study and treatment and just over 100 arthritis clinics in the entire U.S., most located in 8 cities.

XIV. Are these facilities adequate?

1. No. The need for additional clinics, hospital beds and rehabilitation facilities and trained personnel to treat arthritis is urgent. (3)

a. The facilities that do exist are completely inadequate.

2. In view of the increasing knowledge about arthritis in children and the ever increasing population of the aged, this need will grow progressively in the years to come. (3)

3. Facilities are needed to aid in research on the rehabilitation and restoration of bedridden arthritics to active life. (3)

XV. What are we spending for research on arthritis?

1. The most recent estimated annual allocations for arthritis research and closely related basic studies total \$15,182,112; distributed as follows:

a. National Institute of Arthritis & Metabolic Diseases, U.S. Public Health Service, estimated for fiscal 1969 (out of a total appropriation of \$143,888,000). (15)

Grants:

Research grants.....	\$7,955,000
Research fellowships.....	452,000
Training grants.....	1,493,000
Total	9,900,000

Direct appropriations:

Intramural research.....	1,606,000
Collaborative research and development	42,000
Biometry, epidemiology, field studies	\$198,000
Total	1,846,000

Total research in arthritis

and rheumatic diseases.....	11,746,000
b. Veterans' Administration (6):	
Department of Medicine & Surgery, estimated fiscal 1969.....	1,664,000
c. The Arthritis Foundation (3):	
For research in universities, hospitals and other institutions in 1968.....	1,772,112
Total	15,182,112

XVI. How does this compare with other national expenditures?

1. In contrast with the \$15,182,112 currently being spent for arthritis research:

a. The Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture is planning to spend an estimated \$254 million during fiscal 1970. (8)

b. The people of the United States in 1968 spent approximately:

(a) \$14,585,450,000 (billions) for alcoholic beverages. (9)

(b) \$8,371,500,000 (billions) for tobacco product and smokers' accessories. (9)

(c) \$209,250,000 for toilet water and cologne. (9)

(d) \$223,780,000 for hair coloring preparations. (9)

2. The current Federal allocation for research on rheumatic disease, Number One Crippler, is about 5% of the \$285 million estimated 1970 expenditures of the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for forest protection and utilization programs. (8)

3. Almost \$218 million is being spent annually in the field of cancer research, and research fellowships, including expenditures by the Federal Government and by the major voluntary health agencies. (10)

XVII. How much does the Arthritis Foundation raise annually nationwide and how are these funds spent?

According to the 1969 Annual Report of the Arthritis Foundation, the American people contributed \$8,117,034 to the Foundation during that year.

Expenditures for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1969 were as follows:

	Amount	Percent of total
Patient and community services....	\$1,805,700	22.4
Research.....	1,789,600	22.2
Management and general.....	1,280,600	15.9
Fundraising.....	1,217,400	15.1
Public health education.....	1,159,600	14.4
Professional education and training.....	804,600	10.0
Total.....	8,057,500	100.0

XVIII. What can be done about the problem of arthritis and rheumatism?

1. The public and all agencies in this field should support and cooperate with the Arthritis Foundation, the major national voluntary agency working specifically in this area.

2. Congress should continue to provide funds for research so that a vigorous and direct attack upon the rheumatic diseases can go on without interruption.

3. The problem is centered mainly in the medical schools of the nation where there are inadequacies of personnel, funds and facilities to meet the needs of continued clinical and basic research in the rheumatic diseases.

a. Federal funds should be provided for the construction of laboratories and other research facilities needed to make possible the greater study of these diseases.

b. Federal funds must be increased to make possible more grants-in-aid to non-federal institutions, to provide for the purchase of equipment and the payment of stipends to investigators and their staffs, and to finance the laboratories of the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

4. A major problem is the need for the training of more physicians in the diagnosis and treatment of arthritis and rheumatism.

a. Congress should make available to the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases additional funds for training so that young physicians can be trained.

(a) In fiscal 1969, the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases spent an estimated \$1,493,000 in training grants for arthritis and the rheumatic diseases which is inadequate. (1)

REFERENCES:

(1) Information from the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland.

(2) Chronic Conditions Causing Activity Limitation, U.S. July 1963-June 1965. Series 10, No. 51. National Center for Health Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

(3) 1967 and 1968 Annual Reports, The Arthritis Foundation, New York.

(4) Information on current therapies for rheumatoid arthritis from "Today's Facts About Arthritis" published by the Arthritis Foundation, New York.

(5) Department of Veterans Benefits, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C., personal communication dated August 14, 1969 from Edward R. Silberman, Director, Program Planning and Budgeting Services.

(6) Veterans Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Washington, D.C., personal communication dated September 29, 1969 from Lionel M. Bernstein, M.D., Director of Research Service.

(7) "Arthritis-The Basic Facts" published 1970 by the Arthritis Foundation, New York.

(8) Budget of the United States Government, 1971.

(9) From a survey compiled and published annually by "Drug Topics", Topics Publishing Company, New York, N.Y.

(10) A total of \$217,870,916 is currently being spent in the field of cancer research, as follows: Government funds (fiscal 1969) \$180,011,000. Non-governmental funds, including American Cancer Society, Damon

Runyon Memorial Fund and the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research in New York City; Roswell Park Memorial Institute for Cancer Research in Buffalo, N.Y.; and the M.D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute in Houston, Texas: \$37,859,916.

(11) Computation based on information contained in Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1969—on federal individual income tax receipts, excise tax receipts, total personal income.

ARMENIA SHOULD BE FREE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 51st anniversary of the attempt by the Armenians to free themselves from Communist tyranny. This unsuccessful revolution, which occurred on February 18, 1921, has been followed by over half a century of oppression by the powerful and ruthless Soviet empire.

Many peoples have ruled over Armenia, which has known but a few brief periods of freedom. Arabs, Egyptians, Mongols, Persians, Russians, and Turks have taken turns in subjugating Armenians. Their land is now divided between the Soviet Union and Turkey.

More than 70 new nations have been established since the end of World War II, as the British, French, and others relinquished the reins of government and withdrew from their far-flung colonial empires. The Soviet Union, one of the loudest screamers against colonialism and imperialism, continues to hold on to its colonies, including Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Armenia have the same right to an independent existence as do the peoples of Africa, Asia, and the islands of the seas. Let the self-proclaimed anticolonialists in the Kremlin quit talking against imperialism and demonstrate their sincerity by restoring freedom to Armenia.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM, BLACKLISTING, AND THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it was deeply disturbing to learn that the armed services have instituted a policy prohibiting officers from pursuing graduate education at 15 of the Nation's finest educational institutions. The policy was undertaken at the insistence of the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in retribution for the discontinuance of Reserve Officer Training Corps programs at these schools.

The 15 universities are Boston College, Boston University, Brown University, Colgate University, Columbia University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Hobart and William Smith College, New York University, Pratt Institute, Princeton University, Stanford University, State University of New York at Buffalo, Tufts University, and Yale University.

Regardless of one's feelings toward the action of these schools with respect to the ROTC program, to deny members of the Armed Forces access to these institutions is both arbitrary and punitive. At no time has the Congress mandated such a policy. And I have been informed by Defense Department officials that in the past the Department has consistently opposed legislation to direct such a policy.

This policy can only serve to obstruct the educational advancement of military officers, and thus limit their potential contribution to our country. It can only serve to widen the gulf between the military and civilian sectors of our population.

The most disturbing aspect of this policy, however, is that it casts the ugly shadow of the blacklist—a reprehensible procedure alien to our democracy. Regression to the dark days of the early 1950's cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, on February 17, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Laird urging him in the strongest possible terms immediately to rescind this policy.

Academic freedom has long been cherished as one of the cornerstones of our Nation. Attempts to bludgeon our universities into conformity can only erode that freedom.

UNIVERSITIES BLACKLISTED

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of all of the Members of Congress a very distressing situation which reveals that the military services have blacklisted some 15 universities because they have phased out their ROTC programs.

In early February a young naval officer, who insisted upon being anonymous, came to me and presented a mimeographed list received by him from naval officials and entitled "Civilian Educational Institutions to Which Naval Officers May Not Apply for Enrollment in Graduate Educational Programs—as of October 1971."

These universities included the following:

Boston College.
Boston University.
Brown University.
Colgate University.
Columbia University.
Dartmouth College.
Harvard University.
Hobart and William Smith College.
New York University.
Pratt Institute.
Princeton University.
Stanford University.
State University of New York, Buffalo.
Tufts University.
Yale University.

On February 7 I wrote the following letter to the Secretary of the Navy:

FEBRUARY 7, 1972.

HON. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Secretary of the Navy,
Pentagon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY CHAFEE: I was very distressed to learn from a Naval Officer that the United States Navy has issued a list of distinguished universities in America to which Naval Officers may not apply for graduate training.

I attach herewith a copy of a mimeographed notice given to all Naval Officers who have made inquiry about graduate studies.

I attach a Xeroxed copy of the very poorly mimeographed sheet handed out by Naval officials. For your convenience I attach a clean copy of that document.

I was, of course, distressed to see Boston College on this list of universities to which Naval Officers may not apply.

I know that you will be distressed that Brown University is included in this list.

The Naval Officer who gave this list to me indicated that it was his judgment that the preclusion of ROTC or some other similar activity on the part of these universities had prompted somebody in the Navy to make these institutions unacceptable for graduate programs for Naval Officers.

Another source has indicated to me that it was allegedly pressure from one or more members of the Congress of the United States on the Navy that prompted this particular list.

In any event I know that you will be as distressed as I am.

In the nature of things I feel obliged to inform these universities of the blacklisting of their excellent facilities.

I trust that I will hear from your office a satisfactory reply within 48 hours or 72 hours after receipt of this document.

If no reply is received or if an unsatisfactory answer is given I shall disclose this matter in the Congressional Record with appropriate publicity.

With every best wish, I am

Cordially yours,

ROBERT F. DRINAN,
Member of Congress.

On February 11, 1972, I received the following reply from the Honorable John H. Chafee, the Secretary of the Navy:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., February 11, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT F. DRINAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRINAN: Thank you for your inquiry of February 7 in which you express concern that the Navy is not sending officers to Boston College and Brown University among other distinguished institutions.

The reports you have received regarding our curtailment of graduate enrollment at those schools which are phasing out NROTC programs are essentially correct. The explanation is that, during the current session, the Congress expressed concern about the Military Departments' funding graduate education for officers at institutions where ROTC units were being disestablished. In its report on legislation involving the ROTC the House Armed Services Committee expressed itself as follows: "... it is morally wrong for the military to spend dollars sending students to a particular college or university which has chosen not to cooperate with the military services. ... "We (Congress) do not believe that the fact that a particular university has an element of prestige is sufficient reason for sending a student to a university which has withdrawn from R.O.T.C." (House Report 92-354 at page 4). I quote from a December 7 letter I received from the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee: "It is our hope that it will not be necessary to place a flat prohibition against sending students to these universities which have withdrawn from the ROTC Program when we consider the procurement bill next year but, if it is necessary to legislate on this subject, legislate we will. I am not asking you at this time to withdraw students prior to the completion of the program in which they are enrolled but I am adamant that no new student will be permitted to enter such programs at these universities. Thus, we are looking forward to additional reductions in the number of students attending such schools when the April report is received."

I share with you concern for the loss to the Navy and the nation of the excellent relationships previously experienced with these institutions.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. CHAFAE,
Secretary of the Navy.

The Boston Herald Traveler, under date of February 17, 1972, revealed the black-

listing by the Navy in the article which follows:

NAVY BAN HITS HARVARD, BU, TUFTS, BC—
15 COLLEGES BLACKLISTED

(By Drew F. Steis)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy Department has quietly circulated a blacklist of 15 major U.S. colleges and universities, including four in Massachusetts, where career officers are prohibited from taking government-financed graduate courses.

The blacklist, which includes Harvard, Boston and Tufts universities and Boston College, was uncovered by Rep. Robert F. Drinan, D-Newton, after receiving a complaint from a naval officer.

In an exchange of letters between Drinan and Navy Secretary John H. Chafee last week, Chafee admitted that the schools had been placed on a proscribed list because of the phasing out of Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps programs (NROTC) but placed the blame on the House Armed Services Committee.

In response to a Drinan letter, Chafee replied:

"The reports you have received regarding our curtailment of graduate enrollment at those schools which are phasing out NROTC programs are essentially correct."

Chafee added that the decision to ban attendance at the schools was made during closed door hearings before the House Armed Services Committee in July of last year.

"In its report on legislation involving the ROTC," the Chafee letter continued, "the House Armed Services Committee expressed itself as follows: '... It is morally wrong for the military to spend dollars sending students to a particular college or university which has chosen not to cooperate with the military service. ...'"

Chafee, in his letter to Drinan quoted from a letter he received last September from Committee Chairman F. Edward Hébert, D-Louisiana.

"It is our hope," Hébert wrote, "that it will not be necessary to place a flat prohibition against sending students to these universities which have withdrawn from the ROTC program when we consider the procurement bill next year but, if it is necessary to legislate on this subject, legislate we will."

"I am not asking you at this time to withdraw students prior to the completion of the program in which they are enrolled, but I am adamant that no new student will be permitted to enter such programs at these universities," Hébert continued.

Chafee concluded his letter to Drinan with the words:

"I share with you the concern for the loss to the Navy and the nation of the excellent relationships previously experienced with these institutions."

Placed on the Navy blacklist with the four Massachusetts institutions were Brown University, Providence; Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.; Yale University, New Haven; Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.; and Colgate University, Columbia University, New York University, State University of New York at Buffalo, Pratt, Institute and Hobart and William Smith College, all in New York state.

Drinan said the mimeographed list of blacklisted schools was given to naval officers "who have made inquiry about graduate studies."

The list was preceded by the heading:

"Civilian educational institutions to which Navy officers may not apply for enrollment in graduate educational programs. (As of October, 1971)."

Drinan, who was graduated from Boston College and was dean of the Boston College Law School between 1956 and 1970, said he was "very distressed" about the blacklist.

"That officer came to me with this list, practically in the dead of night. I can't believe that naval officers would be officially

barred from attending some of our nation's finest institutions."

A Navy spokesman at the Pentagon disclaimed any knowledge of the blacklist and said he was unable to provide the Herald Traveler with the number of naval officers who avail themselves of continued studies during any given year.

Spokesmen for the Army and Air Force said they also were unaware of an official or unofficial blacklist for their individual services.

Drinan said he intended to continue his investigation of the ban and would also "inform these universities of the blacklisting of their excellent facilities."

Coincidentally, Navy Secretary Chafee was graduated from Yale and received his law degree from Harvard; two of the schools now blacklisted to naval officers.

On the same day Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., the majority whip addressed the following letter to Congressman HÉBERT, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1972.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my attention that the House Armed Services Committee has taken drastic and unprecedented action in prohibiting career officers from taking government financed graduate courses at fifteen of the nation's finest educational institutions, including several which are located in my congressional district.

The tradition of excellent education which these schools represent should be available to every American, including those who serve in the Armed Forces. It is my sincere belief that to deny access to these universities of higher learning to the officers of the Navy solely on the basis that they have phased out their Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps Program is both unsound and punitive. The officers of the United States Navy deserve, and have a right to attend schools of their choice, just as any civilian has the right to do. If I understand the implications of the present decision correctly, the blacklisting of these colleges is tantamount to a denial of due process to the men of the Armed Forces.

Blacklisting, especially when it interferes with academic freedom, is not favorably looked upon by any freedom loving people. The workingman of this nation has battled long and hard to throw off the shackles of the blacklist, the most incipient restraint on the freedom of any individual. To place the servicemen of this nation under the burden of such a system is the consummate insult to both their commitment to their country and the integrity of the Armed Services.

Regardless of how one feels about the ROTC programs and their removal from many of the blacklisted campuses, it seems ludicrous to punish men who have nothing to do with those decisions and whose only objective is to obtain a decent education. Furthermore, the universities of this nation cannot long remain free and independent if pressure from military and government

In light of all the foregoing, I respectfully urge you to reconsider this decision.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

On the following day the Boston Herald Traveler revealed that not merely was the Navy involved in this blacklisting but all of the armed services had acquiesced in the demand of the House Armed Services Committee that no military offi-

cers attend those universities which had phased out ROTC programs.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Feb. 18, 1972]

ALL ARMED SERVICES INVOLVED—BLACKLIST OF COLLEGES STIRS CONGRESSMEN

(By Drew F. Steis)

WASHINGTON.—Congressmen and senators, concerned over reports of the Navy Department's blacklisting of colleges and universities in their areas, yesterday began a number of independent investigations into the prohibition which affects schools that have deemphasized the Reserve Officer's Training Corps (ROTC) program.

At the same time Rep. Robert F. Drinan, D-Newton, who first uncovered the Navy blacklist, released a second blacklist of 10 educational institutions to which Army and Air Force personnel may not apply.

The blacklisting of some of the nation's major schools, including Harvard, Tufts and Boston Universities and Boston College, which was first reported in yesterday's Herald Traveler, has created a full scale controversy on Capitol Hill.

Angry senators and representatives opened individual investigations with letters to the Department of Defense and to the House Armed Services Committee, which ordered the blacklisting last July.

Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill, D-Cambridge, in a strongly worded letter to Committee Chairman F. Edward Hébert, D-La., termed the blacklist "both unsound and punitive."

"The officers of the United States Navy deserve and have a right to attend schools of their choice just as any civilian has a right to do."

O'Neill said the restriction "is tantamount to denial of due process to the men of the armed forces."

"To place the servicemen of this nation under the burden of such a system is the consummate insult to both their commitment to the country and the integrity of the armed services."

O'Neill urged Hébert to "reconsider this decision" and lift the ban on the individual schools.

The original Navy blacklist, dated October, 1971, was entitled: "Civilian educational institutions to which naval officers may not apply for enrollment in graduate education programs."

It included, beside the four Massachusetts schools, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton, Stanford, Yale and six New York schools: Colgate, Columbia, NYC, State University of New York, the Pratt Institute and Hobart and William Smith College.

Father Drinan said he received the naval blacklist from an unidentified Navy officer who wished to apply for graduate training at one of the schools.

Chairman Hébert, during Armed Services Committee hearings in July of last year, told representatives of the three military services that if voluntary restrictions were not imposed on individual colleges or universities which had "withdrawn from the ROTC program" legislation would be enacted to prohibit the spending of federal money at such institutions.

"It is the belief of the committee," the official report stated, "that it is morally wrong for the military to spend dollars sending students to a particular college or university which has chosen not to cooperate with the military services in providing career opportunities for those students who desire to make the military their career."

Hébert also stated that although officers presently in one of the blacklisted institutions would be permitted to finish their studies, new enrollees would have to justify their choice of a blacklisted school.

Drinan yesterday released a second blacklist for the Army and Air Force personnel which, Drinan said, had been prepared by

the Armed Services Committee staff with the aid of the Defense Department.

The second restricted list, dated Nov. 15, 1971, identified 160 military personnel enrolled at Harvard, 30 servicemen taking courses at Boston University, 20 at Tufts and eight enrolled at Boston College.

It was not immediately explained but Harvard said yesterday that at least two Army colonels and a Navy captain enrolled in advanced management courses at the Harvard Business School on Feb. 4, four months after the ban went into effect.

Drinan said the second blacklist which contained the names of six other universities on the original list, had been given him by a member of the Harvard faculty, who had obtained the information in Boston.

The total number of servicemen from the three branches of the armed forces enrolled at the 10 universities totaled 276, Drinan said.

"I am appalled that these schools are now blacklisted and military officers may not now apply at these fine institutions," Drinan added.

"I've talked with my colleagues on the House floor and in the Senate and there is great support for putting an end to this."

Others on Capitol Hill were equally upset by the blacklist. Rep. Don Edwards, D-Calif., a graduate of Stanford, said he intended to investigate the action. He was joined by Rep. William Ryan, D-N.Y., who wrote letters to the secretaries of the three branches of the armed forces and to Chairman Hébert "to voice our concern" over the blacklisting.

Sen. Edward W. Brooke said he was "very concerned about these reports."

"I will make an inquiry to the Department of Defense," he added.

Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., who received degrees from both Princeton and Columbia universities, both blacklisted schools, said he was "very annoyed and disappointed" that the Defense Department would blacklist any school.

On February 19, 1972, the New York Times, in a front-page story, revealed the background of the blacklisting and the reaction of the universities affected in the following story:

NAVY BARS STUDY AT 15 UNIVERSITIES

WASHINGTON.—Yielding to what it said was pressure from the House Armed Services Committee, the Navy has forbidden its officers to take Government-financed graduate courses at 15 colleges and universities that are eliminating Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

The action was confirmed by the Secretary of the Navy, John H. Chafee, in a letter to Representative Robert F. Drinan, Democrat of Massachusetts, that was made public today.

In the letter, Secretary Chafee said, "The reports you have received regarding our curtailment of graduate enrollment at those schools which are phasing out Navy R.O.T.C. programs are essentially correct." Mr. Chafee said that his decision had been made in response to legislative testimony by Representative F. Edward Hébert, Democrat of Louisiana and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

The schools placed off limits to Navy graduate students are Princeton, Columbia, New York University, Harvard, Stanford, Boston University, Tufts, Dartmouth, Boston College, Colgate, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, and the Pratt Institute.

In its report on legislation involving the R.O.T.C., the House committee said, "It is morally wrong for the military to spend dollars sending students to a particular college or university which has chosen not to cooperate with the military services."

"We do not believe that the fact that a particular university has an element of prestige is sufficient reason for sending a student

to a university which has withdrawn from R.O.T.C.," the committee held.

Secretary Chafee said that he subsequently had received a letter from Representative Hébert that said: "It is our hope that it will not be necessary to place a flat prohibition against sending students to these universities which have withdrawn from the R.O.T.C. program when we consider the procurement bill next year, but if it is necessary to legislate on that subject then legislate we will."

"I am not at this time asking you to withdraw students prior to the completion of the program in which they are enrolled, but I am adamant that no new students will be permitted to enter such programs at these universities."

"Thus, we are looking forward to additional reductions in the number of students attending such schools when the April report is received," Mr. Hébert wrote.

COMMENTS FROM SCHOOLS

Spokesmen at several of the institutions involved commented as follows on the Navy's action:

Yale—"The number of naval officers attending graduate courses here is so small that it is of little significance. It is regrettable that they would deny their officers what in many cases are special courses offered at only a few institutions. For instance, if they want their officers to learn the Vietnamese or Chinese language there are only about six institutions that offer these—we are one."

Princeton—"We haven't heard about the decision, but it is hard to see that the move would have any effect on us, because we only have five or six Navy officers out of 1,400 graduate students."

Dartmouth—"The number of Navy officers attending graduate school here is so small—in fact, I can't think of one—that it won't affect us. But it's too bad the Navy doesn't want to send its officers to the best schools. They're only hurting themselves."

Columbia—"This is the first we've heard of the Navy's decision. What could we possibly say?"

Officials at New York University and Harvard said that they had not heard of the move and declined comment.

On Jan. 15 the board of trustees at Princeton voted to permit military training to remain on campus as an extra-curricular activity. The board had voted 18 months earlier to end the R.O.T.C. programs by June of this year.

The Navy has made no official response to the offer.

DRINAN TOLD BY OFFICER

WASHINGTON, February 18.—The restriction was acknowledged after Representative Drinan sent Secretary Chafee a letter with a list of 15 schools that a Navy officer said he had been given as places where he could not take graduate work.

Representative Drinan asked Mr. Chafee whether it was true that the Navy was prohibiting any new enrollment of its officers at these 15 colleges and universities.

Secretary Chafee then sent the letter saying that the Representative's information was "essentially correct."

Representative Drinan said that such a step was "vindictive, coercive, retaliatory and it cuts off our nose to spite our face."

The Army and Air Force have taken no public stand in regard to members of those services who might take graduate work at the schools involved.

A report ordered by Representative Hébert's committee from the Pentagon shows the military had 164 graduate students and 112 undergraduates in 10 of the universities as of last Nov. 15.

The origin of the blacklisting is described in the following extract from report No. 92-354 of the report from the House Armed Services Committee on H.R.

4729 "Providing Additional Reserve Officers' Training Corps Scholarships for the Army, Navy and Air Force"—under date of July 18, 1971:

EXTRACT FROM HOUSE ARMED SERVICES
COMMITTEE REPORT ON H.R. 4729

Consideration was also given to including a provision which would preclude the Department of Defense, or any of the services, from paying the tuition of a military man at any institution which had withdrawn from the ROTC program. Representatives of the services raised strong objections to the inclusion of such a provision and urged the committee not to include such a provision in the bill this year. As a concession for not so doing, they agreed that they would permit military students to go to schools of higher learning which have withdrawn from the ROTC program only in those cases where there is a unique capability at a particular university. The committee reluctantly accepted this recommendation but warned the Department of Defense and the military services that if they do not comply with this agreement, language would be included in one of the bills the Armed Services Committee takes up in 1972. We do not believe that the fact that a particular university has an element of prestige is sufficient reason for sending a student to a university which has withdrawn from ROTC.

It is the intention of this committee to require a report on a semi-annual basis from each of the services naming the students who attend a university which has withdrawn from ROTC and the Secretary must justify, in each instance, the benefits to be derived from sending that particular individual to a university which has withdrawn from ROTC. It is the belief of the committee that it is morally wrong for the military to spend dollars sending students to a particular college or university which has chosen not to cooperate with the military services in providing career opportunities for those students who desire to make the military their career.

A letter under date of September 30, 1971, from Congressman HÉBERT to the Secretary of the Army, as reprinted below, requested a report from the armed services as to the way in which they were carrying out the blacklisting of universities demanded by the House Armed Services Committee:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1971.

HON. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When the Armed Services Committee considered H.R. 4729, a bill to amend section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, discussions were held concerning the possible inclusion of a provision which would preclude the Department of Defense or any of the Services from paying the tuition at any institution which has withdrawn from the R.O.T.C. program. As you are undoubtedly aware, representatives of the Services urged that we not include such a provision. We followed the Services request and did not include such a provision in the bill on the assurance that the Services would permit military students to go to schools of higher learning which have withdrawn from the R.O.T.C. program only where there is a unique capability at that particular university.

We stated in our report (H. Rept. 92-354) that we would require a report on a semi-annual basis from each of the Services, "naming the student who attended the university which has withdrawn from the R.O.T.C. and the Secretary must justify in each instance the benefits to be derived from sending that particular individual to that university."

We desire that the initial report be provided as expeditiously as possible as of the date of October 1, 1971 and each April 1 and October 1 thereafter.

Sincerely,

F. EDW. HÉBERT,
Chairman.

The following memorandum under date of November 15, 1971, indicates the extent of the military personnel attending colleges which had disassociated themselves from ROTC participation:

NOVEMBER 15, 1971.

Memorandum for Mr. Slatinshek
Subject: Enrollment of Military Personnel in
Non-ROTC-Affiliated Schools.

In response to the Chairman's letters of September 30, 1971 to each of the Services, the following information has been provided in accordance with H. Rept. 92-354 as to the numbers of military personnel currently attending schools which have disassociated themselves from ROTC participation.

School	Graduate level	Baccalaureate, nondegree, and tuition aid ¹	Totals
Harvard University.....	93	67	160
Boston University.....	20	10	30
Tufts University.....	20	0	20
Columbia University.....	15	0	15
Boston College.....	8	0	8
Yale University.....	4	0	4
New York University.....	1	4	5
State University of New York.....	2	2	4
Dartmouth College.....	1	0	1
Brown University.....	0	2	2
Total.....	164	112	276

¹ Includes 27 Army personnel receiving tuition assistance for off-duty education at undersigned schools which have disassociated themselves from ROTC participation.

I reproduce below the text of an interview as given to my office by the Department of Defense with Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird, after his appearance before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 18, 1972:

Q: Secretary Laird, what is your position on Congressman Hébert's demand that certain Navy students not be allowed to go to graduate school, that there be a blacklist?

Secretary LAIRD. We're examining very carefully the requirements for our graduate school programs. We want to do the thing that's in the best interest of the Navy and the best interest of the Service and the best interest of our personnel and the requirements that we have for special training.

Q: Secretary Chafee expressed some concern about it. Do you share his concern?

Secretary LAIRD. Well, I haven't had a chance to look over the Secretary of the Navy's statement but I can assure you that the Secretary of the Navy, as well as Chairman Hébert, want to do what's best for our country.

Q: Congressman Hébert, I wish you could come up and explain to us why you want to blacklist these colleges?

Congressman HÉBERT. I'm just one member of one committee. The Committee's position taken last year in our report and I read Secretary Chafee's letter, he merely quoted the committee report. My position and the committee's position is very simple. Where we've been thrown off of campuses in this country, I don't think that the people who throws the military off should want any part of the Defense dollar. If it's not good enough to have ROTC, they're not good enough to take our Defense money. I am very adamant and positive in that position as the Secretary well knows, he's a kind man.

Q: Do you agree with that Secretary Laird?

Secretary LAIRD. That I'm a kind man? As

long as he says I'm not a con man and a kind man, I will agree that I'm a kind man.

Q: On the other point that he was making...

Secretary LAIRD. We're looking into that very carefully at the present time.

Q: Do you think it would damage the student's possibility as far as graduate work is concerned if they aren't allowed to go to these colleges?

Secretary LAIRD. To be quite frank with you, I think that there are probably some colleges that have special courses and I believe that there may be a necessity on some of these campuses to have continual graduate work. As far as medical schools, we have a shortage of spaces in medical schools and I would hope that the committee would give some consideration to allowing those students that have been accepted for medical education to use our scholarship program on those campuses where they've been admitted. Because we are able with the help of the HR 2, which we hope will pass the Senate soon, to go forward with a new scholarship program and I'd hope that we could use all medical school facilities all over the United States until the HR 2 is fully implemented.

Q: Are you saying that you perhaps would like to see a loophole in the law if there were a law?

Secretary LAIRD. There is no law. I would rather not see a law.

Congressman HÉBERT. As a matter of fact, I don't want to correct the Secretary. There is a law on the books right now which prohibits any defense money from being spent in schools that have not allowed our recruiters on the campus. That's been a law for a few years.

Secretary LAIRD. But this does not apply to the ROTC.

Congressman HÉBERT. No, no, this is the same principle.

Secretary LAIRD. It is not a law for ROTC.

Congressman HÉBERT. Not yet, no. I hope we don't have to put it in.

Q: Do you think this is a proper way to punish these colleges?

Congressman HÉBERT. We aren't punishing anybody.

Q: Admiral Moorer would you address yourself to the blacklisting of colleges? What's your position on this?

Admiral MOORER. I'm not involved in that fortunately because as you know, I'm no longer the Service Chief and I do not get involved in administrative matters of that kind.

Congressman HÉBERT. May I object to the use of the word blacklisting. Were not blacklisting anybody. We're merely laying down rules and regulations. If they don't want to buy our product, they don't have to, we're not blacklisting them. These are the cute words of good reporters like yourself that get over these things. Like early in the game you sought about Secretary Chafee's concern. All Secretary Chafee quoted was the report and said he too shares concern. We all share the concern, but in the connotation of asking the concern, I'm not lecturing you, I'm just saying I don't want to be falling into those kind of traps. This will be cut off of the air, it won't be said, but I'm going to say it anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude, as Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr. concluded in his letter of February 17, 1972, that the denial of access to universities which have phased out ROTC is "both unsound and punitive." I agree also with Congressman O'NEILL when he states:

The universities of this nation cannot long remain free and independent if pressure from military and government quarters is to govern their behavior.

I emphasize the fact that Secretary Chafee has conceded in his letter that the program of blacklisting results in a "loss to the Navy and the Nation." I therefore join Congressman O'NEILL and a growing number of Members of this House in Mr. O'NEILL's request to Congressman HEBERT: "I respectfully urge you to reconsider this decision."

TELEPHONE PRIVACY ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House today the Telephone Privacy Act, which would give the individual greater control over who can call him over the telephone.

This legislation would give to individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the telephone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political organizations and poll takers. In addition, debt collection agencies or any other company with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt would not be covered under this bill.

I believe the Telephone Privacy Act is important legislation because it will significantly reduce the use of the telephone as a tool for invading an individual's privacy. There is no doubt that the use of the telephone as a vehicle for commercial solicitation has vastly increased in recent years. Today, many magazines, newspapers, laundries, butchers and various and sundry other types of businesses are increasingly turning to the telephone to solicit long lists of potential customers. Often taken directly out of the phone book or out of city directories. Conceptually, the best way this legislation can be described is as being analogous to allowing an individual to place a "no solicitors" sign on his telephone. Just as an individual has the right to control who enters his home, he should equally have the right to control what kinds of telephone calls he receives—to the extent that is possible.

Under this legislation, the telephone company would be required to either make a list of customers who do not want to be commercially solicited available to firms, or put an asterisk directly in the phone book by the names of those invoking the commercial solicitation ban. The telephone company would be required to ask its customers, at least annually, whether they wish to invoke the ban. The telephone company would then be required to make available to commercial solicitors lists of those individuals who do not object to being commercially solicited over the phone. The FCC is given the authority to prescribe the specific manner in which the phone

company will make these lists available to these firms.

Simply put, the object of this bill is to put some reasonable restraints on the growing number of firms who are turning to the telephone as an inexpensive and personal medium through which to do their advertising. A recent article in *Parade* summed up the problem by quoting a Los Angeles housewife, who complained that:

In the course of a single day I was phoned by a cemetery lot salesman, a newspaper subscription salesman, a cosmetics saleslady, a used car salesman, an insurance salesman, and a TV salesman.

There are four basic types of phone calls that generate complaints: abusive calls, such as obscene phone calls; debt collection calls; misdirected calls; and commercial solicitation calls. This legislation is directed against the fourth category, commercial solicitation, which affects virtually every phone user in the country. The beauty of this bill is that it will measurably increase the privacy of tens of millions of Americans with minimal expense and with no bureaucracy. Another nice thing about this proposal is that it will be immediately effective and quite easy to enforce. The first reason for it being easy to enforce is that the vast majority of reputable firms will, of course, obey the law. The second reason is that there are sure to be at least 10 complaints if a company is making hundreds of phone calls in violation of the law. Under the bill, if more than 10 complaints are received against a firm, its officers could be subject to criminal prosecution. The third reason is that commercial solicitation is inherently unlike the obscene call problem, where the caller will generally not identify himself. But a company soliciting business over the telephone obviously has to identify itself and, so, the problem of identifying who is breaking the law is eliminated.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the issue in this bill is the individual's right to control possible invasions of his privacy versus the unabridged freedom to advertise. I believe that in this case it is clear that the individual's right to privacy should prevail.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1394. A act to amend the Bankruptcy Act to abolish the referee's salary and expense fund, to provide that fees and charges collected by the clerk of a court of bankruptcy in bankruptcy proceedings be paid into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, to provide salaries and expenses of referees be paid from the general fund of the Treasury, and to eliminate the statutory criteria presently required to be considered by the Judicial Conference in fixing salaries of full-time referees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1395. An act to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76) to increase the maximum compensation allowable to re-

ceivers and trustees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1396. An act to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 63) and sections 631 and 634 of title 28, United States Code, to permit full-time referees in bankruptcy to perform the duties of a United States magistrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2359. An act for the relief of Willard O. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of the term of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers' table and referred as follows:

1635. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, transmitting the Council's Annual Report for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 4(b), 5, and 6 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (H. Doc. 92-256) to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1636. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report of Department of the Army research and development contracts in excess of \$50,000 which were awarded during the period July 1, through December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 82-557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1637. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report on mortgage settlement costs, pursuant to section 701 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1638. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the first special report on alcohol and health, pursuant to section 102(1) of Public Law 91-616; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1639. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 1972 annual report on highway relocation assistance, pursuant to section 33 of Public Law 90-495; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1640. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the incomplete installation of the management accounting system for procurement of equipment and missiles in the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Feb. 17, 1972, the following report was filed on Feb. 19, 1972.]

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11021. A bill to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Twenty-First Annual Report on the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 13267. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 13268. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Office for the Aging in the Executive Office of the President, for the fulfillment of the purposes of the Older Americans Act, for enlarging the scope of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GERALD R.

FORD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 13269. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of living expenses of a State legislator while away from home in attending sessions of the State legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

193. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. B. Stoner, Marietta, Ga., and others, relative to impeachment proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

194. Also petition of the city council, White Salmon, Wash., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Monday, February 21, 1972

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Douglas R. Chandler, professor of church history, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, father of all, we thank Thee for the lessons of our past which revive ancient dreams and remind us again and again of our covenant with Thee. We have learned in our blackest hours of despair to flee to Thee for renewed hope. Thou hast taught us that Thy laws are established in Thy love, and Thy judgments are overshadowed by Thy mercies.

Now again, as we seek to "praise famous men and our fathers who begat us," we thank Thee for the remembrance of one whose face and name are marked so clearly in our history and in our hearts: our first President. By remembering him, we are moved to pray that, like him, we may be free from unworthy passions and small prejudices and that good sense, wise counsel, honest speech, and incorruptible zeal may grace our deeds and words.

Forgive, O Lord, and sanctify to our good the faults which we now confess. Make our minds eager to learn Thy thoughts and our feet quick to walk Thy ways of righteousness and peace. Deliver us from every temptation to spoil the spacious beauty of our inheritance or to endanger the health and goodness of our fair land. Work among us by Thy Spirit, that we may be people blessed by Thee, covenanted for the healing of the nations, instruments of Thy peace, and laborers, still, for that "godly union and concord" of which our fathers dreamed. 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 21, 1972.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GAMBRELL 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 Friday, February 18, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected to bills beginning with Calendars No. 588, through No. 599.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MRS. KAYO N. CARVELL

The bill (H.R. 2714) for the relief of Mrs. Kayo N. Carvell, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-621), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve immediate relative status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen, to which status she would have been entitled were it not for the death of her husband.

JUANITA SAVEDIA VARELA

The bill (H.R. 2792) for the relief of Juanita Savedia Varela, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-622), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve immediate relative status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen, to which status she would have been entitled were it not for the death of her husband.

MRS. CRESCENCIA LYRA SERNA AND HER MINOR CHILDREN, MARIA MINDE FE SERNA, SALLY GAROZA SERNA, GONZALO GAROZA SERNA, AND JAMES GAROZA SERNA

The bill (H.R. 3093) for the relief of Mrs. Crescencia Lyra Serna and her minor children, Maria Minde Fe Serna, Sally Garoza Serna, Gonzalo Garoza Serna, and James Garoza Serna, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-623), explaining the purposes of the measure.